

Sheltered Housing Options Paper Update

“Research shows that loneliness and social isolation are harmful to our health: lacking social connections is a comparable risk factor for early death as smoking 15 cigarettes a day, and is worse for us than well-known risk factors such as obesity and physical inactivity. Loneliness increases the likelihood of mortality by 26%”.

Campaign to End Loneliness
www.campaigntoendloneliness.org

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The Mayor in Cabinet has previously agreed in principle a Floating Support Model to provide the support provision in the borough's sheltered housing schemes - this was subject to further consultation with tenants, landlords and providers.
- 1.2 This paper provides an update on the consultation and changes in the market. It recommends a change in approach from the original proposal (Floating Support Model), to an Intensive Housing Management Service (IHMS) approach.
- 1.3 The paper explains the benefits to the Council and to tenants living in sheltered housing of moving to an IHMS approach instead of a Floating Support Model, which includes:
- Making savings of approximately £593,478 per year
 - An opportunity to reinvest the savings to fund activities that tackle isolation and loneliness in sheltered accommodation in line with the Council's Ageing Well Strategy (2017-20).
 - Maintaining a similar level and type of support to that currently provided in sheltered schemes.
 - Working in partnership with Registered Social Landlords and support providers to improve the wellbeing of older people living in their schemes.

2. Background

- 2.1 Sheltered housing is designed to give older people with little or low levels of support need the independence of having their own flat with the security of having an alarm system and regular checks by a warden, scheme manager or support service.
- 2.2 In Tower Hamlets, all sheltered housing schemes are owned and managed by Registered Social Landlords. As of April 2017, the Council funds the support in 20 schemes in the form of a scheme based warden, Monday to Friday, 9am-5pm who help in emergencies and gives practical support. There are ten contracts in place, covering the 20 schemes, which all end in March 2018. The budget for the support provision is £611,833 pa.
- 2.3 All support contracts are based on a payment per tenant, which means that no payments are made in respect of void properties in schemes, and it is anticipated that the Council will spend in the region of £455,944 for this financial year as a result of void properties, four schemes (managed by three landlords) moving to an IHMS from April 2017 and one scheme being closed for refurbishment works. The three landlords who moved to an IHMS model in April 2017 made these decisions primarily to ensure that their housing management arrangements in Tower Hamlets were aligned with their schemes in other boroughs. This shift by some landlords back to funding the support arrangements in sheltered housing schemes via housing management charges has been one factor that has informed the approach now being proposed to the Mayor in Cabinet.
- 2.4 As part of the commissioning process a review of all sheltered housing contracts took place in 2016 and a Cabinet paper (July 2016) set out a number of options for funding and delivering the support provision in sheltered housing.

- 2.5 Under the recommended option, a Floating Support Model where support staff visit each scheme for a set number of hours per week – based on six half days presence per scheme per week - was calculated at £564,000 pa.
- 2.6 Cabinet agreed, in principle, to move to a Floating Support Model and authorised the initiation of a tender process for the floating support service pending further consultation with tenants and support providers on the changes.
- 2.7 Through the consultation process with tenants, support providers and landlords, as well as changes in the market, it became evident that an alternative model - IHMS would be a viable option to provide support in sheltered housing and create substantial savings for the council.
- 2.8 As noted (2.3), during the consultation, three sheltered housing landlords advised that they would pursue an IHMS or an alternative to provide support to their tenants in their schemes from April 2017. This reflected a wider shift across the country that had not been evident at the time the original recommendations were made to Cabinet. It made sense, therefore to pause the work on the floating support proposals and to investigate with the remaining six landlords whether the IHMS model was a viable option across the entirety of the sheltered provision in the borough.
- 2.9 Those remaining landlords confirmed that a move to an IHMS model had been adopted by a number of authorities in London and across the country, and that some authorities no longer fund a support service altogether. Feedback from landlords/providers on the move to an IHMS was positive with all confirming that they saw this as a viable and sustainable option. In preparing this subsequent paper we have asked the landlords to reconfirm that view, and all six have done so.

3. Tenant consultation

- 3.1 Focus groups were held at each of the sheltered schemes in the borough. Tenants were written to inviting them to attend a focus group with Council officers to discuss the service they were receiving and the proposed changes.
- 3.2 Where requested, one-to-one meetings took place with tenants and their family members or carers to explain in more detail about the Council's position and understand their views and concerns.
- 3.3 A total of 243 tenants plus family members and carers attended the sessions. A summary of the main points are listed below, See Appendix 1 for the detailed findings from the groups.
- Morning wellbeing checks which involve a support worker calling or knocking on every tenant's (if they choose) door to check if they are okay - this is valued for those tenants who have it and should continue.
 - A preference for having permanent staff allocated to schemes so that tenants can build relationships with the support worker was expressed throughout the consultation.
 - Clarity was requested around the role and responsibility of the support worker and the landlord's roles and responsibilities (housing management).

- A number of people noted that group activities used to happen more frequently but are now limited. Tenants' groups in several schemes are not as active as they used to be. This was seen as a negative by tenants, which they asked be addressed by any new model.
- Nearly all the Somali and Bangladeshi tenants said that the weekend half day would not be useful to them and asked whether it could be added to the weekday, as that is when it is needed most. Tenants explained that language support (interpreting/translating) for making telephone appointments with doctors or housing offices and dealing with tenancy matters is a support function that is very valuable and therefore the allocated half day proposed for the weekend would be better used during the weekdays, between 9am-5pm when the majority of services are more likely to be open.
- A small group of tenants queried why the resources to keep the support provision as it is, was not being made available.

3.4 In summary, almost all tenants understood the Council's position and although they raised a number of concerns, viewed the proposal as an opportunity to improve the support provision in their schemes, especially around having the right level of staffing at suitable times in each scheme.

3.5 Mr RC, the tenant representative at one of the sheltered housing schemes in the borough kindly provided a summary of the residents' concerns at the focus group held in his scheme (see Appendix 2), many of which were raised by tenants in other schemes.

4. Landlord and provider consultation

4.1 During the course of consulting with landlords and support providers, it became evident that previous concerns that some of the smaller landlords may have had regarding an IHMS were not as significant as originally thought (the IHMS model had been an option in the original Cabinet report but ruled out). Providers stated that the move to IHMS had been adopted by a number of authorities in London and across the country, noting that some no longer fund a support service at all, and a number of providers had responded to this by restructuring their organisation to adapt to the changes.

4.2 Three landlords (Mercers, One Housing Group and Centra) who are also the support provider had voluntarily chosen to pursue an IHMS or an alternative option to provide support to their tenants from April 2017.

4.3 Mercers have opted to fund their service, Lady Micos, through their charitable arm. One Housing Group, the landlord and support provider for John Sinclair Court and Centra who own and provide the support in Pebble Centre and Gawthorne Court advised that they would seek to fund the support provision through an intensive housing management charge to tenants as part of their housing service charge within their weekly rent, as they do not wish their properties to be open to competitive tender.

They have stated that they will not allow an alternative provider to deliver support services within their buildings. Centra advised that they wish to standardise provision across all their older persons services.

4.4 Gateway Housing Association (GHA) the largest provider of sheltered housing in the borough engaged positively in the discussions about moving to an IHMS model and agreed to explore this option as they identified benefits including:

- the opportunity to maintain and fund the current / similar provision at existing levels within each scheme
- a continuity of staffing within each service,
- continuity in providing a service directly to residents without the need to have to bid for the service.

4.5 In preparing this paper GHA have been asked to reconfirm that they are happy to pursue this option and have provided that confirmation.

4.6 Unlike GHA, who are based primarily within the borough of Tower Hamlets, all other providers have experience of applying for and delivering IHMS services within their housing stock in other boroughs, and were similarly positive in their responses to the suggestion to review the model of funding for the support provision.

4.7 Genesis Housing Association provides support in three sheltered schemes. For their directly managed service at Colin Winter House they are prepared to pursue a move to an IHMS service at the end of the contract (March 2018) as this is something they were already considering.

4.8 Genesis also delivers two agency managed services at Hogarth Court and Manchester Road - the borough fund their staff to deliver the support service. Discussions with the landlord of both buildings, Southern Housing Group, have confirmed that they provide a fulltime worker to deliver a housing management function across the two schemes, i.e. 0.5 full time equivalent staff per scheme per week.

4.9 Genesis has confirmed that they would be willing to discuss options to facilitate a move to an IHMS, and have the capacity to facilitate such a move.

4.10 ASRA have advised that IHMS is a model that they have explored across their group in other parts of the country, including Leicestershire, Leicester, Nottingham and others. They are supportive of IHMS in Tower Hamlets.

5. Intensive Housing Management (IHMS) and Housing Benefit

5.1 An Intensive Housing Management Service (IHMS) is a sustainable alternative to the Floating Support Model and will provide greater savings for the Council as well as maintaining a sustainable support provision for older people in sheltered housing in the borough.

5.2 As a number of landlords/providers have already moved to an IHMS or similar model, it would be prudent to have the same type of model in all sheltered housing schemes across the borough.

5.3 IHMS is a housing management landlord service provided at a higher level than would usually be necessary to those tenants that need increased assistance to

maintain their tenancies. This includes regular landlord tasks as well as support tasks such as those listed in 5.7.

5.4 Under the existing contracts, the support charge is means tested and funded by the Council for all residents entitled to benefits. By moving to an IHMS model, the charge would be included within the housing service charge element of each tenants gross rent. As with the support charge, the IHMS cost can be funded by Housing Benefit where tenants qualify, and will therefore not adversely affect tenants eligible for Housing Benefit. Tenants that currently pay the support charge as they are not eligible for benefits will continue to pay in the form of a housing service charge instead of a support charge.

5.5 The potential savings if the IHMS approach is agreed are £0.97 on every pound currently spent. The Housing Benefits (HB) team have confirmed that the authority recovers 97 per cent of housing benefit claims from central government, hence the potential saving. As the IHMS is payable via Housing Service Charge and is eligible for Housing Benefit, the financial implications to the authority are minimal, equating to £0.03 per pound currently spent. This impact can be offset by utilising a proportion of the savings realised from ending the support contracts.

5.6 Intensive Housing Management can cover issues such as:

- Advice & assistance to understand and comply with the tenancy conditions
- Annual individual risk assessments to ensure any risks are identified and referrals to support agencies made if necessary
- Regular welfare checks to ensure your safety and well-being (this will be at a frequency agreed with the individual tenants)
- Assistance in sustaining all aspects of the tenancy
- Signposting and accessing support from other services e.g. budgeting support; assistance with debt management from voluntary agencies; accessing support to assist with alcohol/substance related matters
- Provision of Pendants for more frail residents
- Testing and maintenance of the Pull Cord Tele-care system
- Increased inspections and maintenance of the building, including health and safety issues, to address increased wear and tear to the property and facilities
- Assistance in claiming/managing housing benefit application
- Advice and assistance on using equipment within the property
- Advice and assistance regarding security of the tenants' home
- Monitoring and signposting for social services care services
- Arranging repairs to communal areas, including fixtures and fittings
- Information and advice to tenants relating to use of communal areas, CCTV

NB: This is not an exhaustive list.

5.7 There will be a need to review the rents and service charge for each scheme and therefore, giving tenants the required notice period to allow for the change. Given that rent increases traditionally take place in April at the start of the new financial year there will be a need to extend all existing contracts for up to six months to facilitate the transition to an IHMS.

5.8 This will allow for full consultation and co-design where landlords/support providers and council officers can discuss the changes with tenants and their families/carers living in the schemes.

- 5.9 Tenants that currently pay the support charge as they are not eligible for benefits will continue to pay in the form of a housing service charge instead of a support charge and may see an increase to cover the support they receive. This will be agreed between the tenant and landlord, once landlords/providers are informed of the council's intentions. As of January 2018, there are 27 self-funding tenants living in sheltered housing.
- 5.10 Landlords/providers have agreed to continue to work in close partnership with the borough following on from the transition to ensure continued improvements in service quality. As rent increases traditionally take place in April, all consultation with tenants and landlords is planned to take place as soon as possible once a decision is made.

6. Local Housing Allowance (LHA)

- 6.1 In the previous Cabinet paper, a section outlining the impact of the LHA for sheltered tenants was included as the government had previously proposed to apply the LHA cap to all claims in supported and sheltered housing with a top-up administered by the local authority.
- 6.2 On 25 October 2017, the government announced that LHA rates would not be applied to supported housing, nor would they be applied to general needs social housing. This was confirmed in a further consultation paper published on 31 October 2017.
- 6.3 Sheltered housing (and extra care) will therefore continue to be funded in the welfare system, and a 'Sheltered Rent' is proposed to be introduced from April 2020 - a type of social rent that recognises the role that these homes play in supporting older and vulnerable people and acknowledges the higher costs of these types of housing compared to general needs housing.
- 6.4 This will see gross eligible rent (rent inclusive of eligible service charges) regulated by the social housing regulator. Rates for sheltered housing costs will be set in consultation with the sector. Welfare arrangements for people living in all types of supported housing will apply across Great Britain.

7. Savings

- 7.1 An allocation of £611,833 is available within the current budget to fund the sheltered schemes (2017/18). This figure is calculated on all services operating at full capacity throughout the year and no self-payers being resident. In previous years, the actual expenditure has been around 10 per cent lower than this budgeted amount, this being the result of some tenants being self-payers and because we do not pay the support charge while properties are void. See Appendix 4 for details of each support contract.
- 7.2 In 2017/18 a projected saving of £155,889 will be achieved due to three providers voluntarily moving to IHMS or an alternative, and one scheme being closed for refurbishment .

7.3 The table below illustrates the costs and savings of an IHMS and the Floating Support Model compared to current support contracts and their cost in 2017/18.

2017/18 budget for support provision in sheltered housing is £611,833			
Model	Existing service	Floating Support	Intensive Housing Management Service
Cost to the council	£455,944 (projected spend based on full occupancy)	£534,000	£18,355 (equivalent to £0.03 per pound currently spent).
Savings	£155,889 (projected savings due to support no longer commissioned in four schemes)	£77,833 (against the current budget of £611,833)	£593,478 (based on 97 per cent of housing benefit claims recovered from central government)

7.4 It is important to note that when the previous proposals were presented to Cabinet in July 2016 the projected level of spend on the current model was significantly closer to the £611,833 budget, so the relative financial benefits of the floating support model at that time were much more positive than they would now be given the lower level of projected spend in 2017/18 resulting in part from the four schemes that have already moved to an IHMS model. It is possible that a remodelled floating support scheme, excluding the four schemes which have moved to IHMS would cost more than the current expenditure. This is another important factor in the decision to recommend the IHMS model in preference to the previously recommended option.

7.5 Gateway Housing Association (GHA) has advised that their situation is unique due to the stock transfer from LBTH and previous mergers and acquisition of specialist schemes. They have stated that they have seven different tenure and tenancy agreements to review as part of the transition.

7.6 GHA have requested that transitional grant be made available to fund ineligible services and transition arrangements. They have also suggested that they may incur exceptional staffing costs through the proposed changes as we move away from grant funding which may impact on potential savings.

7.7 We have agreed to consider their requests in line with those made by all providers and will review them based on their merits once a decision is made. The borough would not want to fund any ineligible costs as the IHMS more than adequately meets service user support requirements.

8. An opportunity to invest in older peoples' health and wellbeing

8.1 The savings realised by moving to an IHMS, presents the Council with an opportunity to invest in activities to help combat social isolation and loneliness. The Council's Ageing Well Strategy (2017-20) highlights the level and impact of social isolation and loneliness, reporting that: "...persons aged over 65 living in Tower Hamlets are predicted to be among the loneliest in both London and England."

8.2 The Campaign to End Loneliness states on its website that:

“Research shows that loneliness and social isolation are harmful to our health: lacking social connections is a comparable risk factor for early death as smoking 15 cigarettes a day, and is worse for us than well-known risk factors such as obesity and physical inactivity. Loneliness increases the likelihood of mortality by 26%”.

- 8.3 It is well documented that improved health and wellbeing for our older population means fewer hospital admissions, less dependency on care and support with less pressure on the council’s health and care resources.
- 8.4 The Council’s Housing Benefit policy lead has confirmed that the provision of a reasonable level of activities when not on a one-to-one basis will also be acceptable. This means that the support model provided via IHMS can include a level of group activities within the schemes in addition to the on-site presence during working hours.
- 8.5 A proportion of the funding that a move to IHMS would save could be used to fund a range of activities in each of the sheltered schemes to combat isolation and improve the general wellbeing of tenants. £77,000 of the potential saving is already taken account of in an existing MTFS savings proposal. £18k is also required to offset the cost to the council of the IMHS (the £0.03 per pound of current expenditure). This leaves an amount of £516k that could be used to fund this range of activities.
- 8.6 This could include English as a Second Language (ESOL) classes, exercise classes, day trips or any other activities that tenants may want that improves their social connectedness, fosters peer support and improves their health and wellbeing.
- 8.7 These funds, (inclusive of those that have already opted out with effect from this financial year) could be made available to tenants living in all sheltered schemes and would still leave a surplus. See table below for possible funding options.
- 8.8 The table below illustrates how the savings, if an IHMS approach is adopted, can be used to fund activities that tackle loneliness and isolation in older people.

Funds (savings) available £516k	Annual activities fund to tackle loneliness and isolation across 25 schemes (711 units)	Remaining funds
	£250 per tenant = £177,750	£415,728
	£500 per tenant = £355,500	£237,978

- 8.9 The recommended option £500 per tenant will equate to a payment of between £5,500 and £21,500 per sheltered scheme, which will offer residents a broad range of choice. From our experience of small grants we know that older person groups value the opportunity to undertake social activities e.g. day trips and purchase small equipment and materials to go toward social activities. This figure will enable the schemes to agree a programme of activities throughout the year that reflect the choice and interests of all residents, as opposed to an activity on a one off basis. Each resident would be able to choose an activity given the funding is per head or it could be agreed on a group basis.

9. Legal considerations

- 9.1 As the recommendation to move to an IHMS is a change of approach to the original Cabinet endorsement, legal advice is that this will need to be approved by the Mayor in Cabinet.

10. Risk

- 10.1 There are a number of risks to this approach but officers believe that these risks can be mitigated and managed as described below. It is also worth reiterating that other Councils have already taken a similar approach where the personal support element is withdrawn, the IHMS ensures security of the scheme and safeguards tenants by providing on-site presence during working hours. In the 2016 tenants' satisfaction survey, respondents stated the top three reasons for moving into sheltered accommodation were: support to remain independent (23%), security (20%), and to have someone on-site during the day (15%), all of which an IHMS will provide. In addition, the service can be dramatically enhanced by reinvesting some funding to deliver a range of activities at each scheme as proposed in this report.
- 10.2 There is very little detail of how the government's Local Housing Allowance top-up fund will be administered by local authorities from 2019 and therefore it is difficult to plan with certainty beyond that date until there is more clarity about how the fund will be administered. Officers believe, however, that any risk beyond 2019 is low.
- 10.3 The process would need to be managed and overseen to ensure that landlords do not charge an unreasonable IHMS rate. However, we would expect most landlords/providers to increase costs as they have not had uplift for a number of years. If Sheltered Rents are brought in nationally, as currently proposed, these will be regulated in any case.
- 10.4 There are no guarantees that support would continue at current levels, but it would be disingenuous of the registered social landlords to reduce support having already stated that they could maintain a similar level of support. If changes to the level of support are considered, registered social landlords would have to consult with their tenants before any decision is taken.
- 10.5 A potential risk is that with an IHMS, the authority would no longer need to commission the support in sheltered housing, therefore no contractual relationship between the Council and landlord/provider would exist. However the Authority does benefit from a partnership with all registered social landlords in the borough, and monitors them on a quarterly basis on a number of performance indicators.
- 10.6 Landlords that have already moved to an IHMS from April 2107 have agreed to work in partnership with the Council to provide the best possible service to their tenants and have agreed to share information and meet with council officers biannually.

11. Recommendations

- 11.1 To agree the recommendations within this report, and authorise the Corporate Director Health, Adults and Community to:
- Adopt an Intensive Housing Management Service (IHMS) model for sheltered housing provision in the borough,
 - Issue new contracts to the existing sheltered housing providers for up to six months to allow for the transition to an IHMS model.

- Fund a range of activities in sheltered schemes at a maximum value of £500 per resident in line with Ageing Well and the Mayor's commitment to tackle loneliness and isolation and improve the wellbeing of elderly tenants living in sheltered housing,
 - Enter into all agreements and make such other as may be required to achieve the recommendations of this report
-
- Appendix 1: Focus group findings on proposed floating support model, January 2017
 - Appendix 2: Transcript of Letter from Mr R C, January 2017
 - Appendix 3: Sheltered Housing contract values, 2017/18

Appendix 1: Focus group findings on proposed floating support model

Scheme	Landlord	Support provider	Focus group summary
Lawrence Close	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	Seven tenants attended. There was limited discussion and residents did not express preference for either model of service provision.
Ruth Court	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	Nine people attended One tenant and two family members expressed a strong preference to maintain the existing model of provision. They queried why the council would not provide additional funding to maintain the current service and raised concerns around safety and security.
Edith Ramsey House	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	13 people attended Tenants discussed the detail of the proposals and requested that the morning wellbeing call be maintained.
Rochester Court	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	14 people attended. Tenants were understanding of the proposals and supported them.
Ted Roberts House	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	15 people attended Whilst generally supportive of the proposals, the tenants emphasised the importance of having face-to-face contact with support staff and the importance of a staff presence.
Hugh Platt House	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	Eight people attended Tenants advised that as long as staff were at the scheme at agreed times it would be fine. They also suggested that they would prefer a staff presence during the week and not at weekends.
Bustan Radaa	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	10 people attended Officers attended the scheme with a Somali interpreter. Tenants understood the proposed model and commented that at this scheme, where English is not the first language, the warden spends a lot of her time translating and interpreting for them. They also preferred staff presence during the week as opposed to weekends.

Mosque Tower	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	<p>10 people attended Tenants were not supportive of the model as their sheltered warden spends a lot of his time translating and interpreting for them, which they would not be possible with floating support provision. They also preferred staff presence during the week as opposed to weekends.</p> <p>The chair of the tenants' involvement group for the scheme had prepared a list of comments to the proposed model – this is attached as appendix 2.</p>
Mandela House	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	<p>15 people attended Tenants advised that good communication and clarity around support workers times and roles would be important.</p> <p>They also requested that that the support worker should have enough time to coordinate activities for tenants as this was very important for them</p>
William Cubitt Lodge	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	<p>15 people attended Tenants were supportive of the proposals and were keen to ensure that the existing scheme manager remained.</p> <p>They queried why the additional funding was not available to maintain the existing service model.</p>
John Tucker House	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	<p>22 people attended Tenants understood the proposals and were interested in how the service would be procured. They queried how the service would be covered when staff are on annual leave and requested that they have a named worker allocated to their service.</p>
Vic Johnson	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	<p>Nine people attended Tenants understood the proposed model and queried why the council would not fund the additional monies to maintain the existing provision. They were concerned that the support worker may not have sufficient time to provide a face-to-face service and co-ordinate activities.</p>
Regency Court	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	<p>9 tenants attended Tenants understood the reasoning for the proposal to move to a floating model and were interested in how the new support provider would work with their landlord and current provider if they were not the winning bidder.</p> <p>They stressed that good communication was important and trust between residents and the</p>

			support worker is essential. They advised that scheme based activities would be welcome and wanted clarity around the support workers role and what would they do when at the scheme.
Appian Court	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	Gateway Housing Association (GHA)	One resident attended. Only five tenants remain in the scheme and the focus group was attended by one resident, who did not express a preference for either model.
Cavell Street	ASRA	ASRA	Eight tenants attended. Tenants understood the proposals and commented that whatever times, the support worker is set to be at their scheme, they should be available for tenants. The six half days presence would be an increase in the current support hours provided.
Phoenix Court	East Thames	East Thames	14 tenants attended (Somali) Tenants wanted to keep the same model, as the level of support they required was high due to their lack of English, which means they need to see a support worker more often. 4 tenants attended (non-Somali) Tenants stated that the support worker should have a good understanding of support planning. They understood the proposals and commented that more joined-up activities across their neighbourhood would be good.
Hogarth Court	Southern Housing Group	Genesis	11 tenants attended Tenants understood the proposed model and the reasons behind the changes. They questioned why the additional funding to maintain existing levels of service was not available. They preferred to have a support worker available in the morning..
Manchester Road	Southern Housing Group	Genesis	12 tenants attended Tenants understood the proposals and how a floating support model would work; they were also interested in the procurement process. They stated that good communication and clarity around support workers times and roles was important to them.

Colin Winter House	Genesis	Genesis	<p>18 tenants attended</p> <p>Tenants understood the proposal and stated that six half days was a good way of managing the support provision. Tenants expressed that they value the morning wellbeing check and the existing staff who provide the support.</p> <p>They were concerned about their safety and security given the reduced staffing presence.</p>
--------------------	---------	---------	--

Appendix 2: Transcript of Letter from Mr R C

Points from Mr R C

1. Part-time scheme manager –
Not suitable for sheltered BME scheme like Mosque Tower
2. Here in Mosque Tower have 5 languages so takes longer to support the residents. Moreover 80% residents cannot speak, read and write English at all. They need assistance in all respects, so they need more time of scheme manager.
3. No need for a Saturday service but full time service in week days
4. Support plan should be once a year not every 6 months. It is unnecessary paper work and time wastage.
5. Less cover of other schemes. So more time for activities with residents.
6. Scheme manager covering too many schemes, therefore quality of work is compromised.
7. Council will continue BME/ languages in specific schemes it strengthens the local BME communities
8. Council should provide more funding for sheltered housing.
9. Council should build more sheltered homes.

Thanks

Mr R C

Appendix 3: Sheltered Housing Contract Values, 2017/18

Allocated budget for 2017/18: £611,833				
Provider	Scheme	Number of units	Unit cost per week	Projected Spend (2017/18)
1. Gateway	Hugh Platt House	20	£14.33	£14,954
	John Tucker House	36		£26,918
	Lawrence Close	31		£ 23,179
	Mandela House	28		£20,936
	Rochester Court	34		£ 25,422
	Vic Johnson House	32		£ 23,927
2. Gateway	Regency Court	30	£14.33	£22,432
	Ruth Court	24		£17,945
	Ted Roberts House	30		£22,432
	Edith Ramsay House	43		£32,151
	William Cubitt Lodge	21		£ 15,702
3. Gateway	Mosque Tower	31	£14.33	£23,179
4. Gateway	Bustaan Raada	16	£14.33	£11,963
5. Genesis	Colin Winter House	34	£18.08	£32,072
6. Genesis	Hogarth & Manchester Rd	58 (31&27)	£15.22	£ 46,040
7. Industrial Dwellings Society	Stepney Green Court	19	£16.63	£16,472
8. Sanctuary	Shaftesbury Lodge	32	£10.26	£17,118
9. PA Housing (formerly ASRA)	Cavell Street	11	£17.82	£10,220
10. L&Q (formerly East Thames Housing)	Phoenix Court	45	22.54	£52,877
Projected spend:				£455,939