



“Who cares?”

Reinventing Sheltered Housing



Andy Sage & Luisa Sartini-Baldwin
The Linchpin Project
6/1/2015

A report by the Scrutiny Review Team, on behalf of the Tenant Participation Group, reviewing the Sheltered Housing Service of South Cambridgeshire District Council

June 2015

Contents

Acknowledgements	3
Executive Summary.....	4
Introduction	13
Evidence gathering	17
Desktop Review	17
Interview with Tracey Cassidy (Supported Housing Manager)....	19
Financing the Sheltered Housing Service Presentation.....	20
Coffee Morning Style Focus Groups	21
Work shadowing	25
Sheltered Estate Officer Team Meeting.....	27
Focus group with Support Officers	28
Presentation by Cambridgeshire County Council	30
Sheltered Forums Consultation	32
Interview with Finance Officers.....	33
Meeting with the Senior Housing Management Team	35
Conclusions and recommendations	38
Appendices.....	46
References.....	48

Acknowledgements

The Sheltered Scrutiny Review Team (SRT) is appreciative of the support it received from South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC), especially the staff within the Sheltered Housing and Visiting Support Services. The review coincided with the unfortunate sickness absence of Tracey Cassidy the Supported Housing Manager, and perhaps not surprisingly, this put the Service under more pressure than normal.

Helen Pagram (Resident Involvement Officer) was always on hand to book venues and taxis and generally help out to make sure things went smoothly. Helen was joined later by Peter Moston (acting Resident Involvement Team Leader) who along with Julie Fletcher (Housing Performance Team Leader) took a keen interest in keeping the Review on track and helped to deal with some tricky issues along the way, as did Anita Goddard (Head of Housing and Property Services).

Last but not least, SRT thanks go to Luisa Sartini Baldwin and Andy Sage from The Linchpin Project who provided mentoring throughout the Review. They went the extra mile to ensure the Review was a success and helped to further develop SRT's capacity to independently challenge and hold SCDC to account.

Executive Summary

Purpose

This report is about the Scrutiny Review of the Sheltered Housing Service recently completed by the Scrutiny Review Team (SRT), on behalf of the Tenant Participation Group (TPG).

The Review focused on the quality and value for money (VfM) of the Visiting Support Service and the Sheltered Estate Officer Team and the extent to which they meet the needs and expectations of residents and the reality of the 'customer experience'.

Approach

The SRT adopted a robust Tenant Audit Approach which included:

1. **Desktop review** – looking at what the paperwork says, including strategies, policies, procedures, performance reports, benchmarking information, funding, etc.
2. **Strategic understanding** – attending a presentation by Cambridgeshire County Council to clarify their cross tenure approach for older persons services and open up a debate about how to 'future proof' the sheltered housing service.
3. **User consultation** – attending Sheltered Housing Forum Meetings in each area to discuss and ascertain their views.
4. **Work shadowing** – spending time with front-line staff and managers to observe and reality check working practices, including partnership working arrangements.*
5. **Focus groups with residents** – designing and undertaking coffee morning style focus groups with tenants at a sample of sheltered housing schemes to reality check the 'customer experience'.
6. **Focus group with housing staff and managers** – generating ideas for improving service delivery, performance and identify any inconsistencies between policy and practice.
7. **Interviews** – to clarify of any unclear areas, apparent inconsistencies, gaps in the available information, etc.

8. **SRT meetings** – discussing key findings, question and challenge key housing, care agency and other partner organisation staff to seek clarification.
9. **Reporting and presenting** to the Portfolio Holder, etc. – a) to write an evidence-based report, b) to discuss and where possible agree with the Supported Housing Manager and Executive Management Team (EMT), c) to revise report if this identifies factual errors and agreement is reached to make substantive changes to the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the report, and d) to present directly to the Portfolio Holder.

* It was later agreed to restrict the work shadowing to the Sheltered Estate Officers because of management concerns about confidentiality and privacy around the work of the Visiting Support Officers and the Supported Housing Manager.

Main Findings

- No policy setting out a clear vision and purpose for the Sheltered Housing Service
- Lack of long-term thinking about how to future proof (make viable and sustainable) sheltered housing
- No explicit customer service standards
- No performance standards specifically for the sheltered service
- Restructure was a legitimate response to funding cuts rather than about service improvement
- Sheltered Forums not providing effective two way communication / capturing customer feedback
- Sheltered Housing is still subsidised by general needs tenants through the HRA and the level of subsidy is set to increase because of the County Council's withdrawal of funding for the alarms
- Most common reasons for moving into sheltered housing are the need for extra support to live independently or as an insurance policy for old age

- Residents feel the service has disappeared and their needs or expectations are not being met
- Generally residents are open to considering paying for support within a “warden” type service but want to know what they would get for their money and how much it would cost before making any decisions
- Residents want to be seen as ‘customers’ and not patronised as ‘only tenants’
- Felt service delivery should be rationalised so that they receive the service through a single officer
- Want easy to understand statements that breakdown the rent and service charges in more detail than those currently provided to leaseholders
- Residents do not feel the Council listens to them or acts on the feedback
- Support for organising a petition to raise the profile of older people and sheltered housing with the Government and thought Age UK should be involved
- The Visiting Support Service provides support for over 65s to allow them to live independently and since 2014 the Service has been operating on a tenure neutral basis
- Since going live the Service has provided support for 623 residents. Support ranges from mobility problems through to mental health problems, including drug and alcohol issues
- The Service is keeping up with demand but residents fear it is not reaching everyone with support needs because it is not being effectively promoted
- The Visiting Support Service optimises available support through signposting and advocacy on behalf of residents. This new way of working makes better use of Cambridgeshire County Council’s reduced funding
- The Service plays an important part in preventing residents reaching a crisis point in their lives such as being admitted to hospital, bed blocking or accessing more expensive social care services
- The sheltered housing model is seen as fundamentally flawed by Cambridgeshire County Council.

Main conclusions and Recommendations

	Conclusions	Recommendations
1.	<p>The Sheltered Housing Service suffers from a lack of clarity, coherence and focus about its purpose, aims and objectives and this would be helped by the Council developing a Sheltered Housing Policy or Strategy. There is also no real forward thinking about how to future proof the service to make it viable and sustainable beyond the current Visiting Support Contract funded by Cambridgeshire County Council.</p>	<p>The Council should set up a working party to develop a Sheltered Housing Policy and consult the Sheltered Housing Forum over its content. The Policy needs to clarify the purpose and role of the Sheltered Housing Service and show how the Service meets the four aims of Cambridgeshire's Older Peoples Policy so that it can be used to attract funding from other organisations, including Cambridgeshire County Council, NHS, Third Sector, etc.</p>
2.	<p>There are very few written procedures or guidance for the Sheltered Estate Officers and this leaves huge grey areas open to interpretation resulting in inconsistency in service delivery. Currently the only procedures that are available are for undertaking health and safety checks and guidance on running bingo and raffles.</p>	<p>The Council should develop a set of step by step procedures for front-line staff that is available through the intranet that can be viewed through their tablets and laptops. The procedures should clearly and concisely set out what staff are expected to do and cover good practice, health and safety, and legal requirements. This would provide staff with a good framework to consistently deliver quality services.</p>
3.	<p>The absence of explicit service standards and performance measures helps to fuel dissatisfaction with the Sheltered Housing Service. Residents do not</p>	<p>The Council should develop a set of explicit service standards and performance measures in consultation with the new Sheltered Housing Forum. These should be</p>

	<p>have any idea of what level of service they should expect to receive and there is no performance culture to support continuous improvement.</p> <p>Residents want to be seen as “customers” and not patronised as “only tenants”.</p>	<p>agreed with residents and widely promoted through the Council's website, newsletters, scheme notice boards, etc. They should also be regularly reviewed through resident-led coffee morning-style focus groups.</p>
4.	<p>In 2015, residents rightly expect a full breakdown of their rent and service charges in a comprehensive and easy to understand statement. They want the format of these statements to be more detailed and clearer than the ones currently produced for leaseholders.</p>	<p>The Council should work with a small group of SRT members to develop a new customer friendly format for the statements and then consult residents through the Sheltered Housing Forums. These statements would help to drive Value for Money (VfM) in the Sheltered Housing Service through increased transparency and accountability to residents.</p>
5.	<p>Residents would prefer to be consulted over the possibility of paying for services such as support, ahead of services simply being withdrawn because the Council does not have any money to pay for them or because an external income stream such as Supporting People Funding, has been pulled. Residents want to be given the option of paying themselves but would want to know exactly what they would get for their money and how much</p>	<p>In the development of a Sheltered Housing Policy the Council needs to involve residents in exploring the options for funding the service, including making use of the intensive housing management Housing Benefit loophole to cover the costs of the Sheltered Estate Officers, residents paying for, or at least contributing towards, the cost of providing support, expanding the Lifeline Plus Service, etc. This would help to future proof the sheltered housing service and manage</p>

	<p>they would have to pay. There is a growing acceptance amongst residents that the viability and sustainability of sheltered housing depends on the willingness of residents being open minded about the possibility of at least contributing to the cost of funding support where it cannot be provided freely.</p>	<p>the risk of the Visiting Support Service and the Third Sector becoming chronically over stretched due to a growing older population with increasing support needs.</p>
6.	<p>The new working arrangements for the Sheltered Estate Officers have not been reviewed since they were introduced in 2012. Residents expect to see their Sheltered Estate Officers more often, they question the value of the new surgeries and are consequently dissatisfied with the service they currently receive, plus there is real concern over alarm response times. Residents would like the service to be rationalised so that they receive their service through a single officer.</p>	<p>The Council carries out a review of the Sheltered Estate Officer role in terms of how well the role's responsibilities meet the needs of residents in practice, how realistic it is to expect them to cover three or four schemes and check average alarm response times and any exceptions. Residents would prefer a more compassionate, community development-type role with a title which reflects this. Any resulting changes to the role should be made in consultation with residents, communicated to all affected and incorporated into the service standards. Review the effectiveness of the surgeries in six months' time after they have had a chance to bed in.</p>
7.	<p>On the surface the Visiting Support Service appears to</p>	<p>Cambridgeshire County Council to be asked to share</p>

	<p>be working well, there is effective partnership working with other agencies and the model of signposting the availability of support in both the statutory sector and the Third Sector has real merit. However, residents have concerns about demand outstripping supply and the Support Service becoming overstretched as more and more people and agencies get to hear about it or if or when it is advertised. The Supported Housing Manager has done a lot of good work promoting the service to GP's, Hospital Discharge Teams, Social Workers, etc. but many sheltered residents are either unaware about the availability of the service or unclear about the role of Visiting Supporting Officers or how to access the service. There is real concern that some sheltered residents are slipping through the net.</p>	<p>and / or present the outcomes of the planned joint management review of the Visiting Support Service. The Service should be advertised to empower residents to self-refer even though this runs the risk of greatly increasing demand and put more pressure on the Support Service. Needs assessments should be updated at regular intervals to ensure that vulnerable Sheltered Housing residents are not falling through the net. Current vacancies need to be filled to ensure the team is fully resourced.</p>
8.	<p>While some of the communal rooms at Sheltered Housing Schemes are well used, others are underutilised and some have been almost completely abandoned by</p>	<p>The Council should report back on its review of communal rooms which had been put on hold due to staffing capacity issues and embrace more radical thinking to include things like</p>

	<p>residents. There is good evidence that tenant involvement in planning, organising and running social activities helps to ensure communal rooms are well used, but they need support to do this.</p>	<p>social enterprises running community cafes from communal rooms. The way forward will differ from scheme to scheme and residents should be consulted before any decision is made for their scheme. Officers and TPG to play a role in sharing good practice between those schemes with thriving communal rooms and those that are struggling, including TPG organising some practical help, advice and support to turn things around.</p>
9.	<p>The Sheltered Housing Forums are not working for either the Council or residents as an effective consultative mechanism. They do not have a Terms of Reference and therefore lack purpose and focus. Residents believe the Forums are top heavy with staff, concentrate almost exclusively on organisational issues rather than their needs, they do not get straight answers to their questions and therefore things just go round in circles.</p>	<p>The Council should implement the recent decision to create a single Sheltered Housing Forum that meets quarterly in locations around the District. Over time the Forum should be encouraged to become more resident-led in the same way as TPG. A Terms of Reference should be developed for the new Sheltered Housing Forum and publicised to encourage more residents to attend and have a voice. Sheltered Forum should elect a tenant representative to attend TPG meetings, as happens with the Leaseholder Forum. This will improve communication and support for the Forums and TPG.</p>

10.	<p>Across the country Sheltered Housing has come to be widely seen as a flawed model that no longer works in an age when it's claimed older people want to stay in their own homes for as long as they possibly can, that only a minority of sheltered residents need regular support and there is no way for landlords to provide support as the funding has been cut and sheltered housing accommodation is of an inferior quality that does not meet the expectations of the next generation of prospective residents.</p>	<p>This Scrutiny Review acts as the catalyst for TPG to launch a campaign to challenge this view and reinvent Sheltered Housing as an attractive form of retirement housing for older people with recognised support needs and people with disabilities. TPG would look to engage the support of Age UK and a campaigning organisation such as 38 Degrees to organise an online petition to get 100,000 signatures so that Sheltered Housing has to be debated in Parliament and receive wide media exposure.</p>
-----	---	---

Introduction

Some important things the reader needs to know about before reading the report.

2012 changes / funding cuts

Back in 2012, in response to the Cambridgeshire County Council cutting Supporting People Funding by 36%, South Cambridgeshire District Council remodelled its sheltered housing service based on the work of a Task and Finish Group.

New model / funding

The Task and Finish Group recommended the establishment of

1. A Visiting Support Officer Team providing targeted support for older and vulnerable people within sheltered housing.
2. A sheltered Estate Officer Team to undertake estate management duties at sheltered schemes, including the management of communal facilities, testing of alarms and letting of sheltered properties.
3. Three Hub offices within the District based on the existing team patches in the North, East and West.

The two teams are funded through different mechanisms a) The Visiting Support Team is funded through a three year contract the District Council was awarded by Cambridgeshire County Council and is free to the recipients of the service, b) The Sheltered Estate Officer Team is funded through the HRA and c) The Hub Offices are jointly funded through the HRA and GF.

Campaign to reinvigorate sheltered housing

SRT support the idea of running a sector sponsored campaign to save sheltered housing through enlisting the help of a campaign organisation such as 38 Degrees. A petition signed by 100,000

people could act as the catalyst for the future of role and funding of sheltered housing to be properly debated in parliament.

The Government and bodies such as Age UK recognise that there is a shortage of appropriate retirement housing whilst at the same time bizarrely sheltered housing is being allowed to die a slow death.

Sheltered housing has an important part to play in bridging the shortage of appropriate housing for older people and people with disabilities, thereby contributing to preventing the spiralling of cost of social care and reducing the pressures on the NHS.

It simply requires

- a) Boldness, a change of mind-set and imagination on behalf of housing providers.
- b) Rebranding and remodelling sheltered housing to give it a fresh image.
- c) Giving residents the option of paying for or at least contributing towards meeting the cost of the support they receive.
- d) Exclusively allocating sheltered housing to older people who have recognised support needs and people with disabilities.
- e) Making additional investment in the sheltered stock to make it attractive to the next generation of prospective residents.

Scope of the Review

Following a presentation by Tracey Cassidy, the Supported Housing Manager, it was decided the Scrutiny Review would cover the following areas:

1. The quality and VfM of the Visiting Support Service and the Sheltered Estate Officer Team and how well risk is managed.
2. The extent to which the Visiting Support Service and the Sheltered Estate Officer Team meet the needs and expectations of residents and the reality of the 'customer experience'.

3. The reasons for introducing the Visiting Support Service and the Sheltered Estate Officer Team and any alternative models that could better meet the requirements of residents.
4. The responsibilities of Visiting Support Officers and Sheltered Estate Officers and the possibility of refocusing or enhancing their roles within the limits of the prevailing contract and funding constraints.
5. The level of customer satisfaction with the 'social life' at sheltered schemes and the capacity of residents to self-organise social activities.
6. The practicalities and demand for developing sheltered scheme communal rooms as 'community hubs' for sheltered residents and the wider community, including possible alternative uses for communal rooms that are no underused by residents.
7. The effectiveness of the working arrangements with care agencies, other partner organisations, e.g. Invicta Telecare, and any opportunities to improve the quality of the service.
8. The effectiveness and user friendliness of the security arrangements at sheltered schemes.
9. The performance of the Visiting Support Service and Sheltered Estate Officer Team against customer service standards.
10. The quality of the current customer service standards, the potential need to review standards and communication methods.
11. The opportunities for increasing resident involvement in performance monitoring, providing customer feedback and service improvement.
12. The transparency of sheltered housing rents and service charges, the breakdown of service charges and the relationship between the service charge and the cost of providing the service.

Scrutiny mentoring and resident-led scrutiny

SRT was mentored through a resident-led scrutiny review by The Linchpin Project, a tenant run Community Interest Company based in Cambridge. Their support helped SRT to effectively challenge and hold the Council to account.

Resident-led scrutiny is about increasing the influence and capacity of residents to robustly challenge and effectively hold their housing provider to account. Residents acting as a critical friend scrutinise, examine, question, critically appraise and reality test the housing providers decisions, performance and service delivery from a residents perspective and capturing the real customer experience through an evidence-based report.

Tenant Audit Process

In planning and carrying out its work, the SRT adopted a robust Tenant Audit approach to ensure it was done in a professional and fair-minded manner.

SRT has provided an evidence base for all of the report's conclusions and recommendations. The report will make hard reading in places but accurately captures the residents' perspective and it should form the blue print for reinvigorating the sheltered housing service.

The Team hope you find the report helpful, interesting and informative.

Evidence gathering

Desktop Review

The Desktop Review was completed by the following SRT members:

- Margaret Coles
- Wendy Head
- Angela Lewell
- Thora Saunders.

They were supported by Andy Sage (Linchpin).

The information requested included strategies, policies, procedures, contracts, service standards, performance information, staffing structures, job descriptions, and location maps.

Documents provided:

- Sheltered Housing Review Update Report for Portfolio Holder
- Current Supported Housing Structure
- Job descriptions for Supported Housing Officer, Supported Housing Assistant and Sheltered Estate Officer
- Estate Officer's duties
- Draft Communal Facilities Use and Charging Policy
- Health and Safety Checks Procedure
- Bingo Guidance for Sheltered Schemes
- Guidance for raffles
- Draft Countywide Older People Strategy.

Plus the following Council website pages:

<https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/housing-strategies-policies-and-procedures>

<https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/sheltered-housing-forums>

<https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/supported-housing>

The Supported Housing Manager confirmed the Council did not have:

- A Sheltered Housing Policy / Strategy
- Any explicit service standards for the sheltered service
- Any specific performance standards / data for sheltered housing

The Council's failure to provide some of the information requested and delays in providing other pieces of information has impacted on the Review.

A copy of the Desktop Review can be found at Appendix A.

Findings

- No Policy / Strategy document for sheltered housing setting out vision, purpose, aims and objectives for the service
- No explicit customer service standards
- No performance standards specifically for the sheltered service
- Restructure was a legitimate response to funding cuts rather than about service improvement
- The introduction of the two teams happened well in advance of opening the Hubs
- Sheltered Forums were meant to act as a feedback loop on the impact of the changes but this didn't happen
- Confusion over whether or not there was a Terms of Reference for the Sheltered Forums (none provided)
- Very limited guidelines / procedures for staff
- Older Peoples Strategy (was draft now finalised).

Interview with Tracey Cassidy (Supported Housing Manager)

The interview was conducted by Carol Akribi and Les Rolfe (SRT members) and the note taker was Andy Sage (Linchpin). Wendy Woodbridge (Sheltered Estate Officer) also attended the meeting to take notes.

The questions were based on the accreditation criteria used by the Centre for Housing and Support, to which the Council subscribes.

A copy of the interview can be found at Appendix B

A copy of the interview notes were sent to the Supported Housing Manager for her to sign them off but this did not happen due to her being absent from work through illness.

Findings

- No real vision for service, only a description of the case for 2012 changes
- Lack of long-term thinking about how to future proof (how to make the service viable and sustainable) sheltered housing
- Paperless approach to working places heavy reliance on supervision, team meetings and appraisals to convey working practices (few written procedures)
- Other than corporate performance standards, there is no yard stick to measure performance against
- Sheltered Forums not providing effective two way communication / customer feedback
- The introduction of surgeries is attempt to improve communication and make the service more responsive
- Restricted interpretation of the meaning of independent living appears to shy away from offering residents choices / options to make informed decisions that encourage independent living
- Sheltered Forums not driving service improvement
- Council represented effectively at partnership meetings by Supported Housing Manager
- The Hubs are expected to improve joint working between the two teams and partner organisations

- Limited encouragement to run social activities. Not proactive enough when things are not happening
- There are formal procedures for carrying out staff recruitment that appear to be working well
- The organisational culture now encourages development and training.

Financing the Sheltered Housing Service Presentation

The presentation was delivered by Tracey Cassidy (Supported Housing Manager), Gwynn Thomas (Principle Accountant [Housing]) and Abbi Murray (Assistant Accountant).

The presentation covered:

- The HRA and GF – ring fence, administration charge, variable service charging
- Outside funding
- Actuals 2013/14
- Scheme examples.

A copy of the presentation can be found at Appendix C.

Findings

- The presentation gave a useful overview of how the sheltered housing service is funded, but left many residents feeling the devil is in the detail
- Sheltered Housing is still subsidised by general needs tenants through the HRA
- The level of subsidy is set to increase because of the County Council's withdrawal of funding for the alarms
- Requirement for a follow-up meeting to explore whether the Council was achieving VfM in a number of areas.

Coffee Morning Style Focus Groups

Eight focus groups were held to capture the views of residents.

SRT members hand-delivered 1370 invitations to residents' homes to publicise the meetings, as well as putting up posters in all the scheme communal rooms.

A total of 125 residents attended the focus group meetings and this included a high number of leaseholders.

The meetings were facilitated by the following SRT members (three or four per focus group) who asked the same eight questions at each meeting:

- Carol Akrbi
- Joan Ball
- Carol Greensmith
- Patti Hall
- Wendy Head
- Andy Knibbs
- Angela Lewell
- Adrian Prentis
- Les Rolfe
- Ron Ryan
- Jim Watson.

Luisa Sartini-Baldwin (Linchpin) provided support at many of the events and with the report.

A copy of the full report including notes from all eight focus groups can be found at Appendix D.

Findings

- Most common reasons for moving into sheltered housing were needing extra support to live independently or as an insurance policy for old age
- Feel the service has disappeared and their needs or expectations are not being met
- Think the service has been cut back too much

- Find it difficult to get hold of their Sheltered Estate Officer and the service depends on the member of staff you get
- Want to see their Sheltered Estate Officer more often
- Query if housing surgeries are a good use of the Sheltered Estate Officers time as so few people are attending them (admittedly early days)
- No longer feels like sheltered housing because younger people who do not have support needs are moving in and are not interested in the community of the scheme
- Most people were unsure about the role of the Visiting Support Service
- Those residents benefiting from the Visiting Support Service value the service but find it limited
- Not reaching everyone with support needs because it is not being effectively promoted
- The removal of daily visits means some residents with support needs are falling through the net and residents with dementia or no family are being ignored
- Residents with unmet support needs are at the mercy of their neighbours for help
- Generally open to consider paying for support within a “warden” type service but want to know what they would get for their money and how much it would cost before making any decisions
- Others felt they paid enough for a service they were no longer receiving
- Would appreciate being asked about paying for services that are threatened before they are withdrawn
- No idea of what the customer service standards are meant to be or what they are paying for
- Leaseholders complained they were receiving a lower level of service than when they signed their contracts and queried why there were differences between the leases
- Not happy with the level of service they receive and do not feel they get VfM (may be linked to the lack of explicit customer service standards)

- Residents want to be seen as 'customers' and not patronised as 'only tenants'
- Need a Handyman Service and are frustrated this longstanding request has not been progressed (this is now being trialled)
- Service delivery rationalised so that they receive the service through a single officer
- Expressed dissatisfaction over alarm response times (need to check average response times and any exceptions)
- Want a breakdown of rent and service charges. Require statements that are open, transparent and easy to understand i.e. clearer and more detailed than the statements currently provided to leaseholders
- Sheltered schemes that have a social committee or tenant group make better use of their communal rooms
- TPG and Resident Involvement could help schemes that are struggling to run activities by providing volunteers to help with recruitment, organisation, publicity, etc.
- Need a clear way of paying for hire of communal rooms. Events organised by residents from the scheme should be free and events organised by outside bodies should be charged at an hourly rate similar to the rates charged by Village Halls
- Advertise availability of rooms better to other groups such as mental health groups, disability groups, lunch clubs, and nurses and other professionals
- Promote activities better to all local residents, with the assistance of the Sheltered Estate Officer
- Object to paying for Broadband in the communal rooms as no one uses it and / or there is still no access to the on-site computer at some schemes
- Willing to consider social enterprises making alternative use of communal rooms, e.g. community café but tenants would have to have a say before any agreements were made
- Not suitable for all schemes and some residents were anxious about outside organisations or individuals regularly using their communal room

- Do not feel the Council listens to residents or acts on resident feedback
- Communication is a real issue, e.g. emails described as falling into a 'black hole'
- Resolving issues takes too long
- Sheltered Estate Officers seem unable to answer questions without referring to a higher officer
- Many residents have never attended a Sheltered Forum
- Sheltered Forums are badly run with no organisation, objectives or outcomes
- Sheltered Forums are staff heavy and focus too much on their issues
- Never get straight answers and issues just go round in circles
- Need to decide what these meetings are for, who will run them and then relaunch them
- Moving Sheltered Forum meetings around the schemes would encourage more people to attend and add their voice
- Real concern about the erosion of the sheltered service
- Want to see the Warden Service brought back; it was a false economy to take the service away as it will increase the costs of social care and the pressures on the NHS (pointed out those days had gone)
- Think job descriptions should be reassessed to see if the roles are appropriate to meet residents needs
- Sheltered housing should be for the over 60's or people with disabilities
- Some residents discussed organising a petition to raise the profile of older people and sheltered housing with the Government and thought Age UK should be involved.

Work shadowing

SRT work shadowed 5 Sheltered Estate Officers to gain a better understanding of what their job entailed. Ahead of this they studied the Sheltered Estate Officer Job Description and devised a set of standard questions to ask the Sheltered Estate Officers while work shadowing them.

The work shadowing mostly covered checking the alarms, but also included one sheltered housing surgery.

The work shadowing was undertaken by the following SRT members:

- Joan Ball
- Patti Hall
- Wendy Head
- Les Rolfe
- Jim Watson

Copies of the Sheltered Estate Officer anonymised Work Shadowing Reports can be found at appendix E.

Findings

- There was a good rapport between the Sheltered Estate Officers and residents
- The alarm checks were thorough and the single observed sheltered surgery was well attended and worked well
- Sheltered Estate Officers understand the thinking behind the paperless approach to working but would still welcome more written guidance on how to do their job and accept this could be online rather than paper based
- Team meetings are generally held on a monthly basis and are seen as a place to air job related problems. Some Sheltered Estate Officers are more vociferous than others
- There was only a basic understanding of the role of the sheltered housing service which was seen as encouraging independent living

- In the absence of performance measure Sheltered Estate Officers rely on the lack of complaints as an indicator that they are performing well in their job
- Training needs are identified as part of one-to-one supervision and the appraisal process with their Team Leader / management and are being met
- Sheltered Estate Officers liaise closely with the Visiting Support Officers and make referrals
- The Hubs are not yet fully operational but it is hoped that they will help to deliver a better joined-up service
- The role of the Sheltered Estate Officer is not well understood and it would be helpful to develop an explicit set of service standards to clarify what level of service sheltered residents should receive and this would in turn help to manage expectations
- Communication can be a problem between management and the Sheltered Estate Officers and between the latter and other housing staff.

Sheltered Estate Officer Team Meeting

The Team Meeting was attended by Carol Akribi, on 22nd January 2015. Her main reason for attending the team meeting was to observe what happened and how effective it was as a mechanism for providing officers with clear guidance on working practices and standards and effective two-way communication.

The Supported Housing Manager was absent after being rushed to hospital earlier in the day. Perhaps understandably this had quite an impact on the meeting and meant the exercise was of only limited value to the Review.

Copy of the report can be found at appendix F.

Findings

- Tony Kitchen listened to the Sheltered Estate Officers complaints about finding it difficult to use the new Tablets and despite the apparent VfM implications of reversing the decision, he agreed to look into the possibility of returning their old laptops
- Susan Watford explained that due to a change in the law it was now not necessary to have a Food Hygiene Certificate if a person only cooked in a scheme kitchen once a month or less. After some persuasion, all officers said no one was cooking more than once a month or less, but there appeared to be some uncertainty about the validity of this
- From February 2015 external risk assessments will last for three years, but internal will stay the same. Some disquiet was expressed by Officers
- Sheltered Estate Officers were asked to source furniture for the Hubs from their own scheme in the first instance and where this was not possible place an order for new furniture
- On this experience, it was impossible to judge whether team meetings are an effective mechanism for management to communicate acceptable working practices and standards or receiving quality feedback from front-line staff to improve services.

Focus group with Support Officers

The Focus Group was attended by Debbie George (Team Leader), Shirley Stephen (Acting Head of Supported Housing), Alison Spence (Visiting Support Officer) and Tina Blee (Visiting Support Officer).

The Focus Group was moderated by Carol Akribi and Jim Watson (SRT members) and the note taker was Andy Sage (Linchpin).

The Focus Group replaced the planned work shadowing of the Support Officers which was blocked after it was deemed inappropriate because of sensitivities around confidentiality and privacy.

The Focus Group covered a broad range of questions and gleaned useful feedback on how the Support Service works and is performing from an officer's perspective.

It is important to note that it was not the same as reality testing customer experience and level of satisfaction with the Support Service from perspective of the users of the service.

Copy of the notes from the focus group can be found at appendix G.

Findings

- Service is to provide support for over 65s to allow them to live independently
- Since 2014 the Service has been operating on a tenure neutral basis
- Felt the service was performing well
- Additional support available through the Lifeline Plus for those residents willing / able to pay for it
- Since going live the service has provided support for 623 residents
- Six Support Officers (should be nine) each provide support for 20-30 residents
- Support ranges from mobility problems through to mental health problems, including drug and alcohol
- Keeping up with demand

- Very few cases fail to meet the criteria to receive support
- Referrals come from a variety of sources, including GPs, Hospital Discharge Teams, Social Workers, Sheltered Estate Officers, etc.
- Supported Housing Manager has worked hard to get the message out to potential referral organisations
- Countered criticism about ignorance about the Service by saying it was promoted at the time of the changeover
- Sheltered Housing Officers regularly refer cases to the Service
- Support is offered for a maximum of two years
- Much of the working is about accessing support through the Third Sector, for example befriending services
- Only sign off residents once support is in place and is working
- Monitor the quality of the support provided by other organisations and agencies and advocate on behalf of residents where support services are underperforming or failing
- Sheltered residents opened up about their support needs when the Service was launched resulting in a backlog of demand
- Organised into three patches to minimise travel time and maximise contact time
- Visiting Support Officers help each other out in periods of high demand
- Quite a lot of paperwork but acceptance it came with the territory of supporting vulnerable older people
- Cases are assigned to nearest Visiting Support Officer by the Team Leader. Consideration is taken of current workload and this is not just about numbers, it depends on the number of High, Medium and Low category cases they supporting
- The service plays an important part in preventing residents reaching a crisis point in their lives such as being admitted to hospital, bed blocking or accessing more expensive social care services
- Optimises available support through signposting and advocacy on behalf of residents

- Promotion of assistive technology helps to reduce demand on traditional support services
- Ideas for improving the Service include recruiting a mental health specialist, recruiting three additional Visiting Support Officers need to fill current vacancies to allow the service to be advertised more widely, and better IT to support remote working
- The Service should be promoted as good practice.

Presentation by Cambridgeshire County Council

Lynne O'Brien, Service Development Manager gave a presentation to SRT on 31st March 2015. The presentation covered the Care Act 2014, Cambridgeshire Older People's Strategy and the Housing Related Support Service.

Findings

- The Care Act 2014 comes into force on 1st April 2015. It fundamentally changes the relationship between County Councils and people requiring care, places additional responsibilities on County Councils at the same time as they are anticipating more spending cuts
- Cambridgeshire Older People's Strategy has been finalised and has four aims
 1. Older people to remain independent, living in homes that are appropriate to their needs and actively engaged in their communities for as long as possible
 2. People retain the skills and confidence to look after themselves and their families into older age
 3. Carers of older people are able to cope with and sustain their caring role and choose support which is right for them
 4. Older people live with dignity, are safe and protected from harm and isolation.

- Over the period between 2001 and 2036 the population of over 85s in Cambridgeshire is expected to grow by 317%, to 43,000 people
- The Visiting Support Service was a response to changes in the people they support
- The Service is designed to:
 - Link people to community activities
 - Trigger low level interventions
 - Identify if people have family and support networks and signposts where they can get support
 - Concentrate on those in need, both people within schemes and those in the wider community
- The vast majority of older people live within the wider community
- This new way of working makes better use of Cambridgeshire County Council's reduced funding
- Cambridgeshire County Council is about to undertake a management review of the Visiting Support Service
- Cambridgeshire County Council endorses the development of Extra Care Housing to meet the under supply of places in Cambridgeshire. It sees Extra Care Housing as a way of allowing people to live independently longer and with a good quality of life
- Believes the sheltered housing model is fundamentally flawed, namely
 - a) People prefer to live in their own homes longer.
 - b) Much sheltered housing accommodation is small and lacks modern amenities.
 - c) Often the support needs of social housing sheltered scheme residents are lower than people living in the wider community in other forms of tenure.

A copy of the presentation can be found at appendix H.

Sheltered Forums Consultation

Les Rolfe (SRT member) attended the following meetings to update them about the Review:

- North Area – 10th March 2015
- West Area – 11th March 2015
- East Area – 12th March 2015

The meetings were not particularly well attended and are attended mostly by leaseholders. Many of the attendees had gone to their local coffee morning style focus group.

Copy of report can be found at appendix I.

Findings

- Interested in know how things were progressing
- Attendees voted to scrap individual area Forums and hold a joint forum instead, every three months
- Agreed they should not be held at South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne and agreed they should be moved around the District
- Agreed in general that the joint Forum should be tenant-led
- Changes require revision of the TPG Constitution in respect of Forum representatives.

Interview with Finance Officers

The interview was with Gwynn Thomas (Principal Accountant Housing]) and Abbi Murray (Assistant Accountant).

The interview was conducted by Les Rolfe and Andy Knibbs (SRT members) and the note taker was Andy Sage (Linchpin).

The interview was a follow-up to the Financing the Housing Service Presentation and covered a range of VfM related questions.

Copy of interview can be found at appendix J.

Findings

- In 2012, sheltered housing rents went up in line with Government Policy to meet the phasing in target rent. At the same time, the Council introduced service charges to lower the subsidy that sheltered housing received from the HRA. This gave the impression that sheltered tenants were paying roughly the same amount for a reduced level of service
- The Supported Housing Manager post is exclusively charged to the HRA, apart from work undertaken on non-sheltered General Fund projects, i.e. there is no recharge to Cambridgeshire County Council for work related to the Support Contract
- The Council employs a Procurement Officer to get the best VfM on contracts. Most contracts last for three years, and any saving made through switching are passed on to residents but not until the savings have been banked which could be a full year after the start of the new contract
- The Council has just introduced a new approach that brings forward the production of end of year accounts and it is hoped that this will make it possible to send out service charge statements in August (currently September)
- The process of decommissioning the offices at Sheltered Schemes has not been completed due to the absence of the Supported Housing Manager. Assistant Accountant to investigate and check to see if it can be backdated to avoid

Business Rates being charged where the offices have been physically taken out of use

- The new alarms being fitted reportedly transfer additional call costs to the resident but they are not notified of this. In the absence of the Supported Housing Manager, Assistant Accountant to investigate and report back
- Sheltered Housing has a budget for purchasing IT equipment. Accepted that switching back and forth between laptops and tablets may not offer good VfM. Assistant Accountant to raise the matter
- Broadband at the sheltered schemes is charged £34 on a rate for businesses, i.e. higher than residential use. The Assistant Accountant is currently looking into what the package includes and whether the Council (and the residents who pay for it) are receiving VfM
- Overpayments involving third parties such as energy suppliers are only reimbursed to residents after the Council has received payment from the third party, this can sometimes take a long time. Assistant Accountant to chase up the outstanding overcharge at Hall Close, Bourn
- Overpayments down to error by the Council should be repaid quickly
- The Council plans to issue sheltered tenants with service charge statements based on those received by leaseholders. More openness and transparency would incur extra cost through having to recruit more staff
- Assistant Accountant is looking into a possible error in how the calculation is done for the adjustment for non-sheltered residents for the grounds maintenance service.

Meeting with the Senior Housing Management Team

The officers present were:

- Stephen Hills – Director of Housing
- Anita Goddard – Head of Housing and Property Services
- Tracey Cassidy – Supported Housing Manager
- Shirley Stephen – Supported Housing Officer.

The SRT were represented by the Report Writing Team and the chair of TPG

- Dave Hammond
- Angela Lewell
- Thora Saunders
- Wendy Head – Chair of TPG.

The meeting was facilitated by Andy Sage and minutes were taken by Luisa Sartini Baldwin, both of The Linchpin Project.

The meeting focused on the report's draft conclusions and recommendations which were very well received by the Senior Housing Management Team.

Copy of report can be found at appendix K.

Findings

- Stephen Hills is currently working with Cambridgeshire County Council and other District Councils on the Older Persons' Strategy, and they agreed with the need to reinvent sheltered housing
- Felt the need for written procedures / guidance was more pertinent to the Sheltered Estate Officer role than the Visiting Support Officer role. Staff will have tablets so pro-formas can be developed and loaded onto them for staff to use
- The need for explicit service and performance standards could link into the rethink of the role and policies around Sheltered Housing
- Service standards should link with service charge statements to show how the service achieves Value for Money.

- The idea of sheltered housing being a flawed model links to the point about the role of sheltered housing
- It is estimated that 3000 more sheltered properties will be needed across Cambridgeshire over the next few years, due to changing demographic
- Investment is needed to improve retirement housing and an improvement in quality may make it easier to attract funding for related services
- SCDC are looking to invest in their stock, as many of the properties are not as attractive as they could be, particularly around insulation, and leasehold homes can sometimes be slow to sell.
- A long-term approach to introducing new allocations criteria could work and it would need to meet the re-engineering of what "Sheltered" means.
- Also need clarity on bungalows – are they sheltered or not, as at present some are and some are not!
- Residents should have a breakdown of their rent and service charges and as it is relatively easy to do it should be a quick win
- Should have the initial results from the Council's Communal Rooms Review in two weeks. Should be able to work together on this
- Residents currently see Broadband as a cost rather than a benefit. SCDC is working on digital inclusion and have appointed a lead officer for this project and she can work with SRT on this
- The requirement for a more straight-forward charging policy links to the Communal Room Review
- SCDC have been piloting Lifeline Plus which is an extra chargeable service, the concept could be extended to include additional support. SCDC were able to source charitable funding to do this pilot and if the offering is right it may be possible to get further funding to extend services
- Stephen Hills is meeting with Richard O'Driscoll (Older Peoples' Service at Cambridgeshire County Council) soon to review the Support Service and will want to feed the SRT review into

this discussion. SCDC need to see how they can get the safety net right, especially now the service is tenure neutral

- The increase in mental health issues is being felt across other areas in Housing. There is increasing awareness within health services so there is a need to work across functions to see how much can be done
- The idea of revisiting and updating the needs assessment may help SCDC identify the gaps, especially in support needs vs support service
- The Sheltered Estate Officer role has run for about 3 years so SCDC do need a review of the role, especially around standards and expectations
- A new Handyman Service should go live on 5th May and publicity is being printed. This is a 3 month free pilot to assess demand, but ultimately it will be a chargeable service
- Should add to the campaign the issue around “Supporting People” funding, as it is still being paid but is not ring-fenced so support is being forgotten. It is a national issue and we have lost sight of where this funding is going and how it should be spent.

Conclusions and recommendations

	Conclusions	Recommendations
1.	The Sheltered Housing Service suffers from a lack of clarity, coherence and focus about its purpose, aims and objectives and this could be helped by the Council developing a Sheltered Housing Policy or Strategy. There is also no real forward thinking about how to future proof the service to make it viable and sustainable after the withdrawal of Supporting People Funding.	The Council should set up a working party to develop a Sheltered Housing Policy and consult the Sheltered Housing Forum over its content. The Policy needs to clarify the purpose and role of the Sheltered Housing Service and show how the Service meets the four aims of Cambridgeshire's Older Peoples Policy so that it can be used to attract funding from other organisations, including Cambridgeshire County Council.
2.	There are very few written procedures / guidance for staff and this leaves huge grey areas open to interpretation by front-line staff resulting in inconsistency in service delivery. Currently the only procedures that are available are for undertaking health and safety checks and guidance on running bingo and raffles.	The Council should develop a procedure guide for front-line staff that is available through the intranet that can be viewed through their tablets and laptops. The procedures should clearly and concisely set what staff are expected to do and cover any health and safety or legal requirements. This would provide staff with a framework to consistently deliver quality services.
3.	The absence of explicit service standards and performance measures helps to fuel dissatisfaction with the Sheltered Housing Service. Residents do not	The Council should develop a set of explicit service standards and performance measures in consultation with the new Sheltered Housing Forum. These should

	<p>have any idea of what level of service they should expect to receive and there is no performance culture to support continuous improvement.</p> <p>Residents want to be seen as "customers" and not patronised as "only tenants".</p>	<p>be agreed with residents and widely promoted through the Council's website, newsletters, and scheme notice boards. They should also be regularly reviewed through resident-led coffee morning-style focus groups.</p>
4.	<p>In 2015, residents now expect a full breakdown of their rent and service charges in a comprehensive and easy to understand statement. They want the format of these statements to be more detailed and clearer than the ones currently produced for leaseholders.</p>	<p>The Council should work with a small group of SRT members to develop a new customer friendly format for the statements and then consult residents through the Sheltered Housing Forums. These statements would help to drive VfM in the Sheltered Housing Service though increased transparency and accountability to residents.</p>
5.	<p>Residents would welcome the opportunity to be consulted over the possibility of paying for services such as support, ahead of them simply being withdrawn because the Council does not have any money to pay for them or an external income stream has been pulled. Residents would prefer to be given the option of paying themselves but would want to know exactly what they would get for their money and how much they would have to pay. There is a growing acceptance amongst residents that the</p>	<p>In the development of a Sheltered Housing Policy the Council needs to involve residents in exploring the options for funding the service, including making use of the intensive housing management Housing Benefit loophole, paying for, or at least contributing towards, the cost of providing support, etc. This would help to future proof the sheltered housing service and manage the risk of the Visiting Support Service becoming over stretched and the Third Sector plundered due to a growing</p>

	<p>viability and sustainability of sheltered housing depends on the willingness of residents being open minded about the possibility of at least contributing to the cost of funding support where it cannot be provided freely.</p>	<p>older population with increasing support needs.</p>
6.	<p>The new working arrangements for the Sheltered Estate Offers have not been reviewed since they were introduced in 2012. Residents want to see their Sheltered Estate Officers more often and are consequently dissatisfied with the service they currently receive and there is real concern over alarm response times. They also question the value of the new housing surgeries.</p>	<p>The Council should carry out a review of the Sheltered Estate Officer role in terms of how well the role's responsibilities meet the needs of residents in practice, how realistic it is to expect them to cover three or four schemes and check average alarm response times and any exceptions. Residents would prefer a more compassionate, community development-type role with a title which reflects this. Any resulting changes to the role should be made in consultation with residents, communicated to all affected and incorporated into the service standards. Review the effectiveness of the housing surgeries in six months' time after they have had a chance to bed in.</p>
7.	<p>On the surface the Visiting Support Service appears to be working well and the model of signposting the</p>	<p>Cambridgeshire County Council to be asked to share and / or present the outcomes of their proposed</p>

	<p>availability of support in the Third Sector has real merit. However, residents have concerns about demand outstripping supply and the Support Service becoming overstretched as more and more people and agencies get to hear about it or if or when it is advertised. The Supported Housing Manager has done a lot of good work promoting the service to GP's, Hospital Discharge Teams, Social Workers, etc. but many sheltered residents are either unaware about the availability of the service or unclear about the role of Visiting Supporting Officers or how to access the service. There is real concern that some sheltered residents are slipping through the net due in part to the reduction in the number of visits residents now receive from the Sheltered Estate Officers.</p>	<p>management review of the Visiting Support Service. The Service should be advertised to empower residents to self-refer even though this runs the risk of greatly increasing demand and put more pressure on the Support Service. Needs assessments need to be regularly updated to ensure that vulnerable Sheltered Housing residents are not falling through the net. Current vacancies need to be filled to ensure the team is fully resourced.</p>
8.	<p>While some of the communal rooms at Sheltered Housing Schemes are well used, others are underutilised and some have been almost completely abandoned by residents. There is evidence that tenant involvement in planning, organising and running social activities helps to ensure communal rooms</p>	<p>The Council should resurrect its review of communal rooms which has been put on hold due to staffing capacity issues and broaden the remit of the review to embrace more radical thinking to include things like social enterprises running community cafes from communal rooms. The way forward will differ from</p>

	are well used, but they need support to do this.	scheme to scheme and residents should be consulted before any decision is made for their scheme. Officers and TPG to play a role in sharing good practice between those schemes with thriving communal rooms and those that are struggling, including TPG providing some practical help, advice and support to turn things around.
9.	The Sheltered Housing Forums are not working for either the Council or residents as an effective two-way communication mechanism. They do not have a Terms of Reference and therefore lack purpose and focus. Residents believe the Forums are top heavy with staff and concentrate on almost exclusively on organisational issues rather than their needs. They do not get straight answers to their questions and therefore things just go round in circles.	The Council should implement the recent decision to create a single Sheltered Housing Forum that meets quarterly in locations around the District. Over time the Forum should be encouraged to become resident-led in the same way as TPG. A Terms of Reference should be developed for the new Sheltered Housing Forum and publicised to encourage more residents to attend and have a voice. Sheltered Forum should elect a tenant representative to attend TPG meetings, as happens with the Leaseholder Forum. This will improve communication and support for the Forums and TPG.
10.	Across the country Sheltered Housing has come to be	This Scrutiny Review acts as the catalyst for TPG to

	widely seen as a flawed model that no longer works in an age when it's reported older people want to stay in their own homes for as long as they can, that only a third of sheltered residents need regular support, there is no way for landlords to provide support as the funding has been cut and sheltered housing accommodation is of an inferior quality that does not meet the expectations of the next generation of prospective residents.	launch a campaign to reinvent Sheltered Housing as a form of retirement housing for older people with recognised support needs and people with disabilities. TPG would look to engage the support of Age UK and a campaigning organisation such as 38 Degrees to organise an online petition to get 100,000 signatures so that Sheltered Housing has to be debated in Parliament and receive wider media exposure.
11.	Residents are concerned about the fairness of some of the service charges and whether or not they are getting VfM. Without explicit service standards spelling out what level of service residents should receive or a full breakdown of what their rents and service charges are paying for, residents feel in the dark and this increases their level of dissatisfaction with the service.	The Council should undertake a VFM appraisal similar to that required of Housing Associations in partnership with TPG and publicise the findings through the Council's website, newsletters and the Sheltered Housing Forums.
12.	Residents want a more straightforward charging policy for hiring communal rooms and see opportunities for generating more income than it is anticipated the new charging policy would bring in.	The Review of communal rooms should take another look at the charging policy for hiring communal rooms and consider ways to generate enough income to remove rather than simply marginally reduce the service charge paid by

		residents for the communal room.
13.	The allocation of Sheltered Housing to people that have no immediate need for it, for example those people who traditionally moved into sheltered housing as an insurance policy against their support needs in later life, ultimately undermines the case for funding the service. Also, the allocation of bungalows to families trying to escape the bedroom tax is understandable but regrettable and short termism.	As part of the development of the Sheltered Housing Policy consideration should be given to changing the criteria for allocating sheltered housing to people who have a recognised support need or people with disabilities. The possible implications for the workload of staff and the social life at schemes would have to be factored in.
14.	The Support Service is currently running with three vacancies but is keeping up with current demand. Staff are convinced that the Service is performing well and the new way of working works better than pre-2012 arrangements. The Team is encountering a high number of mental health referrals, including alcohol and drug related cases and remote working could be better supported by investment in IT.	The Council should recruit to the full complement of Visiting Support Officers specified in the contract and talk to Cambridgeshire County Council about the option of employing a mental health specialist to help open up statutory and voluntary mental health services and networks for the benefit of residents using the Support Service.
15.	The Council undertook a comprehensive assessment of needs ahead of the changeover to the new working arrangements but	The Council should revisit and update the needs assessment to gain a better understanding of the current needs of residents and what

	<p>this was not kept active and is now likely to be badly out of date.</p>	<p>type of service they are likely to require in the future. This could help to support the development of a reinvigorated model for sheltered housing.</p>
16.	<p>The provision of Broadband in the communal rooms at Sheltered Schemes is seen by residents as a cost rather than a valued service at present. Residents do not think the monthly charge of £34 offers VfM and much more needs to be done to encourage residents to use the service.</p>	<p>The Council needs to provide desktop computers at all of the schemes that currently have Broadband but do not have computers to access the service. Training also needs to be provided, initially concentrating on how to do online shopping, stay in contact with family members and search the internet.</p>
17.	<p>Some time ago the decision was taken to decommission the offices in Sheltered Schemes to avoid having to pay Business Rates, but this process has not been completed. Staffing capacity issues and Business Rates are still being incurred.</p>	<p>The Council should investigate what needs to be done to complete the decommissioning process and if it can be backdated to the time that the offices physically ceased being used. Residents should be reimbursed for any overpayments.</p>
18.	<p>Communication is widely considered to be a problem both over bigger service changes such as the replacement of alarm systems and day to day issues such as notification of staff sickness.</p>	<p>The Council should build more time into consultation exercises with residents, creates more effective two way communication through the new Sheltered Housing Forum and other mechanisms and develops a customer service culture that treats residents as customers.</p>

Appendices

Please see separate booklet.

Appendix A – Desktop Review

Appendix B – Interview with Supported Housing Manager

Appendix C – Financing the Sheltered Housing Service

Appendix D – Coffee Morning Style Focus Groups

Appendix E – Work shadowing

Appendix F – Sheltered Estate Officer Team Meeting

Appendix G – Focus group with Support Officers

Appendix H – Presentation by Cambridgeshire County Council

Appendix I – Sheltered Forums Consultation

Appendix J – Interview with Finance Officers

Appendix K – Senior Housing Management Team Meeting

References

Making it Work for Us: A residents' inquiry into sheltered and retirement housing – Age UK (2012)

More than a few kind words! Reshaping support in sheltered housing: A good practice guide for and local authorities – NHF (2010)

Warden support in sheltered housing – House of Commons Library (2012)