



The Modernisation of Residential Care and Day Care services for older people Consultation

An Analysis of the questionnaire & written responses

April 2019



CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
1. INTRODUCTION	7
2. BACKGROUND	7
3. METHODOLOGY	8
4. RESULTS - Residential Care	8
5. RESULTS - Day Care Services	48

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- This section provides a summary of the main findings.
- The report presents the findings of a consultation on proposals to modernise Rhondda Cynon Taf residential care and day care services for older people. The report covers the questionnaire responses that were received online or in paper format, as well as any other written submissions.
- The consultation period ran for 12 weeks from the 14th January to 8th April.
- 372 responses to the Residential Services questionnaire were received and 125 responses to the Day Care Services questionnaire were received.

Residential Care

- 47.3% of respondents agreed with the Council's preferred option to retain a level of provision of residential care homes which are focused on providing complex care and respite. Only 34.9% disagreed with the Council's preferred option and the others unsure.
- Members of the public were more likely to agree with the preferred option 3 than other respondents, with 56.7% of the public in agreement. 39.5% of staff respondents were in agreement, with a fairly high 29.1 % unsure. 44.2% of relatives agreed with the preferred option, with 40% disagreeing.

The comments received on option 3 (the preferred option) can be summarised under a number of key themes, as follows;

- **Geographical Location (n =15)** - There was concern about the geographical provision of residential care and that the Council must ensure that there are sufficient places in local areas across RCT.
- **Rhondda Fach (n=30)** - Although there were comments in relation to specific homes and areas, this theme was most prevalent for the Rhondda Fach area, where a number of comments were made highlighting the need for provision in this area.
- **Support for Option 3 (n=62)** - There were a number of comments in support of the Council's preferred option.
- **Concerns about impact of change on residents (n=38)** - concerns about the impact change could have on current residents.

- **Disagree – No changes to current model (n=28)** - These comments largely focused on the current care provided to relatives and residents own satisfaction with the homes.
- **Concerns over private sector / Extra Care (n=36)** - concerns over the level of care provided by extra care facilities. There were also a number of comments concerning the level of care provided by the Private Sector.
- **Recognition change is needed – Re-invest in current homes (n=21)** - a change is needed. However, these focused on reinvesting in the current homes in RCT and suggested that the provision should be extended
- **Need more information (n=20)** - Some respondents suggested that there was a lack of information provided that made it difficult to make a decision.
- **Praise for current homes (n=17)** - Throughout this section there were comments made praising the care and service provided by the councils' current residential homes and the staff that work there.

Respondents were asked what impact option 3 would have upon themselves or their family if it was to go ahead.

- **Impact on Resident (n=100) – Impact on Relative (n=52)** - There were concerns that they would find it difficult to cope with change and this could have a negative impact on their health and well-being. Alongside this, there were concerns about the impact the proposals could have on relatives
- **Impact to Staff (n=52)** - The prospect of potential job losses was highlighted as an area of concern for staff with effects on their financial circumstances.

Option 1 – Continue Existing arrangements – Do Nothing

46.5% of respondents stated that they agreed that this should be the preferred option. The comments received on this option can be summarised into the following key themes:

- **Change is needed (n=64)** - agreement that there needed to be a change to the current system. There was a recognition that to do nothing would not benefit future generations and showed agreement for the preferred option
- **Change needed – Modernise current homes (n=44)** - often caveated with the preference that the homes would not be closed.
- **No change is needed (n=46)** - the current homes were suitable as they were and meeting the needs of current residents.
- **No Change - Don't like change / Disruption (n=23)** - potential disruption any changes to the current provision may lead to and the effect this would have on residents and their families.

- **No change- Care is good (n=27)** - Coupled with the above theme, there were a number of comments made giving praise to the high level of care.

Option 2 – Phased decommissioning of all the Council's care homes as part of planned programme of transformation in line with the implementation of the Council's extra care development programme and Cwm Taf care home market position.

- 82.9% of respondents said that this should not have been the preferred option.
- **Disagreement with Option 2 (n=78)** - there was a need for some level of council run residential care homes to remain as an alternative to private sector homes.
- **Disruption to residents (n=62)** - Similar to the proposals with Option 3, there were a number of comments made opposing option 2 based on the potential disruption any closures or move would have on current residents.
- **Concerns about Private Sector (n=29)** - There were also a number of comments made concerning the level of care provided by the Private Sector.

Respondents were given the opportunity to provide any other comments or provide alternative proposals or suggestions.

- **Modernise current buildings (n=20)** - the current residential care homes should be modernised.
- **Modernise current buildings- Rhondda Fach suggestions (n=29)** - There were a number of suggestions for a new build home to be built on land identified in Pontygwaith as well as other sites identified as suitable.
- **Agreement with proposal- Change is needed (n=23)** - In favour of modernization of facilities and the provision of choice to residents.
- **Disagreement with proposals (n=26)** - There were comments made against the preferred option.
- **Disruption for Residents (n=25)** – Moving residents would cause distress and upheaval.
- **Concerns about staff / jobs (n=7)** - Once again there were further comments made regarding the future of jobs within residential homes.

Day Care Services

Phased decommissioning of the Council's day services as part of a planned programme of transformation in line with the proposed new service model.

- 53% of respondents disagreed with the preferred option.
- **Disruption for service users (n=22)** - Current attendees of the centres commented how they are satisfied with the current service and it meets their needs

- **Need more information (n=14)** - There were concerns that the level of detail regarding the preferred option was not sufficient
- **Praise for current Day Centres (n=14)** - In general there was praise for the services provided, the staff and the level of care received.
- **Agree with proposal (n=10)** - There was some support for the preferred option in comments that stated the proposals could open up more opportunities to people within the community to access services.
- **Agree with change – Day Centres to remain open (n=12)** - In support of a change to modernise the current system however they were opposed to closing the day centres
- **Disagree with proposal (n=9)** - The service is of benefit to users currently and uncertainty over the proposed benefits of any changes to the system.

Respondents were asked what impact option 2 would have upon themselves or their family if it was to go ahead.

- **Impact on service user (n=52)** - Potential impact on the service user would be detrimental to their health and well-being.
- **Impact on relatives (n=28)** - The respite that is afforded to relatives whilst family members attend the day centre was evidently an important factor and comments indicated that this was a vital service in ensuring they were able to continue with their caring responsibilities at home.
- **No Impact (n=12)** - The proposals would have minimal or no impact
- **More information needed (n=9)** - Some respondents felt that the proposals did not provide enough information to be able to make a judgement on the options.
- **Impact to Staff (n=7)** - Possible impact and changes would have on staff.

Option 1 - Alternative Options – Continue Existing Arrangements – Do Nothing

- Respondents were asked if option 1 should have been the preferred option. 48.3% of people agreed and 36.4% disagreed with the proposal to do nothing.
- **Agree- No need to change (n=35)** - the service is currently meeting the needs of its users and therefore no change is required.
- **Disagree – Change needed (without closing day centres) (n=22)** - There were suggestions made to modernise the current day centres and amend opening hours.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report presents the findings of a consultation on proposals to modernise Rhondda Cynon Taf residential care and day care services for older people. The report covers the questionnaire responses that were received online or in paper format, as well as any other written submissions.
- 1.2 Section 2 outlines a brief background to the reasons for the consultation.
- 1.3 Section 3 provides a brief methodology.
- 1.4 Section 4 presents the findings for the residential care proposals.
- 1.5 Section 5 presents for the findings for the day care services proposals.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 An independent review of residential and day care services for older people was commissioned in 2018 and undertaken by Practice Solutions Ltd, Abercynon. In the light of the independent Report, the Council's Cabinet agreed at a meeting on 19 November 2018 that officers should, for Residential Care;

- Initiate a 12-week public, resident and staff consultation on future options for the Council's Residential Care Homes. The three options being considered by the Council and the subject of the consultation were:

Option 1:

Continue with existing arrangements

Option 2:

Phased closure of council Care Homes, with residents moving to Extra Care or the independent sector

Option 3: (The Council's preferred option)

Retain a level of provision of Residential Care Homes which are focussed on providing complex care and respite.

- 2.2 For Day Care Services;

- Initiates a 12-week public and staff consultation on the options regarding the future of the Council's day service provisions for older people. The two options being considered by the Council and the subject of the consultation were:

Option 1:

Continue with existing arrangements

Option 2: Preferred Option

A Phased decommissioning of the Council's day services as part of a planned programme of transformation in line with the proposed new service model

3. METHODOLOGY

- 3.1 The consultation period ran for 12 weeks from the 14th January to the 8th April 2019.
- 3.2 The full consultation methodology is outlined in the main report (Practice Solutions).
- 3.3 The questionnaire was designed by the consultation team in liaison with Practice Solutions and senior Adult services staff.
- 3.4 The questionnaire was promoted online and through social media and a paper copy was sent to all of the key stakeholders, including, residents, service users, relatives and staff. Paper copies were also available at the events in the homes and day centres, as well as the public events and on request through a dedicated contact number. A freepost address was also provided.
- 3.5 A dedicated email address was set up and all written submissions were welcomed and are included in this report where relevant.
- 3.6 372 responses to the questionnaire were received to the residential care questionnaire and 125 responses were received for the day care services questionnaire. The results are outlined in this report. All of the written responses have been shared with Cabinet Members and Senior Managers to inform decision making.

4. RESIDENTIAL CARE

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

- 4.1 33.5% of respondents to the questionnaire were members of the public, 26.9% were relatives of the residents and 24.2% were staff.

Break % Respondents	
Base	364
Q1 Are you a:	
Resident of a residential care home	8.5%
Relative/Partner/Friend of a resident in a Council run residential care home	26.9%
Advocate for a resident of a Council run residential care home	1.1%
Member of the general public	33.5%
Staff member	24.2%
Other (please state)	5.8%

Note: If totals do not equate to 100%, throughout the report, this is due to rounding.

4.2 Respondents were asked which residential care home their views related to. The table below shows that 24% of questionnaires received were providing general comments about the proposals, with Ferndale House (67 responses) and Troed y Rhiw (57 responses) receiving the most comments specific to their homes.

Counts Break % Respondents	
Base	366
Parc Newydd, Talbot Green	42 11.5%
Pentre House, Pentre	24 6.6%
Tegfan, Aberdare	18 4.9%
Ystrad Fechan, Treorchy	11 3.0%
Bronllwyn, Gelli	1 0.3%
Cae Glas, Hawthorn	12 3.3%
Clydach Court, Trealaw	13 3.6%

Dan Y Mynydd, Porth	9 2.5%
Ferndale House, Ferndale	67 18.3%
Garth Olwg, Church Village	24 6.6%
Troed Y Rhiw, Mountain Ash	57 15.6%
No - these are general comments	88 24.0%

Recommended option 3 – The preferred option

- 4.3 The Councils recommended option was for the Council to retain a level of provision of residential care homes which are focused on providing complex care and respite.
- 4.4 47.3% of respondents agreed with the Council's preferred option to retain a level of provision of residential care homes which are focused on providing complex care and respite. Only 34.9% disagreed with the Council's preferred option and the others unsure.

Counts Break % Respondents	
Base	364
Q3 Do you agree with option 3?	
Yes	172 47.3%
No	127 34.9%
Don't Know	65 17.9%

- 4.5 The table below shows that members of the public were more likely to agree with the preferred option 3 than other respondents, with 56.7% of the public in agreement. 39.5% of staff respondents were in agreement, with a fairly high 29.1 % unsure. 44.2% of relatives agreed with the preferred option, with 40% disagreeing.

Counts Analysis % Respondents	Q3 Do you agree with option 3?		
	Yes	No	Don't Know
Q1 Are you a:			
Resident of a residential care home	9 30.0%	12 40.0%	9 30.0%
Relative/Partner/Friend of a resident in a Council run residential care home	42 44.2%	38 40.0%	15 15.8%
Advocate for a resident of a Council run residential care home	1 25.0%	1 25.0%	2 50.0%
Member of the general public	68 56.7%	41 34.2%	11 9.2%
Staff member	34 39.5%	27 31.4%	25 29.1%
Other (please state)	14 66.7%	5 23.8%	2 9.5%

4.6 The table below shows the levels of agreement (numbers of responses) split by each residential care home. The numbers are fairly low at this level, so caution should be used in interpreting the data.

Counts Respondents	Total	Q3 Do you agree with option 3?		
		Yes	No	Don't Know
Base	358	169	125	64
Parc Newydd, Talbot Green	42	15	20	7
Pentre House, Pentre	23	8	7	8
Tegfan, Aberdare	17	8	4	5
Ystrad Fechan, Treorchy	11	7	4	-
Bronllwyn, Gelli	1	-	1	-
Cae Glas, Hawthorn	11	6	1	4
Clydach Court, Trealaw	13	5	6	2
Dan Y Mynydd, Porth	9	7	1	1
Ferndale House, Ferndale	64	20	20	24
Garth Olwg, Church Village	23	13	9	1

Troed Y Rhiw, Mountain Ash	57	23	27	7
No - these are general comments	87	57	25	5

4.7 The comments received on option 3 can be summarised under a number of key themes, as follows;

Number	Theme	Detail	Number of comments
1	Geography / Location	Location of homes is important- equal share all over RCT.	15
1.a	Location – Rhondda Fach	Concern that Rhondda Fach could lose only care home if Ferndale House closed.	30
2	Re-build / re-invest in current homes	Investment should be made to current homes to re-build or renovate to ensure as little change as possible to residents.	21
3	Disagree – No Changes to current model	The system is working fine currently – why change this.	28
4	Support Option 3	Agreement that option 3 is a sensible approach to cover needs.	62
5	Concerns about impact of change on residents	Any change / move would have a negative effect on resident and concerns how big this impact could be.	38
6	Praise for current homes	Current care homes and staff provide excellent care.	17
7	Concerns over private sector/ Extra Care	Local authority care is better than Private sector / Extra care won't meet needs	36
8	Need more information on option 3	Concerns that 'complex needs' isn't defined and how this will impact on future service users.	20
10	Other	Miscellaneous Comments	25

Geographical Location (n =15)

- 4.8 There was concern about the geographical provision of residential care and that the Council must ensure that there are sufficient places in local areas across RCT. The location of homes in relation to transport access was also a concern with comments indicating a reliance on public transport for staff and visitors to the homes.

Some comments included:

“There is a need for complex care and respite to be provided locally in places that are easy to access on public transport.”

“I think it’s important to analyse provision across RCT in order to ensure any revision to the current model clearly demonstrates a fair & reasonable geographic distribution of homes & families”.

“This should be at a provision that allows all family members to be able to visit without undue financial increase and should be ease of access i.e on transport routes for those who have to use public transport.”

“I feel at Parc Newydd we provide a very high level of care to residents and respite with very good geographical location to local shops and amenities, bus routes and near to general hospital which benefits residents, family, friends and staff.”

Rhondda Fach (n=30)

- 4.9 Although there were comments in relation to specific homes and areas, this theme was most prevalent for the Rhondda Fach area, where a number of comments were made highlighting the need for provision in this area. There were concerns that the area does not have adequate alternative provisions and travel to other areas would not be suitable.

Some comments included:

“Ferndale House is the only provider in the Upper Rhondda Fach for residential, respite and people with dementia. Closing Ferndale House will not only affect the residents and their families but will hit the community hard. I agree that investment is needed but Pontygwaith and Maerdy have yet again being treated as unimportant.”

“Closing Ferndale House would have a devastating blow to Ferndale as a community.”

“What about Maerdy to Porth there will be no residential or day centre!”

“Continued provision in Rhondda Fach i.e Ferndale as we are poorly served regarding vital services”.

Support Option 3 (n=62)

- 4.10 There were a number of comments in support of the Council's preferred option. Some of the comments suggested that there needed to be a change to the current model and the proposed option would provide more choice to suit needs.

Some comments included:

“This option enables the Council to meet its obligations to those people who most need high standards of Care and Respite”.

“I agree to the council's decision to actually improve the service of care provided as our homes at present have few or very little en-suite facilities and for what the clients pay I think this is now a necessity”.

“I think it is vital that the council retain some control of the residential homes especially for the more complex cases.”

“I think that option 3 is a considered option as long as there would be homes available for people to enter if their needs required them a place of safety.”

“Believe this is the most realistic option despite the review suggesting that the council provided no residential facilities. Extra care housing is a reliable evidence based model for provision of service as the individual requires more care. Ideally most would wish to remain in their own homes, which means there needs to be investment in community provision and electronic or virtual solutions too.”

Concerns about impact of change on residents (n=38)

- 4.11 Alongside the comments in support of change to the current system were concerns about the impact change could have on current residents. There was a concern that any change or move would have a negative effect on residents in homes currently. Whilst some comments state that if managed correctly this could be minimized, others felt that this would be too much change for the residents to cope with.

Some comments included:

“My mother is 94 this year and has settled into Garth Olwg very well. The staff are wonderful and all the residents appear very happy. To move all these old people would cause a lot of upset and confusion to many residents.”

“I want as little change and upset for my mother as possible, dementia sufferers need simplicity and the same things to maintain their wellbeing and changes will not help her at all.”

“Providing there is no disruption to the existing residents whilst maintaining the same care as provided by the staff at this present time.”

“My mother has dementia which is slowly taking away her memory. Any changes to her surroundings will cause a lot of anxiety and confusion. She currently refers to her room as her home. I strongly feel that changes to her surroundings and routines (and with changes in staff) would not benefit Mum in any way.”

Disagree – No changes to current model (n=28)

- 4.12 Another theme emerging in this section was the idea that ‘if it’s not broke, don’t fix it’. These comments largely focused on the current care provided to relatives and residents own satisfaction with the homes. The comments highlight a feeling that the system is working adequately for these relatives and residents and that any changes to this would have a negative effect. The comments largely disagreed with any change.

Some comments included:

“Why change anything that is working as well for the community.”

“I am happy where I am, everything I want is here for me. I have my room as I want it, I’m very happy where I am. I’m 91 years old I don’t want the hassle and move about, I’m settled. If I was younger it would be different but a big move would be hard. Not for me – I wouldn’t settle nowhere else.”

“I would prefer option 1, maintaining status quo. This will cause the least disruption to all residents and their families.”

“Why change something that works”.

Concerns over private sector / Extra Care (n=36)

- 4.13 A number of comments were made regarding the Extra Care facilities discussed as part of the proposals. There were concerns over the level of care provided by these facilities and whether needs would sufficiently be met. Levels of isolation and well-being were also highlighted as an area for concern with Extra Care. There were also a number of comments concerning the level of care provided by the Private Sector and therefore in support of the Council retaining residential homes.

Some comments included:

“It is important that councils keep control of homes – for the safety of residents. Too many private firms have had problems with care.”

“Private run homes in general do not have a good reputation. This covers staffing levels and 24/7 qualified supervision qualified training by independent certified individual’s staff salary levels and turnover as well as inspection.”

“I can see that Extra Care in a modern accommodation will provide an alternative to a care home and allow residents to be independent, but not everyone will be able to be independent.”

“Working at the home our residents are cared for in a warm friendly environment, this is what they need at their time of life. Extra care does not work like this, a lot of people living in Extra care are isolated, it’s quite sad.”

“Extra care are large, cold buildings with no atmosphere. I know people living in Ty Heulog not suitable for everyone.”

Recognition change is needed – Re-invest in current homes (n=21)

- 4.14 There were a number of comments that acknowledged that a change is needed to the current system. However, these focused on reinvesting in the current homes in RCT and suggested that the provision should be extended further.

Some comments included:

“Care homes could be refurbished and residents kept where they are, it could be done bit by bit avoiding much disruption.”

“I believe existing residential homes should be adapted to encompass special needs – more staff and specialized training, plus extension of units on existing sites. Homes already available are geographically well places for local residents and families.”

“All existing homes should be upgraded and kept open. Extra care facilities should be built as planned as demand will increase in the next few years.”

“With a growing aging population, RCT should be maintaining its existing facilities and seeking to further extend the current level of provision.”

Need more information (n=20)

- 4.15 Some respondents suggested that there was a lack of information provided that made it difficult to make a decision. Comments included questions regarding specific details outlined in the proposal and required further detail on the consequences of the proposals before they felt able to make a decision on their preference. There were also a number of requests to define complex care.

Some comments included:

“Would need a lot more information before my decision is made.”

“One option was to do nothing; another to decommission all. This claims to be a middle ground but it’s entirely unclear as to what would happen. Will some homes close? If so, which ones? Will newer homes be built to meet current standards? How can you expect people to provide their opinion when the options are so vague?”

“This option does not give any actual details of what will determine complex needs. All residents have different needs, not details of the costs of providing newer facilities no details of where the funding is coming from. “

“There is not enough information to make an informed decision. Who will pay for the care of individuals who will be looked after by the

external market? What would the criteria be? Any who would make the decision?"

"We are being asked to make an informed choice with very little information!"

Praise for current homes (n=17)

- 4.16 Throughout this section there were comments made praising the care and service provided by the councils' current residential homes and the staff that work there.

Some comments included:

"Ferndale house is the only home in Rhondda Fach, excellent reputation and loyal staff. Rebuild in Pontygwaith on the old rest assured land."

"Keep Garth Olwg care home open, for clients and their families who need respite care and continue with the excellent reputation that we pride ourselves on, when it comes to supporting families and clients with the help and care they deserve."

"My mother-in-law was a resident at Bronwydd, followed by a private nursing home and the difference between both was huge. Well done to council run establishments."

"Cae Glas is a wonderful care home – please do not even consider closing it – staff are amazing. My mother is safe and happy."

"Pentre House HFE is exactly that a well run established home that provides all the care and attention that the residents of our home require. Pentre House is situated in a beautiful area and all the residents are extremely happy here".

- 4.17 Respondents were asked **what impact option 3 would have upon themselves or their family if it was to go ahead**. The following main themes emerged.

Number	Theme	Detail	Number of comments
11	Impact on Resident	Impact on their emotional and mental health as well as to their medical health. Unnecessary upset as they are happy where they are.	100
12	Impact to community	Loss of community ethos, services in area. Rhondda Fach – no alternatives in area.	14
13	Impact on Relative	Location of home may mean extra travel making visiting difficult. Extra care responsibilities adding burden to relatives and extra stress.	52
14	Staff	Job cuts leading to added financial strain / stress Travelling to work adding extra time / burden.	52
15	Positive / No direct impact	Minimal or no impact at present but potential for impact as become older and may need to access service.	51
16	Other	Miscellaneous Comments	32

Impact on Resident (n=100) / Impact on Relative (n=52)

- 4.18 One of the most common themes that emerged in this section was the impact that the proposals could have on the residents of the homes. There were concerns that they would find it difficult to cope with change and this could have a negative impact on their health and well-being. Alongside this, there were concerns about the impact the proposals could have on relatives. Possible home closures could mean increased travel time to visit relatives, extra caring responsibilities leading to added stress, concern for the well-being and safety of their relative outside of a residential home environment.

“I don’t think my mother would deal with the change. It would also be more difficult for family to visit as regular as we do.”

“I feel this will impact on families and service user’s emotional wellbeing as they may not be able to live within the locality of their

family, they may not receive the respite as required due to lack of resources and availability within the service.”

“The proposed consolidation of the care homes would have significant detrimental effects on my family with both parents reaching old age along with my in laws, the ever decreasing options of good high quality care provision in residential care will obviously limit their and my options when the time comes for them to access appropriate care”.

“I truly believe that my mother would not survive the upheaval. She is settled and happy where she is, the care she receives is next to none. I have never met such a homely place and the staff are wonderful and completely dedicated. My mother has dementia and is extremely well looked after. Dementia patients seem to have less consideration for their wellbeing”.

“It would cause undue worry and stress as the current arrangements suit my mother. She is comfortable and familiar in her surroundings. She would not cope physically or emotionally with another arrangement. It would have a detrimental effect on us all.”

Impact to the Community – Rhondda Fach (n=14)

- 4.19 There were a number of comments made in relation to the impact the closure of Ferndale House would have on the communities in the Rhondda Fach area. The negative impact of moving residents from their local communities was highlighted through a number of comments as well as the suggestion that the local economy may also be impacted.

“.....the impact on the community spirit where people who shop up Ferndale pop in for chats and the school children come weekly to do activities as they are all in walking distance. Staff are all in walking distance i.e walk to work in the snow to pull together as a good team to make sure they are there to give the care they need.”

“My home is in Rhondda Fach, to move me to another valley would be heart breaking please build a home in Rhondda Fach, that’s where I’m from. If I go somewhere else it would be a big impact on my family.”

“I do not live in Ferndale but I would not visit Ferndale or surrounding areas therefore local businesses would suffer.”

Impact to Staff (n=52)

- 4.20 There were a number of comments that indicated varying impacts to members of staff in residential care homes. The prospect of potential job losses was highlighted as an area of concern for staff with effects on their financial circumstances. There were also comments made regarding the uncertainty of the future with further information required regarding job security.

“On a personal level, if this proposal was to go ahead it would have a very negative impact on my family as I fear I may well find myself unemployed, and with three teenagers going through university and college at the moment it is a very concerning time for my family.”

“If the care home I work in was closed this would have a massive impact on my financial situation and especially if I were to lose my job. This is obviously causing worry and stress to myself.”

“Obviously we cannot recommend as we are going into the unknown the impact on myself as an employee is yet unknown as we haven’t been told what is happening with our homes which ones will close.”

- 4.21 Additionally there were comments from staff indicating that potential changes to the location of their jobs could have an impact on their home life.

“If home was to close I may need to be out of the house longer as I may need to travel further for work.”

“If my home closes & I’m relocated to another home, I will be away from my family for longer each day.”

“I have concerns about travelling to and from a new place of work (further distance) with a young family at home to consider. I find the whole situation very stressful having been through this before at Maesffynon”.

- 4.22 However, there were also comments made by staff members indicating that should the decision be made to close homes they would welcome the opportunity to take early retirement or voluntary redundancy.

“I have already expressed an interest in taking early retirement as I am now 64 years old. Therefore the impact on my family if I was able to

finish would be advantageous. Also this would make room for those who want to continue in this employment”.

“I would be only too happy to ensure our elderly are cared for at the standard of what’s needed and would apply for redundancy.”

“As I am 56 I would like to be offered EVR as I have a long service with RCTCBC.”

Positive / No Direct Impact (n= 51)

- 4.23 In contrast, there were also comments made indicating that the proposals would have a positive impact or no direct impact. There was also the suggestion that although there would be no impact at present, this was due to not requiring residential services for a family member or themselves.

“It would not impact directly on myself or my family.”

“I would like to think there will be good care available for me in the future as I am getting older. No immediate impact.”

“Not directly at this time but may in the future, and I hope it’s positive”.

“With my parents in mind (age 65+), in their later years I know they would still prefer to maintain a level of independence and would only move into a care home should their needs absolutely need it. This would give far more flexibility in their care and give them what they actually want/need.”

“The option you are choosing might suit my family in years to come”.

Option 1 – Continue Existing arrangements – Do Nothing

- 4.24 Respondents were asked if they thought that option 1 should be the preferred option. 46.5 % stated that they agreed that this should be the preferred option.

Counts Break % Respondents	
Base	342
Q6 Do you think this should have been the preferred option?	
Yes	159 46.5%
No	130 38.0%
Don't Know	53 15.5%

4.25 The table below shows that residents and relatives are more likely to agree with the option to do nothing, with members of the public having similar numbers who agree and disagree. More staff disagree with this option than agree.

Counts Analysis % Respondents	Total	Q6 Do you think this should have been the preferred option?		
		Yes	No	Don't Know
Base	337	157 46.6%	129 38.3%	51 15.1%
Q1 Are you a:				
Resident of a residential care home	26	21 80.8%	1 3.8%	4 15.4%
Relative/Partner/Friend of a resident in a Council run residential care home	90	50 55.6%	25 27.8%	15 16.7%
Advocate for a resident of a Council run residential care home	4	1 25.0%	2 50.0%	1 25.0%
Member of the general public	117	52 44.4%	52 44.4%	13 11.1%
Staff member	79	28 35.4%	35 44.3%	16 20.3%
Other (please state)	21	5 23.8%	14 66.7%	2 9.5%

4.26 The table below shows the levels of agreement with do nothing (numbers of responses) split by each residential care home. The numbers are fairly low at this level, so caution should be used in interpreting the data.

Counts Respondents	Q6 Do you think this should have been the preferred option?			
	Total	Yes	No	Don't Know
Base	338	157	129	52
Q2 Do your views relate to any residential care home in p...				
Parc Newydd, Talbot Green	41	22	15	4
Pentre House, Pentre	21	9	8	4
Tegfan, Aberdare	16	11	3	2
Ystrad Fechan, Treorchy	11	4	3	4
Bronllwyn, Gelli	1	1	-	-
Cae Glas, Hawthorn	11	3	7	1
Clydach Court, Trealaw	13	8	3	2
Dan Y Mynydd, Porth	9	1	6	2
Ferndale House, Ferndale	56	23	16	17
Garth Olwg, Church Village	19	14	4	1
Troed Y Rhiw, Mountain Ash	55	32	14	9
No - these are general comments	85	29	50	6

4.27 The themes emerging in the comments in this section for the option to do nothing can be grouped as below:

Number	Theme	Detail	Number of comments
17	Change is needed	Some form of change is needed. Homes need upgrading and a change to the system balanced with the need to maintain levels of care. Alternatives to closing all homes suggested.	64
17a	Change is needed – Reinvest in current homes	Recognition that change to model is needed but not closure – reinvest in current homes	44
18	No Change is needed	Homes are suitable as they are	46
19	Don't like change / disruption	Older people don't like change, particularly those with dementia. Concerns the disruption will cause harm.	23
20	Care is good	Care in the homes is good, no change.	27
21	Other	Miscellaneous Comments	36

Change is needed (n=64)

- 4.28 The comments in support of option 1 showed a high number of people were in agreement that there needed to be a change to the current system. There was a recognition that to do nothing would not benefit future generations and showed agreement for the preferred option
Some comments included:

“Every care environment needs to evolve as long as it does not lose its safety, compassion and affordability.”

“The current model is already very out dated... residential care uptake is down, and the number of voids is unsustainable. People generally wish to remain in their own home and have services provided. Extra care housing gives this option in a reasonable form. If residential care is not an attractive option now, it certainly won't be as my generation grows older”.

“Getting older and living longer means that every ones care needs will always differ and would probably need to be based on person centered care regarding each of our individual problems as we get older and on

a personal level I must agree that I would want my own bathroom and space as I get older and I'm sure even on holiday there aren't many of us that wish to share a bathroom in this day and age. Not even on holiday".

Change needed – Modernise current homes (n=44)

- 4.29 However this was often caveated with the preference that the homes would not be closed. The level of care being maintained was a concern and alternatives to closing all homes were suggested.

"I think existing arrangements need to be looked at and wouldn't suggest doing nothing at all but don't agree with the closing of residential homes across RCT they should be upgraded and better use of resources / shared resources with other service areas."

"Modernisation of existing facilities would be essential, if they were all retained, prove too costly to be viable and not be suitable for future generations, whose expectations could not be met in the homes as they are configured at present, with facilities which were designed decades ago".

"Due to the deteriorating condition of many care homes I recognise the need to improve facilities. However I have serious reservation about the model of care that is being proposed and whether it will meet the needs of care users."

"Perhaps the allocated money should be spent on updating existing care homes wherever possible".

"Modernisation of the 11 buildings would have been my preferred option".

No change is needed (n=46)

- 4.30 A theme that also emerged in the comments for this question was that the current homes were suitable as they were and were meeting the needs of current residents.

"Happy with current provision. Moving my father would upset him and me."

"I want to keep things as they are – do nothing. As I find it suitable for me where I am."

“This is an excellent home and if things are not broken don’t fix them. We as a family appreciate there must be changes but this is a lovely home and to move these residents would be worrying”

“Why can’t the home stay as it is? I don’t want an en-suite, by having the toilet out of my room makes me walk. I have a commode in the night I could never be able to live on my own I need staff to help me.”

No Change - Don’t like change / Disruption (n=23)

- 4.31 There were some comments made regarding the potential disruption any changes to the current provision may lead to and the effect this would have on residents and their families. This was seen as a factor for favouring the option to keep the homes and service as they currently are.

“Some residents have already been uprooted from Maesffynon to Tegfan. Another move would be very unfair for them, especially to a different type of care.”

“All residents are happy and do not want to go elsewhere, surely this is understandable. Would you like it if you were told that you can’t live here anymore and imagine the stress, not just upon the resident but families too”.

“I fail to see how this would benefit residents if they have to move from any home they already reside in. Such upheaval would be detrimental to their health and wellbeing.”

No change- Care is good (n=27)

- 4.32 Coupled with the above theme, there were a number of comments made giving praise to the high level of care provided currently by the residential homes.

“As far as my own experience extends I can say that I have been very satisfied by the treatment and help I have received from existing staff at Garth Olwg”.

“Tegfan residential home have provided a high level of care to my mother....My mother has complex needs; mental health & physical needs which the staff at Tegfan have successfully managed with support from the mental health team and GP.”

“Ferndale House provides excellent care for its residents”.

“Treodyrhiw is an excellent home with the appropriate units for different needs. Staff are the most caring I’ve come across.”

Option 2 – Phased decommissioning of all the Council's care homes as part of planned programme of transformation in line with the implementation of the Council's extra care development programme and Cwm Taf care home market position.

4.33 Respondents were asked if option 2 should have been the preferred option. The overwhelming majority, 82.9% of respondents said that this should not have been the preferred option.

Counts	
Break %	
Respondents	
Base	339
Q8 Do you think this should have been the preferred option?	
Yes	25 7.4%
No	281 82.9%
Don't Know	33 9.7%

4.34 The comments in relation to option 2 can be grouped under the following themes;

Number	Theme	Detail	Number of comments
23	Concerns about Private Sector Homes	Private sector homes are run as businesses for profit, not the same standard as LA.	29
24	Extra care concerns	Extra care model has some issues that need to be addressed, cannot provide same levels of care.	14
25	Disagreement with option 2	Council should retain homes	78

26	Agreement- if managed	Providing the moves for residents is managed and in an acceptable timescale	9
27	Disruption to residents	Residents are happy and should not be moved. Potential to cause upset and distress.	62
28	Other	Miscellaneous Comments	28

Disagreement with Option 2 (n=78)

- 4.35 A theme emerged in the comments section that mirrored the high number of people opposed to Option 2. The comments suggested that there was a need for some level of council run residential care homes to remain as an alternative to private sector homes.

“Seems an unreasonable all or nothing approach.”

“Closing all Council homes would seem a bit drastic. It makes sense to keep some in-house provision for those with the most complex needs, with extra care providing more opportunities for others”

“Need to provide alternatives. Not everyone will want same”.

“Closing all 11 residential care homes would be the worst option and the most harmful to residents, families and friends.”

Disruption to residents (n=62)

- 4.36 Similar to the proposals with Option 3, there were a number of comments made opposing option 2 based on the potential disruption any closures or move would have on current residents. A negative impact to their health and well-being were highlighted as being areas of concern for this option.

“Disruption to residents caused by moving/upheaval. Low standards in care & services in independent/private care homes locally.”

“Residents are too old to be moved about.”

“It wouldn’t benefit the residents of these care homes as the upheaval in their later lives and their happiness and continuity would greatly affect them”.

Concerns about Private Sector (n=29)

- 4.37 There were also a number of comments made concerning the level of care provided by the Private Sector. It emerged that there were concerns that the cost of private care coupled with the perceived lower standard of care made this option unviable for many.

“How can a private company provide care cheaper with profit the main concern?”

“Have doubts about current standards in private sector due to funding issues and recruitment of suitable staff. Most have no qualifications or monitoring systems in place.”

“Absolutely not. To give care options solely to the private sector would have huge implications.”

“I strongly feel that there must be council provision for care. I have experienced care in the private sector and like any commercial organization the bottom line is profit”.

Extra Care concerns (n=14)

- 4.38 Alongside concerns about the level of care provided in Private sector homes were a number of comments regarding Extra Care facilities. These comments suggested that there were concerns regarding the ability of these facilities to provide the same level of care as a residential home. A number of questions were also raised in these comments regarding Extra Care facilities including the location, cost and availability to all.

“Extra care housing may look good on paper but is it what will suit everyone I doubt this very much. People will just end up waiting longer in hospital for a placement.”

“Extra care homes are fine if people can manage but what about clients that top out of extra care and do not qualify for complex care – where would these people go?”

Agreement – If managed (n=9)

- 4.39 There were a small number of comments in favour of this option with the caveat that any changes for residents must be managed effectively to minimise the disruption.

“If I think that the clients who live at Clydach Court will be happy and settled in new accommodation and that this will be an easy transition and in the long term benefits our clients’ health and well-being then I have no issue at all.”

“It would have to be a slow decommissioning – you cannot usurp people out of their homes and upset their visiting families. But as you say, the homes that they are in are not fit for purpose.”

“Independently run homes are usually much better staffed with better facilities due to funding”.

- 4.40 Respondents were given the opportunity to provide **any other comments** or provide **alternative proposals or suggestions**.

Number	Theme	Detail	Number of comments
29	Agree with proposal – change needed	Agreement that change is needed, suggestions for changes to service model	23
30	Modernise current buildings	Buildings could be modernised without moving residents	20
30a	Re-build home in Rhondda Fach	Provision in Rhondda Fach needed – alternative sites suggested	29
31	Disruption for residents	Moving residents would cause distress and upheaval could be damaging to health and well-being.	25
32	Disagreement with proposals	Council should continue as is.	26
33	Staff	Concerns about what this means for staff	7
34	Other	Miscellaneous Comments	37

Modernise current buildings (n=20)

- 4.41 A common theme in the comments was the suggestion that the current residential care homes should be modernized. This was suggested as a way of ensuring residents at the homes would have minimal disruption and maintaining their health and wellbeing at their current levels.

“At Ystrad Fechan we are set in vast grounds, plenty of room to build on if necessary”

If however this for our clients that live at Clydach Court, the home could maybe be down sized and modernized with the least of disruption and it’s in our clients best interests maybe modernize if this is an option and is feasible and of course cost effective.”

“Current homes should be modernised appropriately and retained. The older population with needs requiring placements in care homes is only going to increase in years to come”.

“I believe that Troedyrhiw home could be adapted with en-suite and provide a service for individuals with Dementia due to its size and lay out being all on one level.”

Modernise current buildings- Rhondda Fach suggestions (n=29)

- 4.42 Coupled with the suggestion to modernise current buildings, a theme emerged in the comments particularly relating to the area of Rhondda Fach. There were a number of suggestions for a new build home to be built on land identified in Pontygwaith as well as other potential sites being identified as suitable. These comments recognised the need for change but a reluctance for the home to be closed losing provision in this area.

“There are many sites throughout the Rhondda Fach that could be considered for development such as the former Rest Assured land in Pontygwaith. It is essential that there is residential care provision in the Rhondda Fach, not only for current residents and their families but for future residents and their families too.”

“..... There are plots of land available. The old Maerdy Secondary School, Main road Maerdy. The old school. Station road Ferndale, in principle many people will benefit option 3 but not dementia patients or people with severe physical difficulties.....“

“Look at the land in Maerdy, Ferndale, Tylorstown and Pontygwaith. Keep the Rhondda Fach alive. Please please invest in us”.

Agreement with proposal- Change is needed (n=23)

- 4.43 There were a number of comments made that supported the idea of change to the current system. These comments were in favour of modernisation of facilities and the provision of choice to residents.

“I would like to see investment in residential care to modernise facilities each locally of the authority should continue to offer residential support and this could be at a reduced scale for more personal service. Complex physical needs, functional mental health and dementia care, specialist dementia care alongside extra care.”

“Extra care facilities could provide staffed units for respite provision. Residential care homes should be upgraded and adequately staffed at certain times of the day to meet the needs of the people that live in them. People should have the choice of where they want to live.”

“I would like to see money well spent on residential care and to modernise facilities.”

Disruption for residents (n=25)

- 4.44 Once more, there were a number of comments in this section highlighting the negative impact the disruption could have on residents. Comments from residents indicated they would not welcome the idea of moving and the change could be detrimental to their health. Relatives were also concerned at the potential disruption and disagreed that any changes to the system should impact on the current residents.

“These elderly people have worked all their lives. Surely at their age they should not be moved around like pieces of furniture. Outrageous.”

“I am not in favour of the preferred proposal. I feel too many lives will be impacted at a negative level on a large scale”.

“I am only concerned about my relative, not the future of the service. I want to know that she will stay where she is happy and comfortable, not moved to somewhere she will be confused. That is no way to treat the elderly. We will all be that person one day.”

Disagreement with proposals (n=26)

- 4.45 There were comments made against the preferred option. These emphasized the importance of the levels of care current residents and relatives of the residential homes receive. This was shown in the comments that praised the individual homes and the standards they hold. There were also comments that highlighted the impact that relatives feel when caring for relatives.

“General feelings are very negative about the councils’ proposal from families I have spoken with. People are aware of councils funding problems but this is seen as not putting the welfare of existing care home residents first. Many of the homes scheduled to close are older but function well and have been maintained to a good standard. They don’t need to close, charge more in the current homes to keep them open.”

“My father is a resident at Tegfan Aberdare, he has made it clear to me that he is happy and settled in Tegfan and does not want to move.”

“I think too much money is being spent on other things that is not important. Shutting the care homes is not the answer. These care homes are their homes I was hoping to come into Parc Newydd myself in years to come. I have been to visit relatives and friends in other homes but to me Parc Newydd is the best.”

“People are being encouraged to stay in their own homes as long as possible but at what cost to the unseen carers (family/friends etc) who provide long hours of care often to the detriment of their physical and mental health. I was the sole carer for my mother for 7 years and frankly the level of stress was enormous. It severely impacted my physical and mental health.”

Concerns about staff / jobs (n=7)

- 4.46 Once again there were further comments made regarding the future of jobs within residential homes and concerns regarding the effect of home closures on current staff. There were also a number of comments from staff stating that although they have concerns for their own jobs, the level of care provided to residents was of the utmost importance.

“Listen to the staff who are providing the care in these residential homes. Ask them what improvements they’d like to see as they are the experts”.

“Would jobs also be lost if you are closing homes?”

“Personally I will say ‘what will be will be’. There is nothing anyone can do to fight your decisions, I just feel saddened that so many people will be put out of work and most important that all the elderly residents are going to be disrupted which may cause a lot of problems for them.”

“Although all staff are concerned for their jobs at this time we are all working together to keep a happy home for residents their families and each other.”

Equalities Impact

- 4.47 Under the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duties, the Council has a legal duty to look at how its decisions impact on people because they may have particular characteristics. The full set of results will be used to inform the Equality impact Assessment.

Respondents reported the following impacts;

Age – Residents

“Age - no where to live when I get old and need extra care”

“Age as I am part of the generation which will be directly affected by These proposals.”

“Due to my age and the length of time I have lived here I think if I had to move the upheaval would kill me.”

“Given my age any reorganisation could impact on my care in the future”

Age -Staff

“Age. I am in the bracket that would benefit from redundancy.”

“As a single male living alone I would not be in a position to accept any type of redundancy offer, I am too young to receive any kind of VER offer so I would urge the council to ensure reduction of the workforce that comes as a result of implementing these changes, council offers redundancy as voluntary only”

"It may give me the opportunity to take early retirement. At 64 I now feel I would benefit from this."

"Obviously my age is a major worry I'm not yet retirement age and where do I stand if these changes are put in place"

Disability

"Age / disability. I am registered blind so any change of surroundings"

"Being a parent of a 19yr old vulnerable adult or in the future if I myself needed to go into a care home I would like to remain in my area where I was born and bred and why should that choice be taken away from anybody. As a carer it is all about the vulnerable adults preferences and choices, if they want to remain in the Rhondda Upper Fach. Please don't forget about our individuals now who are happy and content at Ferndale House."

"Registered as disabled myself. Ferndale is easy for me to visit my mother, elsewhere would be a complete nightmare. It would mean less visiting time, more buses to catch, people to rely on as now I can visit anytime and I even take my dog to see his Nan, which they all love. You would not only isolate the residents but it impacts on visitors alike."

Mental Health/Relationships

"upsets and confuses me."

"The proposal Option 3 and Option 2 will have a significant affect on my relationship. The stress and anxiety caused by disrupting and moving my father will be extremely traumatic to my whole family as well as my father. It will severely affect my mental health and my relationships."

Relationship Status

"Age, disability, relationship status for my husband and I would be pertinent if we need to use additional care as we age. My disabled husband will have different needs from me - would we be separated?"

- 4.48 Under the Welsh Language measure 2011 and the Welsh Language Standards, the Council has a duty to look at how its decisions impact the Welsh language. Respondents were asked how they felt the proposal could impact opportunities for people to use and promote the

Welsh language and if in any way it treats the Welsh language less favourably than the English Language.

The following are a selection of comments made;

Positive

“Staff are receiving basic welsh skills to enhance the level of support they can offer individuals who speak welsh; this enhances communication with fluent welsh speakers also; a service must be able to meet the communication and preferred language choice of its users.”

“Not sure, but more people shall meet each other”.

“My husband is a Welsh speaker, he is able to use his birth language at the day centre with other attendees and staff.”

“In welsh society today, nearly all forms and paperwork are given in both welsh and English. I fail to see how the proposal could, or need to, have any negative affects.”

“I speak fluently Welsh but don't use the language regularly but do feel positive about bringing the language back. It is our first language and it should be used. I do speak occasionally in Welsh to the service users.”

“Staff could have options to learn Welsh while on duty to help with residents and their families that prefer to use as their first speaking language.”

No Impact

“Continue as normal”

“do not see how these proposals could impact on the usage of the Welsh Language.”

“Not at all! Have never heard a word of Welsh at the Day Centre”

“I hope that by these changes it would not affect the Welsh language in any way at all. I support the use of the Welsh language in its entirety.”

“Has no effect on the welsh language”

“I feel the proposals would have little or no (positive or negative) effect on the welsh language”

"I feel it would have no negative impact for people to use Welsh language and at present the Welsh language is promoted in RCT"

Negative

"Might have negative effect if insufficient staff members speak Welsh"

"As the elderly use Welsh more than younger persons, if the provisions are cut it could result in them being more isolated."

"No services, no social interaction, no enhancing well-being- no need to promote the Welsh Language".

"Pupils and staff of the local Welsh school visit Ferndale House on a weekly basis promoting the Welsh language and giving Welsh speaking residents the opportunity to continue using the language. Closing this home would prevent these visits."

"Privatising Tegfan will have a negative effect on the local community, the welsh language and colloquialisms that are common to local area"

Should not make a difference

"Treat every person as an individual and every need should be met."

"I am not interested in how it effects the language, just so long as everyone gets the care they require, that would automatically include ones language preference whether it be English, Welsh or Martian"

"It shouldn't make any difference - if the council continues with its work around the Welsh language - we should be able to provide services for individuals in the welsh language as and when required. Or any other language as requested by the citizen."

"As long as people are kind and caring I don't think people mind which language you use."

"It may be an unpopular answer but as the vast majority of people of all ages speak English as their first language in RCT even those who speak Welsh at home there should be no negative impact."

Not important/Money should be spent elsewhere

"Save money by dropping the welsh language option & spend it on our elderly"

"I think forcing the welsh language on us is a total waste of paper, signage & money."

“Even though I am a Welsh speaker we spend too much money in duplicating everything to Welsh at high cost pandering to the few.”

“I recognise that there is a legal obligation. I deplore that as a rampant prejudice, which interferes with much more important matters of ethical principle.”

“Not relevant. The Welsh language is promoted by government but is not used in public in RCT”

“Don't Know- it's about providing care not about languages that matters.”

“I am a Welsh speaker but we are wasting money to pander to the whims of a few”

Other Responses – Residential Care

- 4.49 A number of written responses were received in addition to the questionnaire responses and discussions at the various meetings. A summary of the responses are shown in the table below. The full responses have been shared with Cabinet Members and Senior Managers to inform decision making.

Organisations	Summary
Cwm Taf Morgannwg University Health Board	<p>Cwm Taf Morgannwg UHB welcomes the proposal to modernise residential care and day care services for older people in Rhondda Cynon Taff, within the context of our shared partnership aspirations.</p> <p>We acknowledge that the demand for <u>standard residential care</u> home places (as opposed to nursing home care) has decreased as more people choose to stay living in their own homes with appropriate support, or live in more modern accommodation offerings such as Extra Care facilities. As noted in the consultation, despite the good care provided, the current council owned residential facilities do not offer an environment conducive to the wellbeing and personal dignity of the residents. We would therefore agree that option 1 – continue with existing arrangements – is not viable and fails to address the current and future needs and preferences of our ageing</p>

	<p>population.</p> <p>Of the two remaining options we would support the preferred option 3: Reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We feel it is important to retain the choice of local authority residential care for our older people, alongside a range of other appropriate options, as long as the environments are updated to meet current regulatory requirements and quality care is provided in accordance with best practice, such as the Dementia Care Matters Butterfly model • The proposed focus on providing complex care is welcomed in order to ensure appropriate care environments for older people with multiple co-morbidities including those with dementia. We would stress the importance of involving the health board in discussions about bed numbers required for this growing and complex client group, to ensure that provision meets projected demand. • Opportunity for integrated working with health services is afforded more with local authority run facilities • Respite bed provision will also be extremely important to support carers sustain their crucial role in enabling the person they care for to remain living at home. • The health board has welcomed the opportunity to be involved in discussions around the development of extra-care type facilities and we are keen to explore potential benefits of co-location with health facilities and the ability to run some community based health and third sector services from or near to LA facilities. • Whilst minimising new admissions to the council's residential care homes during the consultation process seems sensible to avoid a disruptive impact on residents, we would wish to ensure that this does not lead to delayed transfer of care for clients for whom local authority residential care would be the best option.
<p>GMB and Unite Trade Unions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for status quo. The trade unions and their members believe that with the creation of 6 extra care facilities already agreed this would be difficult.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree that there needs to be an RCT owned home as the Council would be at the mercy of the private sector. • Option 2 is not an option • See benefits of extra care facilities, but believe that the same can be done to existing care homes, which will need investment to bring them up to standard. • Where the extra care homes have been built there are gaps in provision on a geographical area. A list is provided. • Concern of privatisation via the back door. • Concerns with suitability of extra care facilities for dementia care.
Age Connects Morgannwg	<p>The charity accepts that the option of doing nothing is not a realistic option in the changing world as older people look to greater independence and integration into the wider community up to an older age, and as needs change with the increase in demands for dementia services for example. We agree with the overall key principles that underpin this strategy. However, questions remain about how this strategy will be implemented and how it will affect service users and future/potential service users.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age Connects Morgannwg welcomes the Local Authority's decision to retain local authority Residential Care Homes. The Board recognises that service users feel safe with local authority homes, have trust in them and value the high level of care given in these homes. • We are aware that local authority homes need up-dating to meet modern expectations, but we are also aware of comments from current users such as "I don't care how many toilets they have as long as the quality of care is good". Will the authority therefore be investing in staff training to ensure quality of care is of the highest possible standard, including in the private sector? • We would seek more information on whether this strategy is also being considered alongside transport strategies. These valleys remain relatively low in car ownership and cost of travel as well as ease of availability of public transport remain problematic for many families. • While understanding the needs of third

	<p>sector/private residential and nursing care homes to retain levels of occupancy, the Board has commented on the need to ensure choice remains a central principle of service users' decision making when moving home. This choice can be severely limited by the 'top-up' required by the private sector homes. Is the 'top-up' being considered for discussion as part of this strategy?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of beds in Residential Homes for respite and re-ablement purposes is welcomed, however, we would query how this will operate – will beds be ring-fenced? And how will re-ablement staffing be implemented to ensure safe and appropriate packages? • There is limited reference to the Health Service joint working in relation to this strategy and we would be interested to learn what, if any, joint commissioning proposals are to be considered.
<p>Save Care Homes And Centres (SCHAC) – RCT</p>	<p>RCT, recognises that the expected rise in the proportion of older people in the county will result in increased demands on its care services. The Council, as do all residential care providers, face legal requirements to improve the quality of accommodation in homes, such as the provision of facilities in all rooms. RCT faces financial pressures as a result of the cumulative effects of austerity cuts passed down from the UK government via the Welsh Assembly. The Council is also committed to trying to ensure that priority is given to domiciled care whilst at the same time trying to provide for the range of adult needs, particularly those who are aging.</p> <p>These demands and aims are fundamentally in contradiction to an extent that we do not accept it is possible to make financial savings - cuts - whilst at the same time improve service provision as is claimed in this RCT Cabinet proposal 4.2 "...need to deliver care services more efficiently to maximise the benefits and manage cost pressures." and 4.12 "... replace high cost residential services with extra care housing and deliver more effective services with better outcomes for residents."</p>

The provision of 'extra care' sheltered housing is welcome as an additional option to the range of care available for adults in RCT. However, we do not believe that it is in anyway an acceptable or satisfactory substitute for the service provided by the county's current 11 residential homes and five day care centres. RCT proposes to close most of these thus undermining the claim that the 'modernising' proposals will result in a 'better outcome' for residents.

A 'better outcome' for residents can only be achieved by retaining, investing and improving the existing provision, as well as the 'extra care' sheltered housing to avoiding forcing those who need residential care into private provision. We believe that the proposal is primarily aimed at making a contribution to the £13m that RCT aim to save over two to three years.

Our reasons for our opposition to your proposal are as follows:

- Making savings is a key driver
RCT should be honest about these cost pressures and open the books in relation to the efficiency savings they are seeking by the proposed changes to residential care and day centres. It is clear from our calculations that the potential savings are significant and without this openness there is a real risk that the consultation will not be adequate to meet legal requirements.
- RCT residential care provides people with a home and should be prioritised
We would advocate a fourth option in addition the three recommended by the consultants: invest in extra care as well as keep and refurbish RCT's current residential care homes.
- Immediately remove the restriction on admissions to RCT residential care homes

	<p><i>We call upon RCT to remove the 6.14 restriction immediately.</i></p> <p><i>Note: See also response to Day Care element</i></p>
Taffs Well & Nantgarw Community Council	<p>The Community Council voted unanimously to support option 3 (the preferred option).</p> <p>The Community Council fully supported the proposals to promote independence and allow elderly people to remain in their own homes for as long as possible as long as the arrangements are subject to regular review and risk assessments of the individuals concerned and their surroundings.</p>
RCT OPAG (Older Persons Advisory Group)	<p>OPAG members realise there is some need for change but would strongly oppose any decision to have no local authority care homes in RCT. Members feel they would have better service from a local authority run home rather than one which is privately funded.</p> <p>Similarly, with Day Care Centres, we would not wish to see all these centres close to the detriment of the service users.</p>
Future Generations Commissioner for Wales	<p>It is important that well-being objectives (of both public bodies and public service boards), the well-being assessments and plans, the statutory goals and the sustainable development principle (including the 5 ways of working) are considered throughout the process.</p>
Friends of Ferndale House Petition (326 signatures)	<p>On behalf of the signatories below who have considered the following and decided to sign this petition concerning the possible closure of Ferndale house;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a family-like home • It is part of the community • The staff cannot be bettered in their care of residents • The care provided is outstanding • We can see the need for modernisation • A refurb. Home is needed between the Maerdy and Tylorstown catchment area • Suitable plots are available for a new build • Ferndale House has acknowledged support

	<p>from the whole community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consultation meeting was well attended by families and staff.
Individual	Main themes
Resident	<p>Feels strongly that the homes should remain within the community, so friends and relatives are able to visit regularly.</p> <p>These homes should remain in public care for the public good.</p>
Resident	<p>Support for Clydach Court.</p> <p>Relative very happy and settled at this home.</p>
Resident letter via MP Chris Bryant	Concern over the future of Ferndale House
Resident	Support for Troed y Rhiw Home.
Resident	<p>Concerns over proposed closure of care homes.</p> <p>Concerns related to private care providers, lack of staff commitment, delayed discharges and standard of care in private homes</p>
Resident	Critique of Cabinet report and FAQ consultation document
Cllr. Pauline Jarman (Mountain Ash East)	<p>Support for the retention of Troedyrhiw Home in any future model of care that the Council may adopt.</p> <p>There is no doubt that the Extracare Housing referred to in the consultation document will be an attractive option for some people. I am not averse to it being one of the options available to our older citizens to enable them to retain supported independent living but they must be given other choices.</p> <p>Everyone I have spoken to has spoken very highly of the level of care delivered at Troedyrhiw Home and are absolutely resolute in their view that it should feature in the Council's future plans.</p> <p>The Council is very aware of the fragility of the private sector in relation to care services, including</p>

	<p>Residential care. The Council will recall one home in the County closed its doors not too long ago.</p> <p>My constituents believe that the Council run Troedyrhiw Home offers dignity, not only to the Residents but to the staff. Their terms and conditions of service are far in advance of the private sector, with appropriate sickness and pension schemes as well as better pay. They contribute to the local economy by buying locally. Losing these jobs would be a great loss to the community should Troedyrhiw Home be closed by the Council.</p> <p>The demographics of this area shows a massive growth in our elderly population and residential care is going to be the first choice of many of my constituents. I want them to continue to live in Troedyrhiw Home and I hope the Council will acknowledge the wisdom of giving them that opportunity</p>
Cllr. Phil Howe	<p>In respect of Ferndale Care Home I wish to vote for option 1 – Keep things as they are until a new purpose building is built. If this is closed we will be the only valley without care. Public transport is not the best and family will find it extremely difficult to visit loved ones.</p>
Cllr. Maureen Weaver and Cllr. Shelley Rees-Owen (Pentre Ward)	<p>Support for Pentre House.</p> <p>Pentre House plays a part in the community and the facility aids the residents who live there.</p> <p>Every resident we spoke to were happy at Pentre House</p> <p>As Councillors of the Pentre Ward, we can only speak for our community, and we ask that you take on board when making your deliberations Pentre as a whole, and what they have lost over the past 7 years, and that Pentre House remains part of the Pentre community.</p>
Staff letter – Garth Olwg	<p>Support for the retention of Garth Olwg.</p> <p>Residential homes are still a major priority in the community, with experienced staff.</p> <p>The Extra care option doesn't suit the needs of people with complex needs. RCT should</p>

	modernise the existing buildings.
Letter from residents at Tegfan (16 signatures)	Thanks for the meeting that took place and support for Tegfan. Praise for staff and the importance of Dementia Care.

5. DAY CARE SERVICES

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

- 5.1 26% of respondents to the day care services questionnaire were user of the service, with 38.4% of respondents being relatives.

Counts Break % Respondents	
Base	125
Q1 Are you a:	
Day care user	33 26.4%
Relative/Partner/Friend of a day care user	48 38.4%
Advocate for a day care user	- -
Member of the general public	21 16.8%
Staff member	11 8.8%
Other (please state)	12 9.6%

- 5.2 Respondents were asked which day centre their views related to, as shown in the table below.

Counts Break % Respondents	
Base	123
Trecynon Day Centre, Aberdare	20 16.3%
Riverside Day Centre, Pontypridd	12 9.8%
Bronllwyn Day Centre, Gelli	25 20.3%
Ferndale House Day Centre, Ferndale	10 8.1%
Tonyrefail Day Centre, Tonyrefail	26 21.1%
No - these are general comments	30 24.4%

Option 2 – The preferred option - Phased decommissioning of the Council's day services as part of a planned programme of transformation in line with the proposed new service model.

5.3 53% of respondents disagreed with the preferred option.

Counts Break % Respondents	
Base	118
Q3 Do you agree with option 2?	
Yes	31 26.3%
No	63 53.4%
Don't Know	24 20.3%

5.4 The table below shows that the general public are more likely to agree with the proposal than the service users or their relatives. (although numbers are low).

Counts Analysis % Respondents	Total	Q3 Do you agree with option 2?		
		Yes	No	Don't Know
Base	118	31 26.3%	63 53.4%	24 20.3%
Q1 Are you a:				
Day care user	31	11 35.5%	17 54.8%	3 9.7%
Relative/Partner/Friend of a day care user	45	5 11.1%	28 62.2%	12 26.7%
Advocate for a day care user	-	-	-	-
Member of the general public	20	10 50.0%	4 20.0%	6 30.0%
Staff member	10	-	8 80.0%	2 20.0%
Other (please state)	12	5 41.7%	6 50.0%	1 8.3%

5.5 The comments on option 2 can be summarised under a number of key themes.

Number	Theme	Detail	Number of comments
1	Concerns about assessment process	Questions over the assessment process and the impact this could have. Concerns about the process itself.	5
2	Disruption for service user	Change would be difficult for service users to cope with, would affect their health and well-being.	22
3	Need more information	Not enough detail in proposal to answer all questions to make a decision.	14
4	Agree with proposal	Proposal will benefit service users	10
5	Agree with proposal of change – but Day Centres to remain open	Change is needed and could open up opportunities for users but don't want to close / decommission centres.	12
6	Disagree with proposal	Proposal will have a negative effect on service users and provision should continue as present.	9
7	Other		6
8	Praise for current day centres	Care received is good and meets needs	14

Disruption for service users (n=22)

5.6 There was concern that the proposals would have a negative effect on current service users. Current attendees of the centres commented how they are satisfied with the current service and it meets their needs. It provides users and relatives an opportunity for respite and socialisation. There were also comments made indicating that for many current attendees the idea of change would be difficult to cope with and would affect them adversely.

“My wife is totally wheelchair bound she loves going to the centre, mixing with disabled people and older people. She loves the activities that go on she would greatly miss it if it would close.”

“I am concerned about how you propose to replace my visits to the day centre and how the deficit will affect my social well-being.”

“My mother has alzheimers with vascular dementia and attends Tonyrefail Day Centre twice a week and she loves it. She’s got friends there and would really miss this. The staff are also excellent. Mum isn’t good with change as she gets confused and likes routine. The two days a week at the centre allows us freedom to do what we need to do knowing Mum is being looked after.”

“I am happy with the way the service is at the moment. I do not want it to change as I have had a severe stroke and can’t cope with change. I like the activities that go on at Bronllwyn and the food is lovely. I tried meals on wheels a while ago and they were rubbish and so wouldn’t want to go back to those.”

“The reason I do not agree with option 2 is because the elderly people of RCT rely on these services and should not have them removed.”

Need more information (n=14)

- 5.7 There were a number of comments made regarding the information provided on the proposals. There were concerns that the level of detail regarding the preferred option was not sufficient and raised questions about the future plans for the service and the alternatives available.

“A lot of words but you say nothing we need details. ‘People with non-complex needs would have their needs met in other ways’. What?! Tell us what ways. Do you even have a plan? It’s not included here.”

“‘Supported as necessary’ Please elaborate. Too vague. I’m afraid this proposal would leave people isolated.”

“The option is very vague in the wording. Specific examples of intended support for those currently attending day centres need to be addressed coherently.”

“It’s not clear what option 2 is. The language used is very confusing”.

Praise for current Day Centres (n=14)

- 5.8 In general there was praise for the services provided, the staff and the level of care received currently at the day centres. There were

comments made by both relatives and staff outlining the benefits that current attendees experience as a result of attending a day centre.

“Day services provides individuals with social interaction, stimulation, inclusion and well-being. Day services take care of the personal care needs individuals cannot receive at home. Day service is an essential service taking care of the needs of vulnerable individuals in society”.

“Day centres are an important part of the community enabling people to meet with others in the same position and socialise with their peers.”

“It would be such a shame for this building and service to be discontinued as it is such a valuable asset to the older people who attend it. My mother looks forward to meeting up with her friends at the centre and the staff are brilliant.”

Agree with proposal (n=10)

- 5.9 There was some support for the preferred option in comments that stated the proposals could open up more opportunities to people within the community to access services. They also identified the need for a change to the current system and were in favour of services being available through Community Hubs and Extra Care.

“I think our RCT Council ideas of having local Community Hubs serving all our area are a good idea.”

“It is about time that we entered the modern world and offered a more dignified form of day care where needs are better assessed and not everyone lumped together. Mental health and physical/medical support needs can be vastly different.”

“I think this would be a step forward and be a great benefit to the elderly people who use this service.”

“Enhancing opportunities will increase the changes of more people attending the day centres”.

Agree with change – Day Centres to remain open (n=12)

- 5.10 There were also a number of comments that were in support of a change to modernise the current system however they were opposed

to closing the day centres as part of this process and with no change to the level of care and support provided.

"I would only agree with this preferred option if the service provided doesn't reduce the amount of care being delivered to my mother who suffers with dementia."

"I don't believe you need to decommission day services but I do think they need to change. Care isn't a 9-5, it takes over peoples' lives 24/7. I think day services should expand and be more flexible, opening evenings and weekends. This will give individuals, families and carers much needed respite to prevent families breaking down and going into crisis."

"I agree that day services need to change but not close. Day centres offer a fantastic service to individuals who need it. These individuals cannot access normal facilities but when they are here we have all the hoists aids and bathing facilities that they require."

Disagree with proposal (n=9)

- 5.11 Another theme that emerged in this section were comments objecting to the preferred option. There were comments indicating that the service is of benefit to users currently and uncertainty over the proposed benefits of any changes to the system.

"There are always proposals assuring to make 'better' and when it's completed it's not better at all so no change needed."

"I think it is appalling that RCT are even considering closing down day centres. They have been a lifeline to many elderly people over many years. Day centres have helped to keep many vulnerable people out of care homes for quite a few years so it is shocking that this care and support is at risk."

"This does not cater for all client's needs. Carers' coming into home do not meet social/family needs in most of cases of those attending day care centres"

"I want to continue to receive the provision currently provided i.e collection from my home by the carers who look after me at the centre for a full day out of the house"

Concerns about assessment process (n=5)

- 5.12 There were also questions raised regarding the assessment process referenced in the proposals and the impact this could have. There were concerns that re-assessment may mean losing access to the service or whether the process of re-assessment will be suitable in assessing needs.

“Provided the current users of Day centres and their carers have a proper face to face assessment of their needs.”

“Who is completing the assessments and are they on an individual basis”.

“I am unsure as to how it would affect me. If clients are to be assessed would I still be eligible to attend the day centre?”

“Assessment must be by an independent person. Not on the RCT payroll.”

- 5.13 Respondents were asked what **impact option 2 would have upon themselves or their family if it was to go ahead**. The following main themes emerged.

Number	Theme	Detail	Number of comments
9	Impact on service user	Impact on emotional and well-being. Socialising at centres is important and enjoyment of attending.	52
10	Positive Impact – dependant on factors	Provision of transport, same level of activities, no extra cost to users.	6
11	Impact on relatives	Extra care responsibilities, loss of respite, safety concerns.	28
12	No impact	No present impact but potential for future if access to service required.	12
13	More information needed	Not enough detail in proposals, further questions raised. Location / assessment process and cost all areas of concern.	9

14	Staff	Impact on jobs, family life and service provided to clients.	7
15	Other		4

Impact on service user (n=52)

- 5.14 There were a number of comments made that indicated that the potential impact on the service user would be detrimental to their health and well-being. Socialisation was a factor in this section with many stating that without access to the day centres they would be lonely and currently enjoy their time spent at the centre.

“Two visits a week to a Day Centre have been a great help in encouraging my reluctant relative to integrate with others and has given me respite.”

“We as a family are all working so my Mum only sees her carers through the day apart from her visits to the day centre where she meets up with friends she’s made so this would make a big difference to how my mum keeps her life as enjoyable as possible”.

“Without getting out to the day centre I would see no one, and my husband (carer) would have no time to himself”.

“I visit Tonyrefail day centre on a Monday, Wednesday and Friday weekly. The benefits of these visits are uncalculatable to myself and my family. I have a very small family, am widowed and at 88 have survived all of my friends. Without visiting the day centre my fear is that I will become socially isolated which will of course have a detrimental effect on my health.”

Impact on relatives (n=28)

- 5.15 Alongside comments detailing the potential impacts to current service users, there were a number of comments indicating that there would also be a negative impact to their relatives. The respite that is afforded to relatives whilst family members attend the day centre was evidently an important factor and comments indicated that this was a vital service in ensuring they were able to continue with their caring responsibilities at home.

“My Wife would lose 2 days a week at the Day Centre. I am also infirm and would lose 2 days respite as I am my Wife’s carer.”

“At the moment a day at the day care centre enables me to have some independence and for my husband (carer) to have some time on his own. I feat that the recommended proposal would not allow this”.

“Some main carers are able to sleep whilst their loved one is at day centre, to enable them to care for them through the night. Withdrawing some higher level need day centres will result in an influx of social admissions due to carer crisis.”

No Impact (n=12)

- 5.16 A number of comments indicated that the proposals would have minimal or no impact upon them. These comments were usually supported by the fact that they have had no cause to access the service at present but stated there may be impact in the future. However, further details about the nature of the impact were not provided.

“This idea does not affect my family.”

“Not at present but it may help me in a few years’ time (hopefully not)”.

“Dependant where these centres will be. At the moment my family have no need of this service. “

“At present no impact but family members are getting older and it may have an affect in the future”.

More information needed (n=9)

- 5.17 Some respondents felt that the proposals did not provide enough information to be able to make a judgement on the options. There were further questions raised regarding the assessment process, costs, location and facilities that would be able to be accessed.

“I do not know without further detailed information however my mother enjoys and looks forward to her day centre visits because this is how she continues contact with like-minded friends”.

“We don’t know where the new facilities would be. Change is always an issue with dementia.”

“What would the fate of the present attendees who are assessed as unworthy of a place under the new arrangements? I do hope they will not just be ‘abandoned’.”

“I cannot tell from the proposals whether or not a similar service would be offered.”

“The new day centre, would it provide hot meals, shower facilities with help, exercise if able, books and activities?”

Impact to Staff (n=7)

- 5.18 There were also concerns from staff members and current service users regarding the possible impact and changes would have on staff. Current staff members stated the uncertainty over job security was a worrying time alongside the financial implications this would have on their lives. However, their concerns were equally for the level of care and the impact on the service users themselves. There was praise from current service users for the high level of care provided currently by staff.

“The impact would be not only on myself but on the wonderful staff that we have, welsh crafts and other people who come to sell items which we need, also chiropodist.”

“If day centres were to close I would possibly lose my job or be redeployed. I’m more concerned about the impact on the well-being of the individuals who attend.”

“Very stressful, anxious not knowing if my job is safe or if my current role will change and how. Would I have to retrain or reapply for my post. Very upsetting for both”.

“Losing my job would have a devastating effect on me and my family”.

Positive Impact – Dependant on factors (n=6)

- 5.19 There were some comments made that stated the preferred option had the potential to have a positive impact however there were usually factors dependant on this. The provision of transport to a facility was an area of concern as well as there being activities offered. Any cost implications were also cited as a factor that would depend on whether the changes would have a positive impact or not.

“My mother who attends Tonyrefail day centre has been diagnosed with the onset of dementia and is also physically unable to walk unaided, therefore I feel that she and others like her would benefit greatly from any improvements in the service suggested in option 2.”

“As long as transport is provided it should increase standards. Transport is key, I have several friends who cannot get to the village, library, community halls, church because they can’t afford taxis. Very few organisations (I haven’t found any) supply drivers for a reduced fee. Having a facility which would provide drivers to run the elderly where they needed to go and pick them up later, at a reduced price is essential for elderly independence.”

“Hopefully, if still eligible to attend, there would be increased variety of activities on offer. However, in the interim would support still be offered?”

“Hopefully it would improve my social life and health with these services available on the day I use the centre”.

Option 1 - Alternative Options – Continue Existing Arrangements – Do Nothing

5.20 Respondents were asked if option 1 should have been the preferred option. 48.3% of people agreed and 36.4% disagreed with the proposal to do nothing.

Counts Break % Respondents	
Base	118
Q6 Do you think this should have been the preferred option?	
Yes	57 48.3%
No	43 36.4%
Don't Know	18 15.3%

5.21 The table below shows that the general public are less likely to agree with the proposal to do nothing than the service users or their relatives. (although numbers are low).

Counts Analysis % Respondents	Total	Q6 Do you think this should have been the preferred option?		
		Yes	No	Don't Know
Base	118	57 48.3%	43 36.4%	18 15.3%
Q1 Are you a:				
Day care user	30	21 70.0%	7 23.3%	2 6.7%
Relative/Partner/Friend of a day care user	46	28 60.9%	8 17.4%	10 21.7%
Advocate for a day care user	-	-	-	-
Member of the general public	21	2 9.5%	14 66.7%	5 23.8%
Staff member	10	2 20.0%	7 70.0%	1 10.0%
Other (please state)	11	4 36.4%	7 63.6%	-

5.22 The comments on option 1 (do Nothing) can be summarised under a number of key themes.

Number	Theme	Detail	Number of comments
16	Agree – No need to change	Service is meeting needs currently and provides good care- why change.	35
17	Disagree- Change needed but not to close centres	Service requires some change to modernise but closing is not the answer. Should refurbish/modernise current services and buildings	22
18	Disagree – Change is needed	There needs to be change to current service	10
19	Need more information	Questions raised for further detail to make decision	6
20	Other		15

Agree- No need to change (n=35)

5.23 A theme that emerged in this section was that the service is currently meeting the needs of its users and therefore no change is required. The comments indicated that service users and their relatives are happy with the level of care provided and there were concerns that the same level could not be matched if the preferred option were introduced.

“If it works leave it alone, which it does.”

“My mother and all the elderly people that go to Tonyrefail Centre enjoy it there and don’t want change. Don’t you think you’ve taken enough off the elderly already? This is the only socialising and entertainment my mother gets. Shame on you. We are paying more council tax and getting less for it”.

“Too many services have been removed, libraries, paddling pools etc. with no substitution. I fear that your preferred option will result in a similar fashion”.

“This is what works for us at the moment. It’s working so why change it? He feels safe there. To change to somewhere else would confuse him. He enjoys the company and staff are brilliant. I have known some most of their lives, grew up around them and know the person they are which means a lot. If he is happy I can be happy”.

Disagree – Change needed (without closing day centres) (n=22)

- 5.24 There were comments made that supported the notion of change within the day service structure but were opposed to the closure of day centres potentially affecting the service provided. There were suggestions made to modernise the current day centres and amend opening hours to accommodate the needs of service users and their families.”

“I appreciate that to do nothing would further strain the council services, but surely the closure of the day centres is a backward step and introducing local ‘hubs’ would take us back to the old day centres in the local town which closed many years ago. Ask yourself does this make fiscal and wellbeing of older people’s sense. I think not.

“I recognise that changes have to be made but I question the need to close all 5 of the day centres.”

“I think you should focus on the day centres first by extending the hours from earlier in the morning until late evening, that way it will help the individuals and their families to live an easier life.”

Disagree- Change needed (agree with proposals) n=10

- 5.25 There were a number of people whose comments in this section evidenced their support of the preferred option. The idea to ‘do nothing’ was acknowledged as not viable and these comments agreed that a change would be needed to enable the service to better meet the needs of individuals in the future.

“The current model is not financially viable and leaves centres open and not used to the full potential.”

“The need is declining and another model and expectations required.”

“There will always be an ‘optimum’ cost for the amount of expense versus quality of care but to do nothing I feel would be to opt out of the responsibility of doing the best for our community and the people who need us.”

Need more information (n=6)

There were some comments made that stated that they would require more information. Questions were raised regarding the future delivery of the service and what this would mean day to day for current service users.

“The council have indicated that status quo is not sustainable, but in my opinion not enough information is available to make a choice on the

way forward. It is not clear how closing the day centres would affect individuals day to day.”

“The document gives little indication to the kind of provision I would receive or the timescale of the proposed decommissioning of the day centre. I don’t really understand what I would be saying ‘yes’ to”.

“There obviously has to be an improvement plan in the current economic situation. The costs have been suggested as £50M. There must be some practical plans in place to have made this assessment. Are we then able to view any hard plans showing the hub location and the staffing programme to facilitate these?”

5.26 Respondents were given the opportunity to provide **any other comments or provide alternative proposals or suggestions.**

Number	Theme	Detail	Number of comments
21	Current service needs to be modernised	Service needs to change (hours/days) but don't want to lose day centres / activities / food or transport.	21
22	Agree with proposal	Proposed option would benefit service users	3
23	Disagree with proposal	Preferred option would not be good for service users. The service is providing good care and meeting needs – no change needed	16
24	More information needed	Questions raised requiring further information	10
25	Staff	Impact on staff, level of care provided by staff is good don't want to lose	5
26	Other		10

Needs to be modernised (n=21)

5.27 In this section the most common theme that emerged was comments agreeing that there needed to be some change to the current service delivery model. These comments also made suggestions for the type of change they would be happy to see. These included changes to the opening hours, opening the service up to be more accessible to people and changes to the restrictions on services provided by staff (e.g. administration of medication).

"I would like to see flexible day service provision. Evenings. Weekends. Direct payment being used for the families to arrange their own respite care".

"Use the day centres more by stopping the cut backs on users attendance".

"Alternative proposal has been put forward to open longer, accommodate more individuals and utilize the centres better. We should also be allowed to administer medication as this stops individuals attending".

"It appears to me that the day centres are not being used 100% as it is sometimes a difficult task to access the service.....Make them easier to be accessible and I am positive that you would get full attendance and capacity most days. People are prepared to pay for services if you make them easier to access."

Disagree with proposal (n=16)

- 5.28 In this section, there were comments disagreeing with the proposals preferred option. These comments largely centered on the negative impact that closing day centres would have on current service users and their relatives. Some comments also stated that the preferred options proposals would not fully meet their needs in the future.

"Both my and my husband's health is deteriorating and it is vital the existing support continues – any diminishing of the service would cause great problems in us both."

"Please reconsider and keep the day centres open. They are a lifeline to so many people."

"Using your preferred option would have a negative impact on a group of very vulnerable people. 'Bottom line' should not be allowed to taking care of older and less advantaged persons."

"I believe that having a place for members of our community who are amongst our most vulnerable is essential. In my opinion a viable alternative has not been provided."

More information needed (n=10)

- 5.29 Some people felt that the proposals did not clearly outline the exact details of what the future service could offer them and there were concerns regarding the same levels of care and activities provided. Some comments stated that without this information a balanced judgement could not be made on the proposals.

“I would urge you to consider the effect closing the day centres will have on people like myself who depend on them so heavily. Your proposal is unclear, deliberately so I feel, and quite frankly has caused me some level of anxiety of the thought of day centres closing without a definitive accessible alternative”.

“I would need to know what sort of activities you would provide if option 2 goes ahead.”

“My main comment is that there needs to be clear explanation of what complex needs are and what are non-complex needs to give public clear demarcation and difference in services offered, so that there is less risk for confusion and differences in opinion.”

Impact to Staff / Staffing levels (n=5)

“Some comments in this section also concerned the staffing at day centres. They highlighted their praise for the staff and showed concern for the future job security if day centres were to close. Suggestions were also made for improvements to the service by allowing for more activities to take place with increased staffing levels.”

“What would happen to Day Centre staff? Is this the way to treat good staff?”

“I would like there to be more staff working at the centre so they have more time and not be so busy. They are lovely to me but they are rushed with so many people to see to. We used to go for days out but not for a long time now. I enjoyed the outings but I can't stand for a long time and we need enough staff to go out.”

Equalities Impact

- 5.30 Under the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duties, the Council has a legal duty to look at how its decisions impact on people

because they may have particular characteristics. The full set of results will be used to inform the Equality impact Assessment.

Respondents reported the following impacts;

Age – Service User

“Age and disability, my husband is now 79 and is unable to get about too well, his head tells him he can but his legs tell him a different story.”

“age- too old to travel too far. Health- unable to travel too far and confused by change.”

“Age. Should my relative need to move away from a secure environment to obtain day care then my travel plans and arrangements may become more onerous.”

“Age: I find change difficult. I have long term friendships with both fellow users and staff. They are familiar, the building is familiar (I was brought up in Blaenllechau). All this makes me feel safe.”

“My Mother is 91years old and has memory problems, which impacts upon her daily living. She can become withdrawn and day care twice a week helps her to socialise.”

Age - Staff

“At my age I think I would find it hard to compete with younger individuals for care work in an outside industry.”

“At my age I would find it difficult to find another job”

“These proposals affect me because of my age and gender, as a woman of working age, I wish to continue with my career. Depletion of day services restricts my working life and devalues my main role as a carer by denying me respite care.”

Disability

“I feel that the preferred proposal discriminates against me because of My Disability”

“Big impact because of my disability. I would like to have as normal a life as possible and the day centre enables this to be possible.”

“Disability - change in location/journey may lead to more confusion than Currently”

“Disability- my husband has limited mobility and this causes strain on our relationship and daily living. The day care centre help provide respite and support we both need.”

“I am housebound and my health is deteriorating. I find it increasingly difficult to care for my husband - the two days a week he currently attends Day Care to assist with his dementia problems give me great relief. I would find it almost impossible to care for my husband seven days a week.”

“I am the main carer for my disabled son and he has built up relationships with people that would be broken if this centre was closed and he would have to go to a larger day service where his day time activities may not be as many varied or individualised”.

Mental Health

“Due to my age, disability and consequent infirmity I am apprehensive about how this proposal will affect my social wellbeing and health both mental and physical.”

Religion/Belief

“For my religious beliefs to continue to be accepted and appreciated by speaking at Easter and Christmas and giving grace.”

- 5.31 Under the Welsh Language measure 2011 and the Welsh Language Standards, the Council has a duty to look at how its decisions impact the Welsh language. The analysis of this question was combined with the results of the Residential questionnaires and can be found at the end of section 4.

Other Responses – Day Care

- 5.32 A number of written responses were received in addition to the questionnaire responses and discussions at the various meetings. A summary of the responses is shown in the table below. The full responses have been shared with Cabinet Members and Senior Managers to inform decision making.

Organisations	Summary
GMB and Unite Trade Unions	<p>We and are members agree there needs to be changes to secure this service. There is a document supporting this (see below response).</p> <p>The building that we use will need some investment, but they are not in dire straits and are very workable.</p> <p>The opening and operational hours should be looked at, longer in the day to allow families flexibility with working.</p> <p>The plans for the Pontypridd Extra care Facility are not adequate in terms of size and functionality.</p> <p>Both unions believe that the service should be looked at, but separately from the Extra Care facilities</p>
GMB Rep in Tonyrefail Day Centre	<p>The full report outlines proposed changes to the service model for day care services for the elderly, making services more people centred and meeting the needs and expectations for carers, families and individuals who access the service.</p> <p>Conclusion; In Discussions with individuals accessing the service it was identified that day care was falling short of meeting the needs of individuals whose families had home and work life commitments. The plan calls for the extended hours of day services to include evenings and weekends to better meet the needs of individuals. The plan calls for better holistic partnership working to facilitate the change and empower individuals through involvement leading to wellbeing (McLeod, 2018). Gathering Evidence and collating information will ensure that the new model is fit for purpose and satisfies the needs of the individuals, families and carers who access it.</p> <p>Criteria. Complex need that cannot be met in the community will be such as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Onset dementia, Alzheimer's at too early a stage to warrant an EMI setting but warrants the need of an assessed needs centre. • Individuals needing personal care assistance,

	<p>hoisting, assisted bathing or specialist equipment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unmet needs out in the community. • Parkinson's, stroke where individuals may need more than one carer to meet their needs. • Mental health issues i.e. Anxiety, Schizophrenia, depression and social isolation. <p>Individuals will be assessed by assessor care managers, social workers or health professionals and referred to day services when needs cannot be met in the community and a specialist building along with specialist equipment is required to meet the needs of individuals and promote wellbeing.</p> <p>Recommendations;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing the day centre buildings from five down to two, one to cover the Rhondda and Taf Ely areas and one to cover the Cynon Valley Taf Ely areas, the Tonyrefail building is already large enough to accommodate this change. • Better communication between partner services for more efficient cross collaboration (Learning to Collaborate: Lessons in Effective Partnership Working in Health and Social Care) Will identify the individuals who will benefit from access to fully trained staff teams and specialist buildings. • More streamlined and efficient work rotas to ensure service needs are met to a higher standard • Better utilization of resources already at the service's disposal • More person centred planning of risk assessments and care plans to ensure they are an even better fit for purpose • Better Training and development for staff • More flexibility in the service for the needs of individuals to better take into account outside influences such as home life commitments.
<p>Cwm Taf Morgannwg University Health Board</p>	<p>Cwm Taf Morgannwg UHB welcomes the proposal to modernise residential care and day care services for older people in Rhondda Cynon Taff, within the context of our shared partnership aspirations.</p> <p>We acknowledge that traditional day care services have dwindled in popularity as older people have become more active and are engaging in alternative activities and settings. The current model and some</p>

of the physical environments are no longer conducive to the needs of all our older people. We would therefore agree that option 1 – continue existing arrangements – is no longer viable.

We would therefore support the preferred option 2. Our reasons for supporting this option and our provisos are as follows:

- We agree that investment in Community Hubs and universal services would better reflect the choices many of our older people are already making and support inclusion within local communities. It is important that such facilities are flexible to accommodate a continuum of needs, and are accessible for those with disabilities, dementia and their carers.
- We agree with the proposal that with the above universal/community offerings in place, the local authority should focus its day care services on specialist services for people with complex needs including dementia.
- For the people currently accessing day services it is essential that the transition to the new service model is as seamless as possible minimising any negative impact and continues to meet their individual needs.
- Carers often rely on day care services for respite and therefore carer engagement must be central to the development of the new service model. Innovative and flexible ideas for respite provision should be considered that meet the needs of the carer as well as the person cared for, in line with the Older People's Commissioner for Wales report "Rethinking Respite".
- It would be helpful to know what current users of day care services and their carers would like a new service model to look like, as well as the views of people who have opted not to engage with current services, to ensure that the new service model is developed co-productively.
- To maximise the effectiveness of the various levels of day services, opportunities to integrate the input of health, third sector services and other agencies should also be considered.
- Whilst the focus of these services is for older people, opportunities for intergenerational activities should also be maximised.
-

<p>Age Connects Morgannwg</p>	<p>The charity accepts that the option of doing nothing is not a realistic option in the changing world as older people look to greater independence and integration into the wider community up to an older age, and as needs change with the increase in demands for dementia services for example. We agree with the overall key principles that underpin this strategy. However, questions remain about how this strategy will be implemented and how it will affect service users and future/potential service users.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the general direction of provision for day care, again following the key principles of the strategy is to be welcomed, the Board of Age Connects is concerned to ensure that the availability of community services is both sustainable and adequately supported. • The consultation document makes numerous reference to and places a great deal of emphasis on the need to ‘signpost’ potential service users to other forms of care and support. Assumptions cannot be made about the community’s ability to take on these additional roles and responsibilities – especially on a long term basis. Unpaid carers are already under significant pressure and investment in/funding of third sector organisations is either insufficient or has been withdrawn. • There is no clarity in documents seen to date regarding eligibility criteria. • Community Hubs may be appropriate for a range of people including service users with a dementia, especially where there is a facility such as a dementia-friendly café. However the Board is anxious to be clear what support would be provided for any service user referred to its facility e.g. at Cynon Linc. • The Board is aware that the health service in this area is also currently reviewing its day care provision and would ask if this work is being undertaken separately from – or in conjunction with – this local authority strategy. • The Welsh Assembly Government is keen to promote Joint Commissioning of services. • Offering a wider variety and choice of options to enable people to remain living in their communities is to be welcomed but this, in the experience of Age Connects Morgannwg, requires proper and adequate investment.
-------------------------------	--

	Preventative services can become the poor relation when resources are squeezed.
Save Care Homes And Centres (SCHAC) - RCT	<p>Other than the closure of day centres based in residential care homes it is not at all clear what is being proposed, thus making a response difficult.</p> <p>First, it appears that all current users of day centres will have their care needs reassessed and this could mean people being excluded from their current provision.</p> <p>Second, again (7.7 and 7.8) the term ‘complex needs’ is being used without reference to any clear definition. In these two paragraphs it is proposed that RCT withdraws day care for those not having these needs. It is then not at all clear what happens to people who are assessed to have day care needs but not complex needs.</p> <p>Third, (7.9) talks in generalities about a ‘flexible service’ enabling a person to move between a community hub or universal service as required without being clear about what any of these terms mean. The proposal then goes on in similar abstract terms to describe the benefits and aims of a service model that it is difficult to envisage in the first place. Franz Kafka couldn’t have done a better job.</p> <p><i>We propose that RCT think through again what they are proposing in relation to day centres, provide details of organisational structures, aims, strategies and a detailed operational plan then issue a new statement and start the consultations again.</i></p> <p><i>Note: See also response to Residential Care element</i></p>
RCT OPAG (Older Persons Advisory Group)	<p>OPAG members realise there is some need for change but would strongly oppose any decision to have no local authority care homes in RCT. Members feel they would have better service from a local authority run home rather than one which is privately funded.</p> <p>Similarly, with Day Care Centres, we would not wish</p>

	to see all these centres close to the detriment of the service users.
Future Generations Commissioner for Wales	It is important that well-being objectives (of both public bodies and public service boards), the well-being assessments and plans, the statutory goals and the sustainable development principle (including the 5 ways of working) are considered throughout the process.
Individual	Main themes
Staff letter – Trecynon Day Centre	<p>Support for Trecynon Day Centre, accessible location and ample parking on site, as well as various equipment.</p> <p>Suggestion to increase opening times and arrange programmed activity sessions.</p>
Staff letter – Riverside Day Centre	<p>Day centres good opportunity for people with complex needs. There are some people who use day centres who could attend other places in the community with some support, such as the Hubs.</p> <p>Keep some Day Centres open for complex needs. Don't agree with the staff from Tonyrefail centre (see response above). I don't think any centre is more appropriate than any other.</p>