

Appendix A1 - Summary of sheltered housing consultation

Provider	Proposal (What are they going to do to manage the funding shortfall?)	Consultation (How have they consulted about this?)	Impact (What is the likely impact, if not known what steps need to be taken to reach the end point?)
1	<p>Cat 2 schemes – A combination of increase in intensive housing management, and a charge to residents for the out of hours monitoring and response service.</p> <p>Cat 1 schemes - Decommissioning the monitoring and response service. Directing people who wished to continue with this service to a suitable local provider.</p>	<p>All the residents across 8 Cat 2 schemes were sent a letter. A consultation meeting was held at each scheme to outline the proposals. 70% of residents attended the meetings. Some residents elected to have one to one discussion with members of staff about the proposals.</p>	<p>Cat 2 schemes – The impact will be a charge to residents for the out of hours monitoring and response service. An offer of support for those experiencing financial hardship has been agreed within the organisation.</p> <p>Cat 1 schemes – For the majority of service users the impact will be that they no longer receive the monitoring and response service. The minority who wish to receive a monitoring and response service will be supported to find a suitable local provider. This will incur a cost to the service user.</p>
2	<p>Planning to reconfigure the scheme manager role, based on a 50/50 split. They are currently working on the budgets and the figures for next year and plan to submit these to housing benefit in the next 2 weeks. If this is</p>	<p>A letter has been sent out to all the residents. The letter included the contact details for the Retirement Living Manager, and customers were invited to make contact to discuss any concerns or queries. Three residents took up this offer.</p>	<p>The impact at this stage is not known, and will depend upon the outcome of the negotiations for intensive housing management.</p> <p>If these are successful there will be no impact.</p>

	<p>successful, there will be no reduction in the scheme manager hours being delivered.</p> <p>There is no contingency plan in place if the reconfiguration is not accepted by housing benefit.</p>		
3	<p>The organisation has been subsidising the sheltered housing service for some time (There has been a shortfall between what it costs to deliver the support service and the contract value). Under the existing contract terms and conditions they have not been able to re-charge the short fall to the tenants.</p> <p>Under the new contracts they are proposing to charge the short fall to the tenants. The early figures suggest that this will be in the region of £3.00 per month.</p>	<p>The District Manager is in the process of visiting all sheltered schemes and is explaining the proposal directly to the tenants.</p> <p>Once the final figures are known further consultation will be undertaken with the tenants.</p> <p>It is possible that in the future tenants may vote to lose the bank holiday and weekend scheme manager cover, which would offset some of the additional charge.</p>	<p>The main impact to the tenants will be the additional charge. The early figures suggest that this will be in the region of £3.00 per month.</p> <p>Potentially, some customers may face financial hardship. The organisation will support them through welfare advice and signposting.</p> <p>In the future the tenants may elect to use the alarm service in preference to the scheme manager cover arrangement that is currently in place. There will be no change in service delivery at the present time.</p>

<p>4</p>	<p>Re-negotiating Intensive Housing Management funding. The organisation is waiting for a response to this request, and their CEO has been actively trying to obtain an outcome.</p> <p>If they are unsuccessful, or there is still a shortfall, they have a contingency plan which is based on a number of proposals.</p> <p>These proposals include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing the frequency of support visits, enabling independence where appropriate, focussing on those most in need • Removal of extra care services by incorporating customers into mainstream service • Removal of assessment co-ordinator post by streamlining assessments into the allocations process • Introduction of a charge for, or removing the alarm 	<p>All residents were sent a letter explaining the approach. In addition members of staff had one to one discussions, and obtained feedback on 5 specific questions, with 170 customers.</p> <p>Through the process of consultation, the organisation has obtained information from the customers about what is important to them, and they will use this information in the event that they need to put in place their contingency plan.</p>	<p>The impact at this stage is not known, and will depend upon the outcome of the negotiations for intensive housing management.</p> <p>If these are successful there will be minimal impact on the majority of customers.</p> <p>Customers previously fairer charged and those in receipt of partial housing benefit will still be affected, as will tenants in tenures other than sheltered who currently receive support.</p>
----------	---	---	--

	<p>service,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing or reducing the out of hour's service. <p>The outcome of the housing management negotiation will influence how much of the contingency plan will need to be implemented.</p>		
5	<p>Re-negotiation of intensive housing management, which has already been implemented.</p> <p>In addition the organisation will subsidise the remaining shortfall and will not be passing this onto customers.</p>	<p>Consultation had previously been carried out in July 2013 when the housing and support elements were re-configured.</p> <p>More recently the organisation sent all the residents the LCC letter and an accompanying letter offering them the opportunity to raise any queries or to give feedback.</p>	<p>There will be no increase in impact to residents at this time.</p> <p>The situation would need to be re-visited should further cuts be implemented.</p>
6	<p>Reconfiguration of the rent and service charges was undertaken in October 2013.</p> <p>The organisation is now consulting with tenants about proposals for withdrawing the mobile response because of the under use of this service. Tenants have been given an</p>	<p>At the time of the reconfiguration consultation was undertaken with tenants at sheltered housing forums. Every tenant was sent a letter advising them of the impact on their individual circumstances. Visits were undertaken to each scheme to discuss concerns or to answer queries.</p>	<p>The impact on the tenants will depend upon which option the tenants select but it will involve one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The withdrawal of the mobile response service or • An additional charge to tenants (approximately £1 a week per tenancy). We have some schemes (very small schemes) where you have been

	<p>option to vote to retain this service if they are willing to fund the additional costs involved</p>	<p>As funding is now reducing further the organisation is undertaking further consultation with tenants regarding the withdrawal of the mobile response element of the service.</p> <p>The consultation is underway and has taken the form of an initial letter outlining the issues and with an offer to meet with a member of staff if anyone would like further explanation.</p>	<p>underpaying us for the mobile warden and response service so the £1.50 is actually an increase in payment. We are going to have to make a decision internally how to administer this via block gross as our policy has always been to charge what SP has paid. If we do this, for this scheme the tenants will end up paying more for a lesser service.</p> <p>Fairer assessment – I think this is something you need to consider under a block gross contract. Tenants may be entitled to SP as part of a fairer assessment but as a provider if we recommend someone for a fairer assessment then financially we are putting ourselves at a disadvantage as they go from self-funding to fairer assessment but under block gross we do not get any increase income to allow for the income loss of a self-funder. I am not sure what our policy will be on this going forward. At the moment we would still recommend fairer assessment but this could change.</p>
7	<p>Work has just started and is focussing on intensive housing</p>	<p>Initial consultation has taken place with the residents, and once the</p>	<p>The impact at this stage is not known, and will depend upon the outcome of the</p>

	<p>management, which is their preferred option. The contingency plan, if this were not successful, would be to continue with the alarm service.</p>	<p>outcome of the housing management negotiation is known further consultation will be carried out.</p> <p>The indication from the residents, during the initial consultation, was a preference for retaining the warden call alarm service. In the event that the intensive housing management funding does not address the shortfall, they will need to consider potential redundancy. They are not planning further consultation with the residents until the New Year, when the outcome of the re-negotiation should be known.</p>	<p>negotiations for intensive housing management.</p>
8	<p>There are no proposals in place at this time. Based on the size of the contract, and the nature of the service (monitoring only alarm), they are likely to be able to adjust the service charge to make up most of the shortfall. This approach is based on similar situations they have faced in other parts of the country.</p>	<p>No consultations have been undertaken at this time, due to the minimal impact. Consultation will be carried out if they are not able to manage the shortfall, or if further funding cuts are applied.</p>	<p>No impact at the present time, as no proposals have been developed, whilst the organisation looks to manage the shortfall via housing benefit.</p> <p>Currently Lancashire SP part-fund 3 alarm-only services. So we don't have any staff and support planning isn't part of the provision.</p> <p>We use the money received to part-fund 24/7, we used to part-fund the telephone link-line, and to provide peripheral items</p>

			<p>such as pendants. We no longer offer a mobile warden Responder service.</p> <p>The organisation need approx. £2 per flat per week to be able to provide this level of cover. There may be some scope to move part of the cost into service charge. For example the link-line would also carry door entry calls so may well be HB eligible.</p> <p>If there was no funding available we would struggle to provide the service and if customers were not willing to self-fund we would need to consider decommissioning the alarm service which would be a shame as it is quite low-cost to deliver and acts as a real reassurance to older people living in what we deem CAT1 services.</p>
9	Will have an increase in contract value	No consultation necessary	There will be a positive impact due to the low level support charges.
10	Will have an increase in contract value	No consultation necessary	There will be no impact on the tenants.
11	Work has been ongoing in preparation for the potential funding cuts. This work involves a move to intensive housing management funding. In addition they have achieved	Letters were hand delivered to 1130 properties outlining the proposals. The direct telephone number to the manager for Independent Living was included to enable residents to make contact with any queries.	<p>Minimal impact, the reduction in the overall number of scheme managers will affect the frequency of visits to some residents.</p> <p>There will be no additional charges to residents at this time.</p>

	<p>savings in other areas, such as not replacing scheme manager posts when vacancies have arisen. They have reassessed the support needs of all their customers, resulting in freeing up capacity and allowing a reduction in staff resources.</p>	<p>Approximately 10 people made contact.</p>	<p>Further funding cuts may result in an increase in charges to the residents, or the withdrawal of support.</p>
12	<p>Efficiency savings have already been achieved by reducing the number of scheme managers from 16 down to 15, resulting in an increase in of the ratio of tenants to scheme managers. The organisation is also planning to reconfigure the support and housing management services.</p>	<p>No consultation taken has taken place at this time. The organisation has previously undertaken surveys to understand what sheltered housing residents consider to be priorities. They are looking to reconfigure and maintain the overall service to reflect these priorities.</p>	<p>Due to the funding mix adopted at the inception of Supporting People in the short term there should be very little impact on the services sheltered housing tenants receive and want in the short term.</p> <p>However, should there be further reductions in funding in future years there will need to be an ongoing discussion with tenants to ascertain how they would like the service they receive should change and also look at the funding options.</p> <p>Over the last few years we have been remodelling the service particularly around Category 1 sheltered housing and have moved away from the concept of a resident scheme manager, and also developed a team approach to ensure continuity of service. We have also started to increase</p>

			the ratio of tenants to scheme managers. This review will continue.
13	<p>Tenants have been asked to consider 3 possible options. The proposals presented to the tenants were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconfiguring the existing service to provide intensive housing management service • Charging tenants an additional £4.00 per week to maintain current level of service • Reducing the cost of delivery and the support service accordingly (pro-rata to the budget cuts) 	<p>All tenants, at the one scheme, were invited to comment on the statement issued by Lancashire County Council, and were asked for feedback regarding the proposals. The process involved the tenants completing a short questionnaire, and this was completed by 100% of the tenants.</p> <p>The outcome was as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 52% in favour of intensive housing management approach • 28% in favour of an additional flat rate charge to tenants • 20% for a reduced support service. 	<p>Subject to successful renegotiation of the housing benefit there should be minimal impact on the tenants.</p> <p>It was considered that the outcome was representational of the balance of need, which is fairly low level for the scheme. For tenants with high dependency needs, these proposals could have a negative effect where a slightly different service (intensive housing management, for example) would preplace the current support service. A reduction in costs (essentially the scheme manager hours) might result in a diluted service. Charging tenants the shortfall in funding created by Lancashire County Council would not be a popular option with our tenants. The percentage of self-payers and those on benefits (in our scheme) is roughly 40/60 and therefore the impact of a reduced subsidy (generally) might not be considered material or significantly detrimental to the association's finances, and as such might be absorbable.</p>

			However, further funding cuts on such a scale would prove problematic.
14	<p>5 proposals have been presented to the customers, with customers being invited to select their preferred option. The proposals being favoured are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Retaining the level of staffing with funding moving between different funding streams 2. Introducing personal charges ranging from £5-8 per property per week to cover the shortfall 3. Reduction in staff hours at some schemes <p>Customers have been advised that the option that the majority of customers have selected will go ahead. The outcome of the negotiation with housing benefit teams may result in a combination of the 3 options.</p>	<p>All customers have been sent a letter outlining the issues, and this was accompanied by the LCC statement. Customers were invited to attend meetings, which were all facilitated by the Regional Operations Manager and the Service Manager for Older People Services. In the meetings the 5 proposals were presented. All those attending were given a feedback form and were asked to rate their preferred option. For those customers who were not able to attend meetings, front line staff were briefed and were able to go through the information on a one to one basis.</p> <p>Once the level of service charges is clearer there will be a requirement for further consultation with customers.</p>	<p>There will be considerable impact.</p> <p>The proposals could result in nearly 50% reduction in staff hours or where customers are wanting to keep the service as it is, there is a potential shortfall ranging from approximately £5-£8 per property per week depending upon the size of the scheme.</p> <p>Much depends upon the outcome of the negotiations with housing benefit teams. If these proposals are not accepted all customers would be required to pay irrespective of their eligibility for housing benefit/supporting people subsidy. The alternative would be further cuts to the service, a move which would impact greatly on customers and staff members (changes to their role and a greater requirement to travel across schemes).</p>

	<p>The particular challenges are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For some schemes, particularly the smaller ones, the shortfall in funding is considerable • Liaison will be needed with a number of district housing benefit teams regarding remodelling the service. It is possible that some housing benefit teams will agree to the proposals and others may reject them 		
15	<p>The organisation presently subsidises the service as it is a valued service and it is felt that in the future the costs will need to come from the tenants if they want to continue to the level of service they presently enjoy.</p> <p>The board for this organisation has recently been presented with a paper outlining 3 potential options.</p> <p>The options are:</p>	<p>All residents have been sent a letter inviting them to attend a meeting to discuss the spending cuts and future changes.</p> <p>Five formal consultation sessions were held, and a total of 151 residents attended these sessions (Over 11% of total residents) who represented 27 schemes (out of 31 schemes).</p> <p>Transport was made available to residents who wished to attend a session.</p>	<p>The board has not yet made a decision on the preferred option, but it is probable that the application of a consistent support charge will be the favoured approach.</p> <p>Therefore the likely impact is going to be an increase in charge for residents in one geographical area.</p> <p>At this stage it is not possible to say what the level of charge will be.</p> <p>There is concern that there has been no clarity in the out of hour's service and how this can be developed in the future. All the</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leave the service as it currently stands, with the Progress Group further subsidising the service. 2. Re-visit the scheme manager duties and further reconfigure the service (it is likely that this approach will be implemented in the event of further cuts) 3. Applying a consistent support charge across the housing group (the charges for one area are lower than those in other parts of the housing group). 	<p>In addition meetings were held with 5 deaf residents and an interpreter.</p> <p>The Head of Independent Living also responded to 8 residents by telephone.</p> <p>The meetings were an opportunity for residents to express the areas of the service that are valuable to them. The residents have seen the service decrease from a full time scheme manager to a part time one that spend part of their time doing housing management duties.</p> <p>They are unhappy that funding has to be cut and feel that the money could be saved elsewhere.</p>	<p>tenants have an out of hours service which includes a lifting service (pilot scheme)</p>
16	<p>The organisation has been in the process of reviewing the costs and service levels with housing benefit.</p> <p>Verbal agreement has been reached with local Housing Benefit at a separate meeting between officers, but they are</p>	<p>Initial consultation meetings were held throughout October at 8 schemes.</p> <p>Letters were provided to the dispersed schemes as these have no communal rooms. The letters were delivered with an accompanying staff visit for support.</p>	<p>Further consultation meetings have been held in the same schemes setting out a change in service charges as a result of the cuts and a review of how schemes were managed.</p> <p>Service charge letters have been sent out to residents (week commencing 10 November) detailing the charges formally</p>

	<p>yet to receive written formal confirmation that the change in charges towards intensive housing management has been agreed to be covered by them.</p>	<p>These meetings set out the impact of the budget cuts with a focus on reviewing service income and service costs to ensure that support and management budgets were balanced.</p>	<p>with effective dates of Monday 15 December.</p>
17	<p>The service has been planning for the reduction. They are proposing to do this via a combination of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving some costs to housing benefit • Changing the way the service is being delivered • Introducing a standard charge to all residents. 	<p>All 600 residents were sent a letter outlining the proposals. In addition, 9 consultation events were held. Attendance was varied across schemes, but in total 135 people attended.</p> <p>Residents were given the opportunity to ask questions and to vote on one of two proposals.</p>	<p>The impact will be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The introduction of the weekly charge will affect all residents • Self-funding residents may be financially better off • The impact on residents who receive partial housing benefit is not clear at this time. <p>The organisation has set aside an amount of money in the form of a hardship fund to mitigate unintended consequences. Access to this fund will be via a financial assessment.</p>
18	<p>Based on a time and motion study that they have undertaken, the organisation is proposing to claim some of the funding shortfall from Housing Benefit. If successful, this will enable them to retain the full</p>	<p>All tenants were provided with a copy of the LCC statement and a letter from the organisation inviting them to attend a meeting.</p> <p>A tenant meeting was held on the 6 November. The meeting was</p>	<p>At this stage the impact is not known, and will depend upon the outcome of the housing benefit decision. If they are unsuccessful in their claim for Intensive Housing Management costs, they do intend to appeal. The worst case scenario would result in a reduction the scheme</p>

	<p>time scheme manager.</p>	<p>attended by key representatives from the organisation and by 20 tenants.</p> <p>The tenants were provided with the information detailing the savings that need to be make and the proposals from the organisation about how they intend to manage the funding shortfall.</p> <p>The organisation reports that there was very little feedback from the tenants.</p>	<p>manager hours, and therefore the time spent at the scheme.</p> <p>The organisation has continued to see a reduction in funding for support services. They have also seen an increase in the support and care needs of the tenants. They have staff on site funded to provide more housing management and have to rely more on other agencies within the community to refer clients onto in order to get their support and care needs met. These agencies have also received funding cuts and this results in longer periods of waiting time for tenants before they receive any support from these agencies. In the meantime, tenants are left without their support or care needs being met and this can result in a deterioration in their physical and mental wellbeing.</p> <p>Increase in costs for tenants who fund their own services will result in fewer people seeing sheltered accommodation as an affordable option in the future. Especially if we start to also charge for services that would not be funded by housing benefit such as the monitoring of the alarm service. This could impact on individuals who would not pay for such a service, but</p>
--	-----------------------------	---	--

			<p>who require and need such a service. It would be difficult to enforce this to our existing tenants, as the service was not previously included in any schedule of service, within their tenancy agreements.</p>
19	<p>A combination of Intensive Housing Management and personal charges.</p>	<p>All residents at the scheme were invited to attend a meeting, and were consulted about the proposed approaches during this meeting.</p> <p>An individual information sheet and voting form was sent to all customers giving them the option to pay a small personal charge to keep the service or not – all returned wanted to retain the service and pay the charge.</p>	<p>The main impact will be the increased cost to the residents.</p> <p>The residents have elected to pay a personal charge in order to retain the scheme manager.</p> <p>The scheme has a number of frail residents and they did not want to lose the scheme manager as they depend on her to coordinate carers and to manage the scheme.</p> <p>A family member was concerned that if all the funding went and no amount could be moved over to the benefit eligible service charge would they be asked to move. It was explained that at this time that would not happen and the service would assess individual finances and ability to pay if an issue was to arise.</p> <p>The customers at the meeting all said that it was not as bad as they had thought, as they were fully aware of the need to reduce</p>

			expenditure.
20	A combination of Intensive Housing Management and personal charges. Discussions have taken place with one housing benefit team, and further discussions with another team are soon to take place.	All residents have been sent a letter outlining the proposed changes. In addition they have held a number of tenant consultation meetings (64 attended). Once the housing benefit situation is resolved the levy of personal charges will be subject to further consultation with residents.	<p>Work is underway to calculate the service charges. Initial calculations indicate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Around £2/week older people properties • Around £3/week sheltered schemes • Around £5-6/week extra care <p>We are disappointed in the severity of cuts to our Organisations, particularly since we have been reshaping services over a number of years in line with strategic direction of travel to ensure better use of public money, efficiency savings and to respond to changing needs, expectations and to address some of the old-fashioned aspects of legacy sheltered housing services. The comment about being disappointed is not about the cuts per se but the frustration that the money has been equally allocated across all providers when savings could and should have been made by strategically challenging the legacy practices. For example, daily visits which are still provided by some providers are</p>

			<p>very traditional, based on a service model created when sheltered housing originally came into being and not necessary given developments in technology. That said, we are understanding of the economic challenges the Local Authority is facing and the need to make across the board cuts to many of its services. We welcome the approach the LA has taken in committing to maintain what it can for existing providers, for not commissioning the service separately from the landlord's role and for proposing direct awards (subject to meeting the expectations of the LA re: meeting needs and VFM) rather than subjecting the services to competitive tendering.</p> <p>In terms of our tenants, one of the main impacts for many of our tenants is that we won't be able to provide preventative support, particularly around health and wider wellbeing needs to majority of our tenants going forward. One of the strengths of our service has been the ability to observe and proactively address needs at a very early stage and provide intervention support to minimise escalation. We are intending to continue providing regular and structured support to the most</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>vulnerable which will alleviate some of the impact but this preventative support won't be there for many.</p> <p>Secondly, we are aware that some tenants don't have any family, friends or formal care who could respond out of hours, when most emergency needs are for medical/personal care matters. Whilst we are looking at the feasibility of partnering with a care provider who could provide responsive care, it is not viable for us to carry the cost of this from the diminished sum (which of course is for low level housing support not care anyway) so anticipate a gap that will impact on tenants but also ambulance services.</p> <p>Thirdly there will be some impact re: loneliness and isolation as we won't be able to maintain regular visits to most of our customers. Whilst contact with Support staff was limited in terms of addressing such needs, we do know that tenants still feel this is of great value and will undoubtedly have some impact. We are looking at how we could better build up more of a community-asset based service but it does presuppose that there are local services/local people etc. willing to help us help our customers which we know will be a challenge. However, the reduction in</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>funding does give an opportunity to reshape services and initial discussions with a minority of tenants has been positive as well as concerns being raised. Tenants are somewhat reassured by the fact we will continue providing the community alarm given the reassurance this gives.</p>
21	No proposals at this stage	<p>All residents in sheltered housing a total of 1135 have been consulted A copy of the letter from LCC and a covering letter from the organisation was distributed by the support officers as part of their duties whilst on site.</p> <p>We have received feedback from 123 residents using the feedback form and 3 direct e mails to the service.</p> <p>Of the responses the majority of residents want the services they have to be maintained and feel the service provides safety and security.</p>	<p>Whilst there is no clarity regarding impact as proposals have not been put in place. It is likely that a major reconfiguration of the service will be required.</p> <p>This may involve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing service levels, whilst focussing services to those most in need. • Withdrawing the out of hour's response service • Reducing the number of units designated as 'sheltered'. This would impact on availability, areas of choice and locations. • Tenants may also have to pay more for the same or a reduced service. <p>We do not understand how LCC can assume that the funding reduction can be subsidised through intensive housing management for the purposes of Housing</p>

			<p>benefits for stock retaining authorities who have benefit and rent caps to work to. We do not understand how you can demonstrate value for money when you do not have an agreed hourly rate for the service. How can adult social services care responsibilities, and responsibilities for health and wellbeing be achieved with an ageing population with the potential of reduced services across Lancashire? What would the county do if these services were not delivered? Agreed outcomes and quality measures would need to be proportionate with the level of funding.</p>
22	<p>No proposals for changes at this stage. The organisation is considering potential alternative funding options. Also facing different impacts of funding changes in other regions and preferring to take a consistent approach across the whole service if possible. The organisation will continue to deliver the service if possible, subsidising the reduction in funding. Alongside</p>	<p>The briefing information issued by LCC has been shared with all customers and meetings have been held at all the sheltered housing schemes to explain the proposals. Full consultation with residents will be undertaken once proposals have been identified.</p>	<p>There will be no impact in the short term as a result of the organisation subsidising the shortfall whilst the national picture becomes clearer.</p>

	this work will be done to consider options		
--	--	--	--

Other Consultation feedback

23		Whilst the Council is no longer a stock holder, there is concern that such large reductions in funding for sheltered scheme residents will lead to a severe impact on services provided. Whilst housing providers may seek additional housing benefit for some services which are 'housing management', there is no guarantee that such applications will be successful.
24		Hopefully it will ensure the services are provided to people who need it and be more accountable.