

Modernisation of Residential Care for Older People

**AN ANALYSIS OF CONSULTATION BY
RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL**

Practice Solutions Ltd

Geoff Sherlock, Glenda George
and Steve Milsom

January 2020

INDEX

	Page
1. Introduction	3
2. Background	3
3. Consultation Methodology	5
4. Summary	7
5. Care Home Residents and their Relatives	8
6. Residential Care Services – Staff	17
7. Public Consultation	19

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Report provides an analysis of findings from the consultation on Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council's (the Council) proposals to modernise the residential care it provides itself to older people. This report covers the consultation undertaken with care home residents, their relatives, Council staff directly involved in service delivery and also through Public "Drop In" events. This was part of wider public written consultation undertaken by the Council. The full period for all of this consultation was between 30 September 2019 and 19 December 2019.
- 1.2 The meetings were led by Practice Solutions and all meetings were attended by Senior Managers from Adult Social Care.
- 1.3 The views expressed in this report directly represent the views of those attending the series of consultation meetings and responding to the consultation with the public and do not cover the responses to questions and further information provided by Council officers.

2. Background and Rationale

- 2.1 The need to modernise and continually improve Adult Social Care Services is a published key priority for Rhondda Cynon Taf Council. A number of factors have influenced the development of this policy including:
 - Welsh Government Policy – including the Social Services and Wellbeing (Wales) Act 2014 and Regulation and Inspection (Wales) Act 2016
 - Cwm Taf Regional Plan 2018 to 2023
- 2.2 The Council developed its Strategy to modernise accommodation options for older people and deliver Extra Care housing in Rhondda Cynon Taf which was approved by Cabinet in November 2016 and gave a commitment to review and reshape the care market to:
 - Increase the options available for people needing accommodation with care and support; and
 - Deliver a viable alternative for people who are able to remain independent with support.
- 2.3 In September 2017, the Council's Cabinet agreed a £50m investment plan to develop, in total, 300 Extra Care beds across Rhondda Cynon Taf and to deliver modern accommodation options to meet the needs and changing expectations of the growing older population. This policy decision began to address the trend over recent years where the balance of care has shifted from residential care to more community-based options, including Extra Care. Despite this trend, there remains an over reliance on residential care in RCT where the largest proportion of people aged 65 or over in Wales is placed in residential care.

An independent review of residential and day care services for older people was commissioned in 2018 and undertaken by Practice Solutions Ltd, Abercynon. In 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.

The level of provision retained would be based on a determination of the market share and need required in each of the Rhondda Cynon and Taf geographical areas.

- 2.4 At a meeting of the Council's Cabinet on 11 September 2019, Members considered the outcome of the consultation on the preferred options for the Council's residential care homes. The Cabinet agreed to initiate a further 12 week period of public, staff and resident consultation on the preferred option for the future of the Council's residential care homes, i.e. that the Council retains the level of provision of residential care homes, as set out below, focused on complex needs, residential reablement and respite care which is based on a determination of the market share and considered need required in each of the Rhondda, Cynon and Taf geographical areas:

CARE HOMES PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED

- Clydach Court Residential Care Home, Trealaw
- Ferndale House Residential Care Home, Ferndale
- Pentre House Residential Care Home, Pentre
- Tegfan Residential Care Home, Trecynon
- Troedyrhiw Residential Care Home, Mountain Ash
- Cae Glas Residential Care Home, Hawthorn
- Parc Newydd Residential Care Home, Talbot Green

CARE HOMES PROPOSED TO BE DECOMMISSIONED

- Bronllwyn Residential Care Home, Gelli
- Ystrad Fechan Residential Care Home, Treorchy
- Dan y Mynydd Residential Care Home, Porth
- Garth Olwg Residential Care Home, Church Village

3. Consultation Methodology

- 3.1 The Council's Research and Consultation Unit developed in liaison with Practice Solutions Ltd, a comprehensive methodology to implement the Cabinet decisions on a consultation for modernising residential care services.
- 3.2 The aim of the consultation was to gather as many views as possible from residents, their relatives and the public to inform the Council in its decision making as to the future provision of residential homes for Older people in each of the geographical areas of Rhondda Cynon Taf. The consultation took place in Care Homes, meetings open for staff to attend, at Public "Drop in" Events and was planned to take place over a period from 15 October to 21 November 2019. The consultation with the public was to be undertaken between 30 September and 19 December 2019. The main features of the approach to consultation were;
- Letter and Information pack sent to a database of all Council Care Home Residents/relatives (11 homes)
 - Presentations and Question and Answer Sessions at all Council run Care homes for residents, and families
 - 3 events for consultation with staff affected
 - Letters sent to all staff affected
 - "Drop In" Events for the Public.
 - Information Pack also contains Questionnaire to be returned to Council
 - Dedicated consultation email address and free post facility
 - "Have Your Say" Public Consultation on Council's Web Site
 - Advocacy service promoted and available to all service users and their families. A representative of the advocacy service attended each consultation event.
- 3.3 Practice Solutions Ltd, Abercynon, were commissioned to undertake an independent consultation with residential service staff, care home residents and their families. These events were designed to provide more information about the option for change proposed and to give an opportunity for discussion and debate in group sessions.
- 3.4 Members of the Councils Senior Adult Social Services Management Team - including the Group Director and Director for Social Services attended the events. The Council undertook separately a public consultation exercise through their web site and ran 3 "Drop In" Events across the County and findings from these are summarised in this report. Details of the events held during the period from 15 October to 21 November 2019 including the numbers of people attending each event are set out below:

Week	Date	Venue	No of Attendees
Week 1 Staff	15 October	Ystrad Sports Centre	13
	17 October	Sobell Sports Centre, Aberdare	0
	18 October	Llantrisant Sports Centre	16
Week 2	21 October	Dan Y Mynydd	9
	22 October	Ystrad Fechan	9
	23 October	Bronllwyn	4
	24 October	Garth Olwg	34
Week 3	28 October	Clydach Court	6
	29 October	Ferndale House	4
	30 October	Pentre House	16
	31 October	Tegfan	10
Week 4	4 November	Troedyrhiw	25
	5 November	Cae Glas	4
	6 November	Parc Newydd	12
Week 5 - Public "Drop In" Events	7 November	Ystrad Sports Centre	1
	19 November	Llantrisant Sports Centre	1
	21 November	Sobell Sports Centre, Aberdare	3

4. Summary

4.1 This consultation on modernising care home services run by the Council has been completed in Autumn 2019 and covered all of the relevant Council settings in which residential care and support is currently provided. It has engaged a significant number of care home residents, families and staff members as well as members of the public.

4.2 Whilst acknowledging the need for services and facilities to be modernised for the future, there was a common response that the care and support currently provided by the Council was highly regarded and that the impact of any change on individuals and communities should be minimised. A summary of the main themes that emerged in the consultation covers:

- Putting residents and their families at the centre of the modernisation process and ensuring timely and effective communication with them about the detailed implications for individuals as well as the general programme of change was seen as essential. Early information about the options and choices the residents would have for the future was requested.
- Where Care Homes were proposed to be retained, residents and relatives want to see detailed information about how the changes will affect them. Were people to be re-assessed and those who may not meet “Complex care needs” be moved to Extra Care? Members of the senior management team present were able to re-assure people that there were no plans to re-assess people in the homes proposed for retention or move current residents to Extra Care facilities.
- In respect of Care Homes proposed to be de-commissioned transparency about the basis of evaluation used and the rationale for the decision is requested to be made available.
- In respect of refurbishment of homes that are proposed to be retained, information is wanted about what that might entail, when it might be planned and completed for each home. Advice on the implications of refurbishment of a home for residents was sought and particularly when and how it might be completed and whether any temporary moves would be required.
- In respect of Extra Care, further awareness and understanding is needed in respect of the programme and timing for new facilities to be built as well as the detailed operation of the service, how the care and support is delivered and the facilities available and their suitability for residents impacted by decommissioning and residents in other homes. Information at a level of detail about how the transition to Extra Care would be undertaken and the timetable for homes to close was wanted.
- Staff were highly praised across all Care Homes and their role was essential in transition to new arrangements for Care Homes in the Borough.
- There was strong resistance to decommissioning of two of the four care homes proposed – Garth Olwg and Ystrad Fechan – from residents, families and staff. Positive cases were put forward for these homes to be retained.

5 Care Home Residents and their Relatives

- 5.1. Events were organised at each of the 11 Council run Care Homes for Older People. They were attended by both residents and relatives. Following a short presentation from Practice Solutions Ltd to set the scene an “open question and answer” session was undertaken on each occasion. The main themes that emerged in discussion are set out below.

The issues raised for Care Homes it was proposed to retain were generally common across all events and covered:

CARE HOMES PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED

Re-assessment of residents

- If these homes were to be retained, residents and relatives want to see detailed information about how the changes will affect them. For example, would a re-assessment of all residents’ care needs be undertaken to look at whether they might be suitable for Extra Care? If so, what criteria would be used to assess levels of independence?

De-commissioning of homes

- Further information was requested on the care homes that were to be closed and the number of people and the timescales involved. Advice was sought on the intended placement plan for residents to be moved and how this might impact on the remaining Council run Care Homes. How would vacancies be filled and what would happen where no places were available at the time? There were concerns expressed for the future placement of residents, especially those with dementia, who are displaced from their current home and the need to find them a suitable placement.
- As the list of homes to be retained were only proposals at this stage, there was some concern that further closures might be identified in the light of further budget cuts or that decisions on closures might be changed, particularly where the published “assessment mark” was not much better than for a home identified for closure.

Extra Care

- More information about the operation of Extra Care was requested. This covered for example confirmation that couples could be accommodated together, how it is paid for, whether individuals’ homes would need to be sold, the furnishing of flats, whether people with dementia could be accommodated etc.

“moving people from a care home will be expensive, my mother currently has a profile bed in this home”

- The staffing arrangements for Extra Care was raised including the level of support provided, how safeguarding was ensured and whether existing staff would be able to transfer with residents they look after currently. The intended delivery of the care to residents in Extra Care and whether the Council would be involved was discussed.

- The criteria an individual would need to meet to be independent enough to live in an extra care facility was questioned and also whether residents with complex needs in the care homes would be suitable to transfer.

“I don’t understand Extra Care, people at Clydach have dementia; are people with my mother’s needs (dementia) eligible for Extra Care?”

- It was suggested activities must be available in Extra Care to ensure a good quality of life and a community-based environment created as there is potential for loneliness and isolation to exist in Extra Care homes where individuals could remain all day in their own flats.
- The location and the timescales for the opening of Extra Care facilities being built would be essential information for relatives to assess the position of their family member.

Refurbishments

- Information was sought about the Councils plans for refurbishing the care homes that are retained including what that might entail, how it would be funded, when it might be planned and completed for each home.
- The implications of refurbishment of a home for residents was discussed. There were concerns about whether residents would need to move out, if so where to and assurance that they would be able to return when improvements were complete. It was suggested that the extent of any change and disturbance for residents would need to be minimised.

“With regard to en-suites, will they be monitored as that is where the accidents happen. The things that are important to us such as having en-suites, aren’t as important to the older generation. They grew up with big families and smaller houses, sharing a bathroom isn’t a big deal to my mother.”

Relationships between, Carers, Residents and Families

- Positive comments were made about the staff in the care homes and the standard of care that was provided, and the quality of life enabled. Concerns were expressed about whether sufficient staff are available given the increasing levels of care needed.
- The compassion shown by staff towards residents, the dignity displayed, the good relationships and support shown for relatives were all praised. There were concerns expressed about the future employment of the staff in a modernised care service.

“The staff here are wonderful, my wife has been here 18 months, I come down every day to see her, she is well cared for, the food is excellent, the staff are very caring, they look after people like they are their own families.”

Permanent Residency

- The confirmation of the position of current permanent residents in homes to be retained was sought and that they won’t be impacted by closure of the other homes. Concerns were raised that in the future further closures might be planned whereas residents wanted to be assured they have a “home for life”.

- The position of residents who were being cared for on a respite basis was raised and clarification sought. Individuals who are receiving respite care but wanted to remain permanently in the home wanted reassurance they would not be moved elsewhere.

“My mother is on temporary respite, she was going to go into Extra Care, but she likes the company, she has friends here, Extra Care won’t be suitable for her as she has dementia and does forget things, she doesn’t want to go into a flat on her own……she is worried that she would need to move out straight away. I worry about her safety.”

Activities

- The importance of daily activities in the Care Homes to improve quality of life was emphasised. The planning and co-ordination of activities was thought to work well including “dementia singing” and keep fit. The residents benefit from maintaining networks including with the community and for the confidence it gives them.

Positive Feedback

- A number of residents and relatives expressed their pleasure that their care home would not be closing but had concerns it was not yet a final decision. The need for clarity and certainty about the future of the homes was called for. The positive features of the care homes, the environment and the quality of care provided was stressed.

“This place is like an oasis, I was in a dark tunnel before coming here, I’m really happy here.”

CARE HOMES PROPOSED TO BE DECOMMISSIONED

5.2 The issues raised for Care Homes it was proposed should be decommissioned were more specific to each of the four care homes concerned so are covered separately below.

Bronllwyn

Positive attitude to Extra Care

- There was a positive reaction to Extra Care and in particular the independence it provided including having separate bathrooms and facilities. Nevertheless, support from staff was seen as essential. There were some concerns expressed that residents in this care home had a high level of care needs including dementia and that they would not be suitable for Extra Care.

Moving to a new home

- Whilst the residents were happy in Bronllwyn some were concerned about becoming isolated and lonely and were wanting to get taken out e.g. shopping - residents do not want to put pressure on their families for this. In the process of transition to a new home, support was needed for residents who have no family representatives. Further information about the options and choices the residents would have for the future was requested.

Dan y Mynydd

Moving residents to Extra Care or existing care homes

- Whilst the provision of new Extra Care facilities for the future was welcomed there were concerns about meeting the needs of residents in Dan Y Mynydd now. The right solution was needed for each individual as any change and disruption to pattern and routine can cause worry, upset and distress.
- More detailed information was requested about the options and choices available to residents and their families. In particular the planning of any move and its timing would be important. Some might want to move with friends, others might want to move earlier if a suitable place became available. Location of new accommodation would be a key factor. The availability of Social Worker support for the transition would be essential.

High standards of care & specialist care

- Assurances were sought that the same high standards of care and appropriate environment would be available in any new accommodation provided to residents as in Dan Y Mynydd. Specialist Dementia support was provided (Butterfly) and it was important that this should continue to be available. Extra Care was not considered to be suitable for residents in this care home.
- Comparisons were made with care and facilities available in a nearby Care Home. There were comments made that no one wanted to see any “backward steps” in the care, facilities or home-like environment provided in Dan Y Mynydd. In the interim before closure, it was suggested that investment in the building and environment was still required to meet current standards.

“Home is the key word in the discussion, this is their home, this building offers a home environment, the ambience and the feel here is different to any other care home I’ve been to, there is a homely atmosphere it would be a shame to lose it”

Relationships with staff, residents and other families

- The quality of care and commitment shown by staff was praised and there were concerns expressed for their future employment. It was suggested that ideally, the staff should move with the residents. Staff were also important for families and provided help and support. The friendship groups that had been formed in the home between residents were also important to maintain. Good communications with and support for families in the future would be essential. Notification of any decisions must be made to residents and their families first before any wider dissemination.

“There is a huge reliance on the staff here, our relatives can’t communicate the same way as they could before, we know and trust everyone here. It’s the fear of the unknown, we are like a family, I know all the staff and residents by names, I leave here happy that I am entrusting my relative in the care of the staff here”

Ystrad Fechan

Evaluation

- Concerns were raised about the evaluation criteria used to propose that this Care Home should be de-commissioned. The rationale for the decision was questioned. It was agreed that a full copy of the evaluation that had been included in the Council Cabinet paper would be sent to the home so that anyone could read it.

Hold on placements

- Concerns were expressed about the requirement to put a temporary hold on placements into all of the Council homes whilst this modernisation agenda was considered. This had caused a “massive strain” on residential care homes and difficult decisions for some families

Environment / location

- Comparisons were made with Pentre House and it was suggested that Ystrad Fechan had a better design, location and environment including grounds, was more accessible and could be refurbished for less money. It was also more feasible to integrate the home with local health facilities.

Independent Sector

- Concerns were raised about the quality of care and standards of facilities available in the independent sector. It was suggested that the quality of Council Care Homes was much higher. There was reluctance to consider the private sector as an option for care of relatives in Ystrad Fechan.
- The lack of sufficient Nursing Homes in the Borough and the increasing demand for this type of care, especially for Dementia was raised. It was suggested that the Council should be working closely with the Local Health Board to increase the provision of Nursing Homes.

Extra Care

- Questions were raised about the plans to build Extra Care in the Borough and the locations chosen. It was felt that it was essential that these new facilities are integrated with the community. It was suggested that there would be sufficient demand for Extra Care from people currently at home to fill the new facilities and that there was no need to close any of the residential care homes where the level of care needs was higher.
- The future planning of local care and support for people with dementia was raised and it was suggested that plans for use of the grounds of Ysbyty George Thomas could include facilities for this group. The suitability of Extra Care generally for people with dementia was raised and issues such as the level of care required, dependency criteria and the provision of meals for those who could not cook for themselves questioned. For residents in the dementia wing at Ystrad Fechan a higher ratio of staff would be needed. Isolation was also a concern, as currently staff ensure residents participate in activities in the

home and are part of the “family” and as a result, residents have formed lasting friendships.

“With Extra Care – somebody will give personal care, and then would they be left in their own flat as that carer will go – they could be left for hours. As you just said, I come here all times of the day and my father in law in bed, but he’s encouraged to come down – but odd occasion he has said no – then my father in law would be there all day. He interacts with them all here.”

- Concerns were raised about the provision of security and safeguarding for the residents if they were in Extra Care. It was suggested that access around the facility would be less controlled and more open, with scope for wandering greater than in Ystrad Fechan. This would be a worry for families who did not live close to the new facilities.

Alternative options

- One option suggested was the development of a “care village” where a resident could remain even when their care needs escalated as on-site facilities were available. This had a number of benefits and would be suitable for RCT. Another suggestion was to site Extra Care next to Ysbyty George Thomas to integrate care provision. It was felt important that the “Butterfly” model for dementia care was made available in all relevant care homes.

Next Steps

- The decision-making process and transition to Extra Care or new Care homes for individuals was raised including the details of how assessments and placements would be made, the timing and the impact that would have on the continued operation of Ystrad Fechan. Continued investment in maintaining the home was called for.
- The proposed timetable for closure of Ystrad Fechan in 2022 was not long away and early dialogue with residents and their families would be needed and was requested. It was felt important that any decisions about the future of the home are communicated to residents and families first before any wider communication.

Garth Olwg

Complex Care

- There was concern about the definition of the term “complex care”, and how it will be used in the decision-making process about the future care arrangements for residents. Clarity was needed on the criteria used to assess “complex care”, how that is used in undertaking assessments and who would complete them. It was suggested that all the residents at Garth Olwg had high level care needs and were dependent on the care home and its staff. The request was that this “professional term” should be expressed in plain English. Doubt was also expressed as to whether the residents here would be suitable for extra care, and if that was the case, they then should be able to transfer to another local authority residential care home.

Proposal – based on the evidence presented

- There was significant and passionate opposition to the decision made that Garth Olwg should be included on the list of homes that it is proposed should be decommissioned. It was contended that the evidence presented as the rationale for the decision was not valid. In particular, it was suggested that the suspension of placements for permanent residents in Council homes had distorted the analysis in respect of Garth Olwg so that the figures were at a much lower base. The analysis should also reflect that all the residents had now become permanent residents of the area as well. Only allowing respite care admissions suggested the figures were being manipulated. It was alleged that a prior decision had been taken to close the care home as the land could then be sold off to the Comprehensive School across the road.
- Concerns were expressed that the potential decommissioning of Council run care homes was all about saving money and managing the impact of austerity and the pressures on Council budgets. The notion of supporting vulnerable older people who regarded Garth Olwg as their “home for life” had not been given any priority it was suggested.

Staff at Garth Olwg

- The good quality of care and support provided by the staff was highly praised and concerns expressed for their future employment. The staff had demonstrated a strong level of commitment to the residents and treated them with dignity and as if they were family members. Examples were given where staff had been instrumental in improving individuals condition and their lives since they had entered Garth Olwg. The residents wanted to keep their carers what ever happened in the future.

Alternative options for Garth Olwg

- Whilst the need to modernise social care was recognised, no one was prepared to accept as a matter of principle that Garth Olwg should close. Examples were given where material impacts on individuals would result. There was no confidence in the quality of care or standard of accommodation that would be available in the Private Sector. It would also affect the ability of families to visit their relatives where they did not drive and were dependent on Public Transport.

- Proposals were made that Garth Olwg might be utilised for more respite care, day services, luncheon club, social interaction – community facilities within easy travelling distance. However, these facilities were wanted in addition to a care home not instead of. It was also suggested that the home could be refurbished to include en-suite facilities.

Extra Care – Pontypridd

- Information was sought on the building programme for the Extra Care at Pontypridd and how and when individuals would be assessed for a placement. Comments were made that the location was not very suitable for older people – i.e. up a hill and near busy traffic and the railway station.
- Clarification was requested on arrangements for the operation of Extra Care including staffing numbers and delivery of domiciliary care. Availability of facilities such as meals, laundry, help if falls occur, staff on duty at night, hospital visits, GP arrangements, etc. were also raised.
- There was one example provided of where Extra Care works well to meet people's needs and provides a good option with a range of facilities. However, it was advocated that it must not be seen as a panacea for all circumstances and was regarded as a very different service to that provided at Garth Olwg.

Domiciliary / Independent care

- Observations were made about the quality and efficiency of domiciliary care delivered in people's own homes and perceived deficiencies such as late calls and the experience levels of staff. The cost of private sector care homes was also of concern including the need in some cases to pay top up fees which families could not always afford.

Fees / Costs

- There was discussion about the implications of moving into a care home or into Extra Care in respect of costs and fee levels for individuals. Clarity was requested in respect of costs and capital allowances involved in transferring into a private care home. Also, for Extra Care issues around sale of home, charging for domiciliary care, communal costs, own budget management etc. were raised. The rules on savings levels, income from pensions, benefits etc. and how that compared to care homes were explained.

“We need to talk about the residents here..... They are paying a reasonable amount, the private sector can be more, but they still paying a reasonable amount of money, great care provision here – it's their home.”

Decommissioning

- If the Council Cabinet decides to decommission Garth Olwg, families want to be fully involved in the decision making and the alternatives for their relatives. Information was sought about how any closure would be managed, whether it would be phased, how and when residents would be assessed and options examined, impact on staff. The need to maintain friendship groups would be important to the residents.

- It would be deeply regretted by residents and their families if Garth Olwg were to be closed but transparency about the rationale for the decision, the costs involved and how the buildings would be utilised for the future was sought. The home was regarded highly as a part of the community and a closure decision would be opposed strongly. Early notice was requested about when and where the Cabinet meeting to make the decision on decommissioning was to be held.

6. Consultation with Staff

- 6.1 Consultation events were organised for staff working at all Council care homes to facilitate discussion about the proposals to modernise care homes in the Borough. The response from staff is summarised below.

Staff Event at Ystrad Sports Centre

New Buildings / Refurbishments

- Questions were raised about the building programme and its timetable for Extra Care and in particular the facilities planned for Aberdare and Porth. Clarity was also sought on whether Ferndale House would be refurbished or – the preferred option for staff of a new build. The current building is regarded as outdated and would be difficult to bring up to standard. Current residents are concerned that a refurbishment might mean a temporary move whilst the work was undertaken that turns into a permanent move. The important issue was that a Care Home remained in Rhondda Fach valley. The availability of land had to be considered but convenience of location was also important.

Specialist Care

- Concerns were raised about the dependency levels of residents transferring from homes that are decommissioned and the implications for staff who were themselves getting older. Views were expressed about the need for managing specialist care such as dementia separately from less dependent clients. This is a consideration for registration requirements but also in respect of staff's ability to provide personalised outcome focused care. This had already been recognised in the management of Clydach Court.

Empty beds

- Concerns were raised about the period of transition to Extra Care and that a reduction of beds and clients in some homes is likely to occur. It was important that staff are consulted and kept informed during this process. The continued viability of some homes that would have fewer residents was a worry. It was suggested that empty beds could be used as a "step down" to manage the delayed hospital discharges problem.

Providing high standards of care

- There were comments that staff continue to provide high standards of care that had been verified by Inspection Reports. Staff form strong attachments to residents including providing palliative and end of life care and do their best to meet their needs and some residents have suggested that staff should stay caring for them if any move is necessary.

Staff Event at Llantrisant Sports Centre

Community

- Staff were very concerned about the decision to include Garth Olwg on the list of homes it was proposed should be decommissioned and questioned the rationale for selection. This had produced an "outcry" in the community and staff who had shown strong commitment to the home including for emergency situations were dismayed.

Extra Care

- Confirmation was sought as to whether the Council would be providing the Domiciliary Care at the Pontypridd Extra Care facility and if the Garth Olwg residents could transfer to that location. Clarification about specific services and roles such as provision of meals and “handy man” support was sought.

Providing high standards of care

- Garth Olwg provides a high-quality care home that is well managed, with dedicated staff and appreciated by family, and residents. Staff wanted to see it kept open. They had a good reputation which should be considered. There would be a strong protest against closure including a petition. A public meeting was to be held on 4th November 2019.

New Buildings / Refurbishments

- It was suggested that investment in refurbishment of Garth Olwg could be made to create ensuite facilities although this may affect the size and number of rooms available. There was also room to extend into the grounds on the site. Facilities such as laundry, café and hairdressers are already available.
- As Garth Olwg is a two-storey building, there is sufficient scope to provide specialist care in different areas including as at present in respect of learning disability, dementia, frailty and palliative care

Empty beds

- The temporary halt to permanent admissions to RCT Care Homes had resulted in vacancies at Garth Olwg and clients being turned away even though they would normally have a waiting list. Residents receiving Respite Care want to stay at the home but are not able to be accommodated. The application of this rule had been difficult but also needed to be implemented consistently across all Care Homes.

“We have a resident (respite) whose been told she has to go back home, she’s upset she’s just lost her husband, she was told this by her social worker. She cries through the night she doesn’t want to go back home”

Private Care Homes

- Some negative perceptions of private residential care were asserted, but also an example of a very positive experience of a private care home caring for a relative given. Social workers were said to be promoting a particular private care home but information on each home and its facilities was needed.

Other Issues Raised

- It has been rumored that Garth Olwg will close because the local school needs the land.
- There were concerns that there is a lack of sufficiency in the availability of care packages for people living in their communities.
- Staff don’t always have sufficient time to talk to the residents.

7. Public Consultation

- 7.1 The Public Consultation period ran for 12 weeks from 30 September to 20 December 2019 and was undertaken by the Council's Consultation Unit. The questionnaire was designed by the Consultation Unit and members of senior Adult Social Services staff together with Practice Solutions Ltd. It 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, as well as at the public events and on request through a dedicated contact number. A freepost address was also provided. A dedicated email address was set up.
- 7.2 There were 310 responses to the Residential Services questionnaire which were received together with 13 letters, 8 emails and a petition signed by 1020 people to keep Garth Olwg open. A summary of the outcome of consultation with the public shows that for Care Homes, 47% of respondents to the questionnaire were members of the public, 23% were relatives of the residents, 18% were staff and 7% were residents.
- 7.3 A comprehensive analysis of the questionnaire and written responses received has been produced by the Council's Consultation Unit and is available at Appendix 1. The Executive Summary of the Report is set out below.

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 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 30th September to the 20th December 2019.
- 310 responses to the Residential Services questionnaire were received.
- 53.4% of respondents disagreed with the Council's preferred option, with 41% agreeing with the preferred option and the others stating, "don't know".

The comments received on whether respondents agreed with the preferred option can be summarised under a number of key themes, as follows;

- **Agree with preferred option (n=28)** - Comments showing agreement with the Council's preferred option
- **Agree – Ferndale House support for home (n=27)** - Comments agreeing with proposal and showing support for retaining Ferndale House
- **Disagree – Closure of 3 homes in Rhondda (n=11)** - Comments disagreeing with proposal due to quantity of homes to be decommissioned in Rhondda area
- **Disagree – Need more homes / beds not less (n=31)** - Comments disagreeing with proposal as belief that there should be no reduction in places

- Disagree – Garth Olwg praise for home / quality (n=32) - Comments showing support for quality of care in Garth Olwg
- **Disagree – Garth Olwg impact on community (n=29)** - Comments indicating a detrimental impact to the community should Garth Olwg close
- **Disagree – Impact on resident / closure upheaval / general disagreement (n=26)** - Potential impact on residents that moving / closure would bring and general comments disagreeing with proposal

Respondents were asked to provide alternative suggestions; these comments can be themed as follows;

- **Modernise homes (n= 30)** - Comments agreeing with modernization of homes
- **Keep homes open (n=35)** - Comments against closure of any homes
- **Garth Olwg support (n=22)** - Comments supporting Garth Olwg against closure
- **Ferndale house – build new home (n=16)** - New premises suggested for Ferndale House with potential sites identified
- **Ferndale house – respite provision / expand provision (n=16)** - Continue to provide respite provision and expand number of residents to improve socialisation levels

Impact of preferred option

- 57.3% of respondents said that the preferred option would impact on them or their family whilst 42.7% said they would not be impacted by the preferred option. The comments received can be categorised as follows;
- Home being retained having a positive impact (n=10) - Residents pleased with proposal to retain their home
- **Staff – potential job loss / financial impact (n=24)** - Impact of job loss / financial impact or travel distance to new location unachievable
- **Community – impact of closure on community (n=35)** - Potential loss of option for home in future for self or relative / loss of a local home
- Relatives – concern about impact of move / closure on resident (n=27) - Concern that closure would have negative impact on residents
- **Travel – distance to travel / ability to travel (n=32)** - Potential closure increasing travel time / ability to access public transport
- Respondents were asked to identify which, if any, home their views related to. 49.2% of respondents selected 'Garth Olwg' and 25% selected Ferndale House.

Evaluation matrix criteria

- Respondents were also asked whether they agreed with the criteria that the Council used to inform the preferred option (Building suitability/geographical area/current level of use/current cost of placement), 40.5% of respondents agreed with the criteria whilst 42.9% said 'No'. 16.6% of respondents selected 'Don't Know'.

- Of those that selected 'No' respondents were asked to provide comments indicating what else the council should have considered. The themes that emerged in this section have been categorised as follows;
- **Community Views / Residents' needs** - The views of the public and service users should be considered including the current and future requirements of communities
- **Impact of closure on the community (n=20)** - The impact closure of home would have on residents / the wider community
- **Reasons for statistics – occupation figures (n=17)** - The perceived bias of figures on restriction of places during consultation
- **Travel distance / Public transport links (n=16)** - The distance to travel to alternatives / availability of public transport



The Modernisation of Residential Care Services for older people Consultation

An analysis of the questionnaire
and written responses

January 2019



Contents

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	24
INTRODUCTION	26
BACKGROUND	26
METHODOLOGY	27
RESULTS	28
Questionnaire Results	28
Other Responses – Residential Care	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 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 30th September to the 20th December 2019.
- 310 responses to the Residential Services questionnaire were received.
- 53.4% of respondents disagreed with the Council's preferred option, with 41% agreeing with the preferred option and the others stating, "don't know".

The comments received on whether respondents agreed with the preferred option can be summarised under a number of key themes, as follows;

- Agree with preferred option (n=28) - Comments showing agreement with the Council's preferred option
- Agree – Ferndale House support for home (n=27) - Comments agreeing with proposal and showing support for retaining Ferndale House
- Disagree – Closure of 3 homes in Rhondda (n=11) - Comments disagreeing with proposal due to quantity of homes to be decommissioned in Rhondda area
- Disagree – Need more homes / beds not less (n=31) - Comments disagreeing with proposal as belief that there should be no reduction in places
- Disagree – Garth Olwg praise for home / quality (n=32) - Comments showing support for quality of care in Garth Olwg
- Disagree – Garth Olwg impact on community (n=29) - Comments indicating a detrimental impact to the community should Garth Olwg close
- Disagree – Impact on resident / closure upheaval / general disagreement (n=26) - Potential impact on residents that moving / closure would bring and general comments disagreeing with proposal

Respondents were asked to provide alternative suggestions; these comments can be themed as follows;

- Modernise homes (n= 30) - Comments agreeing with modernization of homes
- Keep homes open (n=35) - Comments against closure of any homes
- Garth Olwg support (n=22) - Comments supporting Garth Olwg against closure
- Ferndale House – build new home (n=16) - New premises suggested for Ferndale House with potential sites identified
- Ferndale house – respite provision / expand provision (n=16) - Continue to provide respite provision and expand number of residents to improve socialisation levels

Impact of preferred option

- 57.3% of respondents said that the preferred option would impact on them or their family whilst 42.7% said they would not be impacted by the preferred option. The comments received can be categorised as follows;
- Home being retained having a positive impact (n=10) - Residents pleased with proposal to retain their home
- Staff – potential job loss / financial impact (n=24) - Impact of job loss / financial impact or travel distance to new location unachievable
- Community – impact of closure on community (n=35) - Potential loss of option for home in future for self or relative / loss of a local home
- Relatives – concern about impact of move / closure on resident (n=27) - Concern that closure would have negative impact on residents
- Travel – distance to travel / ability to travel (n=32) - Potential closure increasing travel time / ability to access public transport

Respondents were asked to identify which, if any, home their views related to. 49.2% of respondents selected 'Garth Olwg' and 25% selected Ferndale House.

Evaluation matrix criteria

Respondents were also asked whether they agreed with the criteria that the Council used to inform the preferred option (Building suitability/geographical area/current level of use/current cost of placement), 40.5% of respondents agreed with the criteria whilst 42.9% said 'No'. 16.6% of respondents selected 'Don't Know'.

Of those that selected 'No' respondents were asked to provide comments indicating what else the council should have considered. The themes that emerged in this section have been categorised as follows;

- Community Views / Residents' needs - The views of the public and service users should be considered including the current and future requirements of communities
- Impact of closure on the community (n=20) - The impact closure of home would have on residents / the wider community
- Reasons for statistics – occupation figures (n=17) - The perceived bias of figures on restriction of places during consultation
- Travel distance / Public transport links (n=16) - The distance to travel to alternatives / availability of public transport

INTRODUCTION

This report presents the findings of a consultation on proposals to modernise Rhondda Cynon Taf residential 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.

Section 2 outlines a brief background to the reasons for the consultation.

Section 3 provides a brief methodology.

Section 4 presents the findings.

BACKGROUND

At a meeting of the Council's Cabinet on 11 September 2019, Members considered the outcome of the consultation on the preferred options for the Council's residential care homes. The Cabinet agreed to initiate a further 12 week period of public, staff and resident consultation on the preferred option for the future of the Council's residential care homes, i.e. that the Council retains the level of provision of residential care homes, as set out below, focused on complex needs, residential reablement and respite care which is based on a determination of the market share and considered need required in each of the Rhondda, Cynon and Taf geographical areas:

CARE HOMES PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED

- Clydach Court Residential Care Home, Trealaw
- Ferndale House Residential Care Home, Ferndale
- Pentre House Residential Care Home, Pentre
- Tegfan Residential Care Home, Trecynon
- Troedyrhiw Residential Care Home, Mountain Ash
- Cae Glas Residential Care Home, Hawthorn
- Parc Newydd Residential Care Home, Talbot Green

CARE HOMES PROPOSED TO BE DECOMMISSIONED

- Bronllwyn Residential Care Home, Gelli
- Ystrad Fechan Residential Care Home, Treorchy
- Dan y Mynydd Residential Care Home, Porth
- Garth Olwg Residential Care Home, Church Village

METHODOLOGY

The consultation period ran for 12 weeks from the 30th September to the 20th December 2019.

The full consultation methodology is outlined in the main report (Practice Solutions).

The questionnaire was designed by the consultation team in liaison with Practice Solutions and senior Adult services staff.

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, as well as the public events and on request through a dedicated contact number. A freepost address was also provided.

A dedicated email address was set up and all written submissions were welcomed and are included in this report where relevant.

310 responses to the questionnaire were received. The results are outlined in this report.

In addition, the following responses were received;

- 13 Letters
- 8 Emails
- 1 online petition with 1020 signatures

Note: A large number of responses were received, and a copy of the full comment responses will be shared with Councilors and Senior Officers as part of the reporting process to inform decision making.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Respondents were asked whether they agreed with the preferred option. 53% of respondents said they did not agree and 41% agreed.

Counts Analysis % Respondents	
Base	307 100.0%
Do you agree with the preferred option?	
Yes	126 41.0%
No	164 53.4%
Don't Know	17 5.5%

The table below shows the responses to this question broken down by each home. A large number of responses were received relating to Garth Olwg. This is reflected in the themes of comments for subsequent questions.

Counts Analysis % Respondents	Total	Do you agree with the preferred option?		
		Yes	No	Don't Know
Base	247	99 40.1%	138 55.9%	10 4.0%
If your views relate to any residential care home in part...				
Parc Newydd, Talbot Green	17	4 23.5%	12 70.6%	1 5.9%
Pentre House, Pentre	13	3 23.1%	8 61.5%	2 15.4%
Tegfan, Aberdare	34	27 79.4%	6 17.6%	1 2.9%
Troed-y-Rhiw, Mountain Ash	18	9 50.0%	7 38.9%	2 11.1%
Ystrad Fechan, Treorchy	25	1 4.0%	23 92.0%	1 4.0%
Bronllwyn, Gelli	23	1 4.3%	21 91.3%	1 4.3%
Cae Glas, Hawthorn	12	2 16.7%	8 66.7%	2 16.7%

Clydach Court, Trealaw	15	6 40.0%	8 53.3%	1 6.7%
Dan Y Mynydd, Porth	18	3 16.7%	14 77.8%	1 5.6%
Ferndale House, Ferndale	62	50 80.6%	10 16.1%	2 3.2%
Garth Olwg, Church Village	122	5 4.1%	111 91.0%	6 4.9%

Respondents were asked to provide comments in support of their chosen answer. The following themes have been identified from the answers and a selection of comments is provided.

Number	Theme	Detail	No. of comments
1	Agree with preferred option	Comments showing agreement with the Council's preferred option	28
2	Disagree – Closure of 3 homes in Rhondda	Comments disagreeing with proposal due to quantity of homes to be decommissioned in Rhondda area	11
3	Disagree – Need more homes / beds not less	Comments disagreeing with proposal as belief that there should be no reduction in places	31
4a	Disagree – Garth Olwg praise for home / quality	Comments showing support for quality of care in Garth Olwg	32
4b	Disagree – Garth Olwg impact on community	Comments indicating a detrimental impact to the community should Garth Olwg close	29
4c	Disagree – Garth Olwg praise for staff	Comments showing support for the care provided by staff	11
4d	Disagree – Garth Olwg alternatives not suitable	Comments highlighting the affect closure would have and the perceived unsuitability of alternatives e.g. private homes / extra care	15
5	Disagree – Impact on resident / closure upheaval / general disagreement	Potential impact on residents that moving / closure would bring and general comments disagreeing with proposal	26
6	Agree – Preferred option is best but with caveats	Acknowledgement that preferred option has benefits but concern about how closures would be managed	5
7a	Agree – Ferndale House support for home	Comments agreeing with proposal and showing support for retaining Ferndale House	27
7b	Agree – Ferndale House increase occupancy	Comments agreeing with proposal but identifying a desire to increase numbers in Ferndale House to improve social interaction	7
8	Modernise buildings	Comments identifying a desire to modernize residential care homes	10
9	Other	Miscellaneous comments	12

Agree with preferred option (n=28)

A number of comments were made in support of the preferred option. These comments indicated a preference for the modernisation of the service and an agreement with the information provided in the report and the approach outlined.

Some comments included:

“Well balanced report with impact statements and alternative provision throughout. Decommission dates are sensible – not rushed, to ensure alternative provision for users is available.”

“The proposed closures are homes that are old and do not have the proper facilities.”

“This option would reduce the need to relocate people as their condition changes.”

“Residential homes are very dated and are in need of modernisation. We have to move with the times people pay a lot of money for care so they should have the best for their well-being. Gone are the days of sharing bathrooms, we are not just thinking of now but for the future for our families and ourselves. If homes need to close then so be it – it could have been any one of us. You have to start from somewhere to be able to move forward even though people don't like change.”

Disagree – Decommissioning of 3 homes in Rhondda (n=11)

Some respondents disagreed with the preferred option based on the locations of the homes proposed to be decommissioned. The number of homes proposed to be decommissioned in the Rhondda area were felt to be disproportionately high compared to other areas across the borough.

“3 homes to be decommissioned in the Rhondda and no guarantees of replacements.”

“No, the cuts fall disproportionately on the Rhondda. I understand funding for authorities have been cut, however Rhondda people should have a fair share of the budget.”

“Reduction in support and homes in Rhondda. No reduction only increases in Cynon. Why?”

“3 closures in RCT up valley in Fach, one care home for all of Treherbert, Treorchy down to Tonypany. It's not going to be adequate enough spaces for all the residents. Not good enough when you're closing perfectly good care homes, jobs too.”

Disagree – Need more homes / beds not less (n=31)

A number of comments indicated disagreement with the proposals based on the belief that future demand for residential beds will increase due to an ageing population.

“We need more care homes. Not enough support, facilities or services in the community.”

“There are too few care homes as it is... where are the residents going to be placed?”

“We need more homes for an ageing population not less, what are we paying council tax if it is not to look after our old age people?”

“I don’t think any homes should be decommissioned, we have a very large elderly population and it may be worth considering where such residents will go if they need emergency care too, and how we already fail to place people in suitable care already.”

“The reduction in any care homes will have a devastating impact for the older people in RCT.”

“I think a more robust mapping exercise should have taken place based on current and future generations of vulnerable, older people’s needs which is in the Taf Ely area.”

Disagree – Garth Olwg praise for home / quality (n=32)

A number of comments praised the quality of care and showed support for Garth Olwg. These comments indicated that the home is valued within the community and respondents disagreed with the proposal to decommission this home in particular.

“Garth Olwg is a valued resource within the community, the care delivered by the staff is exceptional and residents are so content there.”

“Garth Olwg is known locally as being one of the best care homes in our area and to see it close would be a huge loss to many people!”

“Garth Olwg Residential Home is one of the best run homes I have ever visited.”

“Garth Olwg is an essential facility servicing out local area. We wholly disagree with the planned closure.”

“Garth Olwg has a fantastic reputation, the residents all speak highly of the care and attention provided, the staff are brilliant! We oldies always say, ‘if and when I can’t look after myself, I’ll go to Garth Olwg’ because I know I’ll feel safe and be well looked after.”

Disagree – Garth Olwg impact on community (n=29)

Respondents felt that the decommissioning of Garth Olwg would have a detrimental impact on the communities in the local area. These comments indicated that the home is used by local people, who live in the vicinity and showed concern for the future residents of the area, as there had been an increase in housing development.

“Please do not decommission Garth Olwg Residential Care Home, Church Village – it’s a vital place for the elderly in our community.”

“There’s a huge percentage of elderly residents in Church Village and it would be catastrophic to shut the Garth Olwg Care home. I do not agree with shutting any care homes as the local residents need care and safety and protection with adequate care provision.”

“Garth Olwg is a care home for people that live in this vicinity. Why would you place them out of the only area some of them have ever known and either grown up in or lived here for many years?”

“Feel the need for Garth Olwg to remain open due to large area covered and all the new properties which have been built in the area.”

“Llantwit Fardre as an area has seen extensive growth in its population, and you should be looking to double the existing facilities in this area, not cutting them out completely.”

“Though I recognize the need to refer residential care in the County Borough, I believe that Garth Olwg Residential Care Home needs to be retained. The area that includes Church Village, Tonteg, Llantwit Fardre is continually growing and no alternative has been proposed by the Council.”

Disagree – Impact on residents / closure upheaval / general disagreement (n=26)

Comments were made disagreeing with the preferred option due to the specific impact this would have on residents and relatives. There were a number of comments that showed general disagreement with the preferred option also.

“The residents wish to remain where they have made friends and integrated into the community, they have made friends with other residents and staff and the closure will have a detrimental effect on their mental health.”

“Upheaval and ‘worry’ and uncertainty effect on elderly frail residents.”

“I love the openness and space and the facilities at Garth Olwg. My anxiety is high, and I couldn’t live in a small room. The space at Garth Olwg means I can walk around outside, the shop and post office are close, the people here in wheelchairs can’t get out so much. If I have to go in on my own, I will have a breakdown like before.”

“Disruption to the residents who reside at Garth Olwg. Residents will be anxious / stressed not knowing where they will be relocated.”

Agree – Ferndale House support for home (n=27)

Another theme that emerged in this section was support for the preferred option, as the proposal included the retention of Ferndale House. A number of comments were made in support of Ferndale House outlining its importance to the local community and the satisfaction of residents and their relatives.

“The choice to save Ferndale House is the right one.”

“I came in a home because the family was struggling looking after me. I wouldn’t go anywhere else only Ferndale.”

“We want Ferndale House to stay open it is very much needed.”

“I agree as Ferndale House is the only residential home within Rhondda Fach which provides care for the local community, which is extremely important to the local community to stay within the area.”

“Ferndale House is more than just a Residential Home. It provides vital links between the residents and local school pupils which must be allowed to continue.”

“Ferndale House should remain open for our local community because it is a vital asset. It’s the only facility left.”

Respondents were asked to provide any suggestions or alternative options to the preferred option set out by the Council. The themes identified are shown below;

Number	Theme	Detail	No. of comments
10	Modernise homes	Comments agreeing with modernisation of homes	30
11	Keep homes open	Comments against closure of any homes	35
12	Garth Olwg support	Comments supporting Garth Olwg against closure	22
13a	Ferndale house – build new home	New premises suggested for Ferndale House with potential sites identified	16
13b	Ferndale house – respite provision / expand provision	Continue to provide respite provision and expand number of residents to improve socialisation levels	16
14a	Changes to service model – expand building use	Current homes should be expanded to include day services / community services	8
14b	Changes to service model – improve council management of service	Comments indicating a change to the management of the service would be efficient	5
15	Build more homes	Comments suggesting more homes should be built not closed	9
16	Rhondda provision – keep homes open	Retain homes in Rhondda	4
17	Other	Miscellaneous	28

Modernise homes (n= 30)

There were a number of comments that suggested that all homes should be modernised. These comments focused on the retention of council run homes and investing in them by suggesting ways to improve homes individually.

“Modernise the homes that will be retained.”

“Keep the homes open and invest money on employing more staff and modernisation of buildings which already exist which have potential.”

“Why not invest in these facilities and upgrade them.”

“Update and improve care homes and protect those that you are responsible for looking after who are unable to look after themselves.”

“Modernise the building it has plenty of potential to extend, lots of ground. Move residents from one part of the building to another. Reduce the 30-bed home to a 20+ room then you can have your en-suites.”

Keep homes open (n=35)

A general theme that continued in this section was to keep all homes open. These comments provided support for all homes however there was a particular focus on those homes proposed to be decommissioned.

“Keep these homes open.”

“We just need to keep them open.”

“The homes should not be decommissioned. Keep them open and do not allocate new homes in other areas if the budget will not allow. Utilise the homes available.”

“Keep them all open as we are an ageing population and more beds will be needed not less.”

“Find the funds to keep them all open. Given that the provision of care is set to increase, we should be preparing to meet the need.”

Garth Olwg support (n=22)

Once again there were a number of specific supportive comments for the retention of Garth Olwg. These comments again praised the quality of the home, staff and care provided and the requirement for a home in the local area.

“Garth Olwg has a great reputation and is a great asset in church village. People who have lived in the area all their lives should be able to stay in the same area.”

“Keep Garth Olwg open to facilitate dignified quality of life in a friendly professional facility that operates to the very highest standards. I have seen this myself and will forever owe a debt of gratitude to Garth Olwg.”

“Garth Olwg, an area of high population and an area which will continue to see its population increase should be retained.”

“Leave Garth Olwg open it’s a good building. Things are working right here, no trouble at Garth Olwg...”

Ferndale house – build new home (n=16)

There were a number of comments that indicated that Ferndale House should be retained but a new premise built in its place. These comments indicated possible alternative sites in the locality.

“Continue to offer a respite provision. Look for land in the locality to build a single storied modern facility with individual en-suites. Outside spaces that individuals can access safely.....Schools that are closing (Llyn Y Forwyn) possible site for modern facility.”

“Consult RCT planning department to look at the availability of land in the Rhondda Fach locality that have potential for redevelopment (Llyn-y-Forwyn primary school site). Plan to build a single storey modern facility with individual en-suite rooms; communal areas and outside space which is accessible to all service users where they can enjoy outside space safely and independently.”

“A new build would be lovely and necessary and will need to be local and not in another valley.”

“Contact RCT planning to see what availability of land is in the locality. Maerdy infant school has not long been demolished.”

“Find land – you have people in land development they know where the land is. Ferndale House deserves a new home.”

Ferndale House – respite provision / expand provision (n=16)

Further to the comments supporting the retention of Ferndale House another theme that emerged in relation to this home was the desire to expand current services and to ensure adequate respite provision is provided.

“Continue to provide specialist day services extending hours or weekend provision.”

“Continue to provide respite provision as this has been proved to be a much-needed facility for relatives to go away with the knowledge that their relatives are looked after.”

“I think Ferndale House should be an EM1 with respite as dementia is increasing and the demand is high.”

“Increase the occupancy levels at Ferndale House, extend day centre provisions.”

“As a member of staff, we need now to increase occupancy levels to improve individuals’ social interaction, continue to provide day centre opportunities, looking at weekend provision in place, also respite.”

57% of respondents said that the preferred option would impact upon them or their family. Of those who selected ‘yes’ they were asked to provide further comment to detail what impact the preferred option would have. The themes are detailed below.

Counts	
Analysis %	
Respondents	

Base	302 100.0%
Would the preferred option impact upon you or your family?	
Yes	173 57.3%
No	129 42.7%

The table below shows the breakdown of each home in relation to the above question.

Counts Analysis % Respondents	Total	Would the preferred option impact upon you or your family?	
		Yes	No
Base	242	159 65.7%	83 34.3%
If your views relate to any residential care home in part...			
Parc Newydd, Talbot Green	18	9 50.0%	9 50.0%
Pentre House, Pentre	13	8 61.5%	5 38.5%
Tegfan, Aberdare	34	22 64.7%	12 35.3%
Troed-y-Rhiw, Mountain Ash	18	11 61.1%	7 38.9%
Ystrad Fechan, Treorchy	25	13 52.0%	12 48.0%
Bronllwyn, Gelli	23	14 60.9%	9 39.1%
Cae Glas, Hawthorn	12	5 41.7%	7 58.3%
Clydach Court, Trealaw	16	9 56.3%	7 43.8%
Dan Y Mynydd, Porth	19	10 52.6%	9 47.4%
Ferndale House, Ferndale	57	40 70.2%	17 29.8%
Garth Olwg, Church Village	120	73 60.8%	47 39.2%

Impact themes:

Number	Theme	Detail	No. of comments
19	Home being retained having a positive impact	Residents pleased with proposal to retain their home	10
20	Relatives / Friends – Happy home is staying	Pleased with proposal to retain home with minimal impact for relative / friend – can continue to visit	15
21	Staff – potential job loss / financial impact	Impact of job loss / financial impact or travel distance to new location unachievable	24
22	Community – impact of closure on community	Potential loss of option for home in future for self or relative / loss of a local home	35
23	Relatives – concern about impact of move / closure on resident	Concern that closure would have negative impact on residents	27
24	Travel – distance to travel / ability to travel	Potential closure increasing travel time / ability to access public transport	32
25	Other	Miscellaneous	9

Home being retained having a positive impact (n=10)

These comments were made in support of the preferred option and indicated that there will be a positive impact if the proposals were taken forward. Residents in the homes proposed to be retained were happy with the proposal and relatives were pleased that their relative would remain in the same home.

“Good that we will have enough council homes.”

“My family rely on me coming to a home that I feel safe and happy. So, thank you for making the right decision to keep Ferndale House open.”

“Yes, the preferred option would have an impact on myself and my family as we need these services in the Upper Rhondda Fach.”

“For Tegfan to be retained it impacts me and my family not only my parents... Tegfan and the facilities have been amazing, and I don’t know what we would do if it closed down.”

Staff – potential job loss / financial impact (n=24)

A number of comments were made indicating the potential impact the preferred option would have on staff. These comments highlighted the perceived financial impact on staff if jobs were lost and the impact home closures could have on travelling to a new work place.

“My family depends on my income. Personal impact if needing to travel would impact on my caring role in my personal life.”

"I have lived in the village all my life. 95% of the time I walk to work especially when it's been snowing. I have never failed not to turn up, my family understand how much I love my job at Garth Olwg."

"Financially, as an employee it would have an impact."

"I would lose the job I love to do; with amazing staff and management I have around me."

"If I were to lose my job, I am the only wage earner in my family. I am worried and concerned."

Community – impact of closure on community (n=35)

There were a number of comments indicating that the preferred option would have an impact on local communities and the future choice that residents would have should they require care. This was particularly prevalent for the communities surrounding Garth Olwg.

"In the future my elderly family had hoped to go into Garth Olwg when they are no longer able to manage within their own homes."

"Being from the locality there is a possibility in the future should my parents or myself need care I would need to be placed in an unfamiliar area with less flexible transport links."

"It will have a big impact to our community."

"As most people in the community I have relatives who may require this support in the future. It's not just thinking about ourselves today but others in the future. Once these facilities are lost, they will never be replaced."

Relatives – concern about impact of move / closure on resident (n=27)

There were also comments concerned about the impact the proposals may have on residents of the homes proposed to close. The potential impact to residents' health and well-being was outlined in these comments.

"My father who is a regular user of Bronllwyn and Ystrad Fechan residential care home receiving respite care, giving us much needed rest, will not be able to use these."

"I visit patients in Garth Olwg, who absolutely love their home and would be devastated to leave. In my opinion this would have a detrimental effect on their health well-being and quality of life."

"Potentially more than 1 move if there are no spaces in the Rhondda. At my mother's time of life, the extra emotional turmoil cannot be emphasized enough."

"My wife and I would have to provide additional comfort and support to a frail blind lady who is very happy with the present arrangement."

Travel – distance to travel / ability to travel (n=32)

A strong theme emerged surrounding respondents concern about the proposals impacting their ability of relatives to visit care homes. These comments highlighted the reliance on public transport or close distance to residential homes as an important factor when choosing a home. These comments indicated that decommissioning homes and the possible relocation of relatives to homes further away would impact on their ability to visit as frequently or as easily.

“As all my family members live in the Church Village area closure of such a lovely residential home would directly impact them due to the fact, they would have to travel further away to get the care they require.”

“Can’t drive – wouldn’t be able to get anywhere else.”

“Local people who visit the home and village would be unable to see their families. Some are elderly they don’t drive. Only one bus service in the area.

“I am 75 and my husband 76 lives 2 bus journeys away at the top of the Rhondda. I visit daily with a round trip of 2 hours each day to give him his yea. If he was living in Garth Olwg, I could walk there in 10 minutes.”

Respondents were asked to identify which home (if any) that their views related to. Respondents were able to select more than one home if applicable. The results show the majority of respondent’s views related to Garth Olwg (120 respondents).

Counts Analysis % Respondents	
Base	248 100.0%
If your views relate to any residential care home in part...	
Parc Newydd, Talbot Green	18 7.3%
Pentre House, Pentre	13 5.2%
Tegfan, Aberdare	34 13.7%
Troed-y-Rhiw, Mountain Ash	18 7.3%
Ystrad Fechan, Treorchy	25 10.1%
Bronllwyn, Gelli	23 9.3%
Cae Glas, Hawthorn	12 4.8%
Clydach Court, Trealaw	16 6.5%

Dan Y Mynydd, Porth	19 7.7%
Ferndale House, Ferndale	62 25.0%
Garth Olwg, Church Village	122 49.2%

In developing the proposals each care home had been scored using an evaluation matrix based on a number of factors detailed in the outline of the preferred option. Respondents were asked whether they agreed with the criteria used to inform the preferred option. The results show that 40.5% of people said they agreed with the criteria, 16.6% were unsure and 42.9% disagreed.

Counts Analysis % Respondents	
Base	296 100.0%
Do you agree with the criteria that the Council used to inform the preferred option? (Building suitability/geographical area/current level of use/current cost of placement)	
Yes	120 40.5%
No	127 42.9%
Don't Know	49 16.6%

Of those that selected 'No' comments were requested to indicate what respondents felt that the council should have considered. A number of emerging themes have been outlined overleaf.

Number	Theme	Description	No. of comments
26	Option to build more / modernise current homes	Current homes should be modernised	8
27	Community Views / Residents needs	The views of the public and service users should be considered including the current and future requirements of communities	18
28	Praise for homes – decommissioned	A recognition of the quality / good reputation of the homes proposed to close	4
29	Impact of closure on the community	The impact closure of home would have on residents / the wider community	20
30	Location of alternative homes / Extra Care schemes	The location of the homes / the alternatives if closed e.g. Extra Care	11

31	Reasons for statistics – occupation figures	The perceived bias of figures on restriction of places during consultation	17
32	Travel distance / Public transport links	The distance to travel to alternatives / availability of public transport	16
33	Other	Miscellaneous	7

Option to build more / modernise current homes (n= 8)

One theme that emerged was that the council should have considered building more homes / Extra Care facilities. These comments also suggested modernizing all homes instead of decommissioning some homes.

“As previously stated, the option to modernise the current building.”

“Build more homes to cover the ones being closed.”

“Far from closing Garth Olwg the authority should be considering extra care to be added to the area. I cannot see how two extra care facilities can be added within the Aberdare, Cwmaman, Mountain Ash triangle which already appears to be well catered for.”

“The council could consider modernizing the building and offer different types of care.”

Community Views / Residents’ needs (n=18)

One theme emerging in this section was that some respondents felt that the council should consider the views of the community and the needs of residents. There were comments that highlighted the needs of residents in local communities would possibly change over the years due to a shift in demographics and requested that these be considered in relation to the preferred option.

“Local people’s feelings and the impact the closures will have on them both now and in the future.”

“In addition, they should take into consideration – public opinion, ratings and user satisfaction surveys, Care Council inspection results, family opinion.”

“The voice of the people who work care and the families of the residents that will be affected by these closures.”

“People who have grown up here, local families.”

“The needs of the older people and the future older people.”

Impact of closure on the community (n=20)

A number of comments highlighted the possible impact the preferred option may have on the community and suggested that this should have been considered as part of the proposal. The impact of a possible home move to residents and the resulting impact on relatives and the decommissioning of a local home all emerged as reasons to consider this criterion.

“...closing of care homes is not acceptable due to the increasing needs of citizens... I work in care and see the heartbreak...worry...stress for the individual and family that face closure/move of their residents.”

“The big change that the elderly would undertake moving it would possibly kill some of them as they have lived in the homes for a long time.”

“The impact it will have on those residents currently in the homes that are destined for closure.”

“They have not really looked into the effect it will have on the community. Staff residents and their family that this will have if Garth Olwg closes.”

“The increasing elderly population in these areas.”

“Should have considered new and emerging demand looking at the age profile in its communities and mapped potential demand and not looked at existing supply of residential homes and their current locations. Those homes were built 30+ years ago when the ageing population of Rhondda and Cynon valley was different...These people are now retired pensioners needing more social care and support to live independently at home or have respite care break as a facility locally where safe.”

Location of alternative homes / Extra Care schemes (n=11)

Some comments suggested that the council should consider the implications of decommissioning the homes and the resulting availability in the locality for residents. This also included Extra Care facilities.

“Residents can only be placed in a home which can meet their personal requirements. This may not be in the area they previously lived.”

“The criteria of the closure being linked to the opening of Extra Care facilities in that area is dependent on the residents being suitable for Extra Care. It would have been helpful to see how many ex-residential home residents have successfully moved to the existing Extra Care facilities.”

“Not convinced that geographical area has been fully thought through.”

Reasons for statistics – occupation figures (n=17)

One other theme that emerged was a perceived bias of the figures presented in the full report. These comments focused on the dates used as comparison and the restriction placed on admissions to council homes during the consultation period.

“Current level of use – this is not a true reflection of usage as for some time local authority homes have been stopped from accepting permanent residents or new respite clients in order to bring down the figures of occupancy. Most homes had waiting lists up to that point.”

“Occupancy levels are only compared from one month in 2018 to one month in 2019. Surely this is not the most accurate way to determine long term occupancy levels. Choosing 2 single months only could provide vast difference in % occupied beds for a number of reasons.”

“.....The fact that before this process started RCT stopped taking permanent residents at Garth Olwg. Therefore, the placement levels worked on are questionable.”

Travel distance / Public transport links (n=16)

A number of comments indicated that there should also have been consideration to the distance to travel and public transport links available to residents and relatives of the homes proposed to decommission.

“Care & residential homes should be in villages or towns so residents who can get about some way with help can walk around a little.”

“Look carefully at how people can conveniently travel to visit residents, public transport is inconvenient in places especially Llantwit Fardre – Hawthorn – maps do not give a true picture of difficulties.”

“The ability of elderly relatives to visit their family members. Travelling by bus in the dark and cold winter months put a strain on elderly families who wish to visit loved ones.”

“Links to public transport – these are elderly people who rely on public transport to get about & maintain social contacts & awareness. Proximity to local facilities (shops, libraries, doctors’ surgeries, hospitals).”

Respondents were asked to identify in what capacity they were responding to the survey. 47% of respondents who answered this question selected they were a member of the general public.

Counts Analysis % Respondents	
Base	296 100.0%
Are you a?	
Resident of a residential care home	21 7.1%
Relative/Partner/friend of a resident in a Council run residential care home	68 23.0%
Advocate for a resident of a Council run residential care home	5 1.7%
Member of general public	139 47.0%

Staff member	52 17.6%
Other (Please state)	31 10.5%

Equalities Impact

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

“Because of my age to move me to another place would be heartbreaking.”

“Being my age, my home is where my heart is.”

“At my age 97 I do not want to move home from where I am – very happy.”

“aged 82 easier for me to visit local home.”

Age – Future Needs

“I am 74, there is a possibility that in the future I will need this.”

“Age – I might well need Garth Olwg home for the elderly in the future I am now 73 years of age.”

“Age. I would be very unhappy if I needed residential care to be placed in a home in the valleys. My family would not be able to visit as regularly.”

Religion – Local congregation

“It makes a huge difference to congregation members to have their minister and fellow church members visit them regularly. This would be a lot harder if the home was closed and residents moved further away.”

“I am a member of Salem Baptist Church, Tonteg and from time to time we have members who have taken residence at Garth Olwg if they were further afield it may mean that there would not be many, if any, visitors thus isolating the person in the home they are in.”

Gender

“To make a happy home all genders live here. I am happy.”

“I am happy with other genders being in the same home as me. I am happy mixing with different identities.”

“I enjoy where I live there are all genders which I enjoy. Doesn’t matter what identity you are.”

Disability

“Disability – I will not be able to travel to visit my father when he is receiving respite care.”

“Disability (self); I have severe disabilities, including a brain injury. I am likely to develop Alzheimer’s or Parkinson’s on top. As I have autism, I don’t like change. Therefore, when the time comes, I need a care home with the provision that Garth Olwg offers it should be available to me.”

No impact

“I do not believe any of the above would be affected as RCT is a LGBTQ equal opportunities provider and has a Welsh language policy. My religious beliefs would be considered as part of my advanced and individual care plan. The need to maintain relationships would be met by remaining close to family and friends who have access to public transport.”

“They would be unaffected under the authorities’ equality policy.”

“They would have no direct effect on me currently.”

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 favorably than the English Language.

The following are a selection of comments made;

Positive

“The proposal to keep Ferndale House open will allow the pupils from the local Welsh medium primary to continue their weekly visit to the home. It has been a real success story for both the pupils and residents and is vital for the Welsh speaking residents to be able to converse in their chosen language.”

“Positive as staff members can speak the Welsh language which can make the workplace an easier and more flexible to work and reside.”

"I agree that both Welsh and English could be used on any literature and perhaps staff could also use some Welsh words when answering the telephone e.g. good morning, good afternoon and good evening."

Negative

"Negative. People in this area do speak Welsh and is strongly promoted i.e. Garth Olwg School, Learning Centre, etc."

"When 90% of the staff can't speak Welsh, even conversational Welsh, it impacts on elderly or disabled people."

"Many people in Llantwit Fardre speak Welsh. Closing Garth Olwg would reduce access to Welsh language speaking opportunities, especially for people who already live in Llantwit Fardre and may need to use Garth Olwg."

"It treats those less favorable whom speak Welsh."

"If the council closes its residential home in a certain area and relies on the private sector to meet the demand, there is a consequence for welsh language provision as the private sector does not have to provide to the same welsh language standards as the council and its welsh language policy."

Not important/Money should be spent elsewhere

"The welsh language act is in force however it appears that measures are only put into practice because the council has to abide by the law. No real emphasis on truly supporting the act."

"Too much emphasis on the Welsh Language. Too much money being spent pandering to the ones who want Welsh on every leaflet etc."

"Far too much money is spent on promoting this ideology by our masters."

"There is no point in promoting the Welsh language in these care and residential homes as most of the staff are not local or welsh speaking."

No impact

"No impact on Welsh language as most people in Wales do not speak Welsh."

"I don't believe the proposal impacts in any negative way to promote the Welsh language."

"The proposal does nothing to impact the Welsh language."

Other Responses – Residential Care

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
Age Connects Morgannwg	<p>Response from Trustees of and Advisors to the board of Age Connects Morgannwg.</p> <p>Outlines requests for further information on a range of issues, under the following headings (see full response for detail);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrictions on Admissions • Options for care • Extra Care • Private Sector Care • Integrated Care • Cost of service changes • Respite Care • Day Care • Managing the Change
GMB and Unite Trade Unions Joint Submission	<p>With question 1 yes, we agree with the homes that are proposed to remain open but would make the following comments on the homes that are proposed to be decommissioned.</p> <p>Ystrad Fechan and Dan y Mynydd are different to the other two as they are next door the designated sites of the extra care facilities for their areas.</p> <p>These two homes could be used to undertake specialist Dementia care as part of the extra care facilities which would be run by the council. This would help with the anticipated increase in dementia sufferers.</p> <p>Garth Olwg is different from the other 3 homes because of its location and the proximity of other providers around it. The home can be used to cover the West/Central Taff area which is not covered very well by other care homes.</p> <p>If we look at the area from Brynna ward to the Tonteg ward not including the two Tonyrefail and Gilfach Goch wards there is a population of 52,205*1. There are only 3 homes (one RCT ran) with access to public transport with a total number of 70 residential beds (TY Heulog -40, Park Newydd – 21 and Penrhos – 9) with 9 registered EMI beds. This is a total of 79 beds. The Llantrisant home which is between Llantrisant and Tonyrefail has 6 registered Residential beds but is not accessible by Public transport. This will be a total 85 beds covering a population of 52,205*1 which is one bed for every 614.18 persons. This is extremely high compared to the Pontypridd area of one bed to 160.72 per person. If we add Gartholog into this that would give 21 more beds which will bring the ratio down to one bed for 492.5 every person.</p> <p>With the removal of Garth Olwg, there would be only one private home (9 residential and 9 EMI beds) from Park Newydd in Talbot Green to Cae Glass in Hawthorn or Duffryn Ffrwydd in Nantgarw. This would leave a population of 24,141 with just 18 beds which is a ratio of one bed to 1,341.16 persons.</p>

	<p>Garth Olwg would be the same as Park Newydd with 21 beds and just one bed less the Cae Glass (22 Beds) but Garth Olwg has the lowest estimation of the development costs (£1.65m) to conform with correct standards.</p> <p>In conclusion GMB and Unite Unions would request that support will be given to retain the 7 homes that have been identified to stay open and also to support Garth Olwg to be retained as a dedicated dementia care setting, we believe there is a need in the area for this service. We would also like to support that Dan-y-Mynydd and Ystrad Fechan homes become dedicated dementia care wings of the extra care facilities.</p> <p>*1 – Source: 2018 Estimate UK National Statistics (Website)</p>
Save Care Homes and Centres (SCHAC) – RCT	<p>SCHAC - save care homes and day centres RCT campaign. We have been campaigning against the proposed closures of RCT residential care homes and day centres since February 2019. We totally reject that these closures are necessary, and we have made the case that they will reduce needed residential care infrastructure at a time when evidence points to an increased demand over the foreseeable future. (see full response for detail);</p>
RCT OPAG (Older Persons Advisory Group)	<p>Agree with some reservation. Some of the care homes are in need of modernisation. We have concerns that in bigger homes such as extra care they may be clinical in approach and will not give the personal care and attention provided in current care homes.</p> <p>Members want to remain in their homes as long as possible.</p>
Rhondda 50+ Forum	<p>Covering letter with response via questionnaire</p> <p>Although we agree in principle with the preferred option, as we can recognise that we must move forward and some care homes need to be modernized, however we have concerns that in bigger homes such as extra care they may be clinical in approach and will not give the personal care and attention provided in current care homes.</p>
Taff Ely 50+ Forum	<p>Agree with some reservation. Recognise the need for modernisation, but still concerns about extra care and isolation/loneliness.</p>
Llantwit Fardre Community Council	<p>The Care home (Garth Olwg) has served the community since 1996 and is a lifeline for many of our very vulnerable elderly residents.... This home is not just a lifeline to the elderly, but also their families.</p> <p>There are 42 dedicated members of staff who have provided excellent support and care for the elderly over many years. The proposal to close the home would not just have a detrimental effect on the wellbeing of the elderly but the staff as well as you would be taking away their incomes.</p> <p>We trust that you reconsider the matter in favour of the concerns of the many individuals including Members of this Community Council.</p>
Llantrisant Community Council	<p>Members were pleased to read the RCTCBC preferred option in its consultation on the modernisation of Residential Care for older people was to retain Parc Newydd in Talbot Green.</p> <p>However, Llantrisant Community Council is strongly opposed to the proposed decommissioning of the Garth Olwg site. Members consider it to be unreasonable for local residents to have to travel to Pontypridd to access residential care. With the population increasing in its ward, this Council believes that investment in the Garth Olwg facility would be a better option for its local residents. To secure its long-term future this Council suggests creating a much-needed dementia specialist service at the site. Furthermore, as services in our local hospitals are downgraded and media reports of 'bed blocking' due to difficulties in finding suitable arrangements for those needing extra care and care home provision continue to make the headlines suggests that the current level of residential care is not meeting demand.</p>

Individual (Letters)	Main themes
Leanne Wood (AM)	<p>Objection to the Consultation.</p> <p>Leaves 70 residents uncertain about their future and care, stress and many are frail.</p> <p>I implore you to stall the decision on the future of these care homes until the Welsh Government can take a more strategic approach to care.</p>
Cllr Lewis Hooper (Tonteg ward)	Number of questions asked regarding the proposals on behalf of residents, in relation to Garth Olwg.
Staff Letter	<p>Objection to the proposal to decommission Garth Olwg</p> <p>Does not object to extra care and thinks it is positive for the Council to move forward with the modernisation of new amenities, but it is not suitable for everyone.</p>
Member of Golden Oldies – Garth Olwg	Objection to the proposal to decommission Garth Olwg
Relative letter via Owen Smith MP	Objection to the proposal to decommission Garth Olwg
Relative 1 – Garth Olwg	Objection to the proposal to decommission Garth Olwg
Relative 2 – Garth Olwg	Objection to the proposal to decommission Garth Olwg
Relative 3 – Garth Olwg	Objection to the proposal to decommission Garth Olwg
Resident – Garth Olwg	Objection to the proposal to decommission Garth Olwg
Resident 2 – Garth Olwg	Objection to the proposal to decommission Garth Olwg
General email – Garth Olwg	Objection to the proposal to decommission Garth Olwg
General letter – Garth Olwg	Objection to the proposal to decommission Garth Olwg

Petition – 1020 Signatures (i-petition) received via email 17/11/19

<p>Save Garth Olwg Residential Care Home</p> <p>Garth Olwg is an excellent facility which has served the community since 1966. This home is a lifeline for the very vulnerable elderly residents who are no longer able to manage in their own homes. Relocating the residents of Garth Olwg will have a very negative impact on the most vulnerable members of our community and also to the 42 dedicated members of staff who have given excellent care and total commitment to them. To remove the residents away from their current home is unfair and cruel.</p>
--