



Council – 25 October 2018

Councillors' Questions

Part A – Supplementaries

1	<p>Cllrs Chris Holley, Kevin Griffiths & Sue Jones</p> <p>Will the Cabinet Member tell Council what provision is there for people when the Day Centres in the The Hollies and Rose Cross House cease and where will that provision be.</p> <p>Response of the Cabinet Member for Care, Health & Ageing Well</p> <p>Day Services for Older People will still be maintained at St Johns, Ty Waunarwydd and Norton Lodge. In addition to this, services will continue to be externally commissioned at 3 additional sites. All service users affected at The Hollies and Rose Cross Day Centres are currently having a social work assessment to determine move on arrangements. These assessments will match those with complex needs to a suitable place based on their individual needs and geographical preferences, and alternative services are being agreed with each individual concerned. A small number of service users have been assessed as having non-complex needs and are consequently being supported in other ways to have any remaining eligible needs met rather than attend a day service. In addition, a small number of service users have decided that they wish to leave the service and this will also be supported in line with their wishes.</p> <p>It should be noted that if the proposals of the council in 2011, then controlled by the Liberal Democrats and Independents, to move all of Adult Social Services in to an independent organisation, none of these Day Services Centres would be owned by the council, none of the services would have been provided by the council and so none of these decisions taken in the interests of vulnerable older people in Swansea would be in the power of the council to make.</p>
2	<p>Cllrs Mary Jones, Mike Day & Jeff Jones</p> <p>Will the Cabinet Member give us an update of the progress with the letting of the 360 and the Swiss Cottage.</p> <p>Response of the Cabinet Member for Business Transformation & Performance</p> <p>The lease of the council-owned Beach and Watersports Café became available when Bay Sports, the operator who had run the site for five years, decided to end their tenancy - and to close on September 5.</p>

	<p>Our aim is to secure a top quality new tenant who will offer a strong service to the public and best value to council tax payers. To help achieve this, we advertised the lease via property agent EJ Hales from August 14-September 21. We promoted it via social media and through news coverage in the local and regional press. We received 14 high-quality responses. Officers are analysing and evaluating them to ensure the best possible outcome. The plan is to finalise the position by the end of this month (October).</p> <p>We have a preferred tenant for the Swiss Cottage and continue discussions with them. Our aim is to secure a top quality tenant who will deliver best value to council tax payers and in line with the wider aspirations for Singleton Park. Officers plan to recommend a preferred option to Cabinet Members by the end of March.</p>
	<p>Part B – No Supplementaries</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>Cllrs Mike Day, Cheryl Philpott & Chris Holley</p> <p>Now that the Parkway Residential Home Sketty is closing can the Cabinet Member comment on whether the commitment that a “home for life still applies”.</p> <p>Response of the Cabinet Member for Care, Health & Ageing Well</p> <p>It is not unusual for people to move on from homes which only provide standard residential care, as needs increase and nursing support might be required. In any home in Swansea such as Parkway which only offers standard residential care, if an individual’s needs change and nursing care is required it would not be safe for them to remain in the home. Therefore, arrangements would be put in place to find alternative suitable accommodation in line with their needs unless they approaching end of life and staffing could be put in place on a very temporary basis to make them as comfortable as possible.</p> <p>It should be noted that if the proposals of the council in 2011, then controlled by the Liberal Democrats and Independents, to move all of Adult Social Services in to an independent organisation the council would be providing no homes for any older people; everyone’s needs would have to be met entirely externally, whether temporarily or for life.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Cllrs Wendy Fitzgerald, Peter Black & Graham Thomas</p> <p>Will the Cabinet Member confirm the current figures for potential savings following the closure of Parkway Residential Home.</p> <p>Response of the Cabinet Member for Care, Health & Ageing Well</p> <p>The projected annual saving for the closure of Parkway is £465,608 per annum. This takes account of the proposed third party top up fees and fees that the Local Authority will need to pay to place eligible residents elsewhere.</p>

It should be noted that if the proposals of the council in 2011, then controlled by the Liberal Democrats and Independents, to move all of Adult Social Services in to an independent organisation, the Council would be providing no residential care directly to any of its vulnerable citizens, so changing the model of provision to provide sufficient reablement to meet demand, and enable people to stay in their own homes as they wish would not be something this council could offer so wouldn't be available to the people of Swansea. Likewise the increased Respite provision to give Families and Partners a break from supporting their loved ones so enabling them to support their loved ones to live at home for longer, perhaps the rest of their life, would not be available to the people of Swansea. Similarly, the provision of sufficient care beds for those with complex care needs would be down to the local market; the Council could not adjust its provision to ensure this was not a worry for older people and their families should this need arise.

5 Cllrs Chris Holley, Mike Day & Jeff Jones

In response to the questions in scrutiny about official Trade Union responses in the consultation on the commissioning reviews it was stated that that while no formal response had been received the Trade Unions had made their views known. Can the Cabinet Member or Leader tell Council what the comments from the Trade Unions were and in which forum they were made, similarly were any responses made by ABMU if so what were the responses and how were they communicated.

Response of the Leader/Cabinet Member for Care, Health & Ageing Well

With respect to the Trade Unions, there was good engagement between Management and Trade Unions during the Commissioning Review process. Before the initial Cabinet papers went live in April an initial meeting was held between management, HR and the Trade Unions to explain the proposals and following this initial meetings held with staff. On 1st May, once the consultation went live, a further meeting was held with the Trade Unions and again there were joint visits to inform staff and answer questions. Further staff consultation meetings were held in each service and then 1 to 1s held with each individual staff member during May and June where Trade Unions were present at the invitation of staff members if requested. A further meeting was held with the Trade Unions on 20th September when the Cabinet decision was taken to inform them of the outcome There has been strong engagement with the Trade Unions throughout the process, and they have worked well with management to address any concerns with staff as and when they have happened. In our view therefore, a formal response was not submitted as all issues were addressed and mitigated throughout the consultation process and it was therefore not necessary to formally raise additional concerns.

In relation to the ABMUHB response, online questionnaires were completed. In relation to the residential care review, ABMUHB raised concerns surrounding the reduction of capacity through the proposed closure of Parkway and whether there was sufficient market capacity to meet this reduction in beds. They also queried whether the home could be taken over by an independent provider. Both of these issues were addressed in the report that was considered by Cabinet. In terms of the proposed reduction in beds, the vacancy levels in the

independent sector are sufficient to meet current and future demand. In relation to whether the home could be run by an independent provider in the future, this is something that was considered and will be looked at again at the time that Parkway closes. With respect to the response to the day service review, ABMUHB was broadly supportive of the proposals particularly a model that supported complex needs. They did however raise concerns about whether the proposed closure of the Hollies would leave those living in that part of the County without a service and whether there could be any impact on delaying hospital discharges from Gorseinon Hospital. The first point was referenced in the report, and there is an alternative day service in Llys Y Werin in Gorseinon so this part of the County is already served and there are also currently a very small number of individuals attending the Hollies. In terms of hospital discharges, availability of day service support is not a factor that affects hospital discharges. Discussions have since taken place with the Health Board surrounding the concerns that they have raised and the Health Board has confirmed that it is supportive of a model that promotes respite, short term reablement and more complex needs.

It should be noted that if the proposals of the council in 2011, then controlled by the Liberal Democrats and Independents, to move all of Adult Social Services in to an Independent organisation, had been realised then the Council would not be undertaking commissioning reviews for Residential and Day services to ensure they became Sustainable, work in a preventative manner and help people be healthier, because it would no longer provided either of these services. Neither would it have gone to consultation with the Trade Unions, ABMU or any other organisation or individual in Swansea on proposals to focus on reablement for people to stay in their own homes as they wish as it would not be something this council could offer. Likewise consultation to increase Respite provision to give Families and Partners a break from supporting their loved ones would be pointless as respite would not be available to the people of Swansea from the council. Similarly, the provision of sufficient care beds for those with complex care needs would be down to the local market; the Council could not consult on adjusting its provision to ensure this was not a worry for older people and their families should this need arise as it would be providing no care beds.

6 Cllrs Peter May and Irene Mann

“Council to insert additional monitoring indicator to track the average proportion of HMOs within areas subject to additional licensing and/or within the designated Management Area.”

The numerator of the proportion should be the number of HMOs.

- a. Is the council going to rely on the solely on the number of Licensed HMOs from the public register at the point in time that the reading is taken.

The denominator of the proportion should be the total number of properties in the areas being considered.

- b. What basis will be used to ascertain the total number of properties.
e.g. Will individual flats within a house each be counted as a single property or will the house itself count as a single property, and will there be any types of residential properties excluded from the denominator.

In the two Lichfields' reports percentages were stated for the proportions of HMOs in LSOAs.

- c. Precisely which residential properties were used for determining the denominator for these percentages and what data did the council rely on to determine them.

Response of the Cabinet Member for Delivery

The Deposit LDP policy on HMOs has been amended during the course of the Examination to ensure it includes a more prescriptive definition of what constitutes 'harmful concentration/intensification', and define the actual HMO threshold limits that will apply. The amended policy sets out a threshold cap of HMOs not exceeding 25% of all residential properties within the existing high concentration areas (which is designated a 'Management Zone'), and for a 10% threshold to be imposed across all other areas. The content of the relevant Policy (H9) was discussed at Examination Hearing Session 19. The only further change to Policy H9 sought by the Inspectors following the hearing, which was in response to a request made at the hearing session by Cllr Clive Lloyd, was to amend the supporting text to recognise the potential for considering noise insulation in all types of HMOs, not just large properties. The only other change requested was to insert an indicator within the Monitoring Schedule (which is an Appendix to the Plan) to track the average proportion of HMOs within areas subject to additional licensing and/or within the designated Management Area to help understand over time the effectiveness of the policy. No other further changes to the LDP were sought by the Inspectors in relation to HMO matters. The Matters Arising Changes to the LDP policies are due to be subject to public consultation later in the year. The changes include the abovementioned reference to the potential for noise insulation measures for all HMO properties, and the following monitoring indicator:

Indicator	Policy Target	Trigger Point	Data Source
Local Indicator: The proportion of HMOs within the Castle and Uplands Wards, having regard to the overall numbers of registered HMO properties as a proportion of the residential properties.	To ensure the number of HMOs as a proportion of the total number of residential properties within the HMO Management Area does not significantly exceed the 25% threshold	Average concentration of HMO's within the LSOAs of the HMO Management Area either reduces or increases by +/-2% from the base level, which is currently around 25%	CCS databases

The monitoring calculations for the indicator will use as the numerator the number of HMOs recorded on the Council maintained public register, supplemented by any other available records at the time that is within the public domain to ensure monitoring is open and transparent. The denominator for the calculation will be the total number of residential properties as recorded by the Local Land and Property Gazetteer, which identifies each separate residential address including individual flats within a property and all tenures. This is consistent with the approach used by consultants Litchfields in their research that has supported the LDP policy, which also used the Local Land and Property Gazetteer (issued to the consultants under licence).

7 Cllrs Peter May and Irene Mann

The council used to have a national performance indicator which was withdrawn in 2015. The indicator read as follows.

“PP1 - Of the houses in multiple occupation known to the local authority, the percentage that have either a full licence or that have been issued with a licence with conditions attached”.

In its last annual report (2014-15) it was cited as a failing indicator in the red category. The quoted percentage was 86.12% when the target was 93%. The trend was also noted as being downward from the previous year.

The reason that was given for the failure was:

“Target not met due to increased number of landlords selling properties/taking them out of multiple occupation. Properties which have been sold and then require new licences create additional demands, but do not result in increased number of licensed properties. Work to clear backlog ongoing.”

On withdrawing the indicator, the report presented to cabinet on 16th July 2015 stated that a “new local indicator was being developed.”

- a. Three years on from the report, has the local indicator ever been developed and if so what were the quarterly results that it showed? (In the form of a table please)

In preparation for the new H9 policy for the LDP which includes a defined percentage threshold, the council have stated to the examiner that: “In order to understand the full extent of HMOs within the 50m radius the LPA will, for proposals in Uplands and Castle Ward, use the Council’s public register of licensed HMOs as the basis for the calculation.”

Accurate and robust calculations are paramount to satisfy public confidence and the inspector.

- b. What improvements have the council made to rectify the failing PP1 indicator of 2015 and how have the impact of these improvements been measured to ensure that percentage data is robust accurate and defensible.

Response of the Cabinet Member for Delivery

- a. National PI PP1; of the houses in multiple occupation known to the local authority, the percentage that have either a full licence or that have been

issued with a licence with conditions attached, was deleted by Welsh Government at the end of 2014/2015.
 The PP1 result for Swansea Council in 2014/2015 was 86% (1,495 licensed HMOs out of a known 1,736 HMOs).
 In 2015/2016 a local PI was introduced; HMO1, the number of houses in multiple occupation that have been issued with a licence. Reported quarterly results are included in the table below.

Year	Year end target	Result Q1	Result Q2	Result Q3	Result Q4
2015/2016	1,540	1,566	1,557	1,613	1,611
2016/2017	1,560	1,638	1,619	1,650	1,660
2017/2018	1,600	1,638	1,661	1,676	1,679
2018/2019	1,600	1,695			

b. PP1 was deleted by Welsh Government as it could not be compared across local authorities and was not an accurate measure of performance given that not all HMOs require licensing and not all local authorities have a large number of HMOs with their areas.

Swansea Council's subsequent local PI is a numeric figure rather than a percentage as a response to Welsh Government's concerns about PP1. It shows an increasing number of HMOs being licensed. The annual targets have been set to aim to maintain a level of licensed HMOs throughout each year irrespective of property sales, change of use and licence renewals as dictated by the local market. It is expected that the number of licensed HMOs will fluctuate throughout each year relative to market conditions.