

INDIVIDUALS OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

REPORT

10 July 2014

Subject Heading:

Impact of Services on the Elderly Topic Group

CMT Lead:

Andrew Blake-Herbert
Group Director Resources

Report Author and contact details:

Wendy Gough
Committee Administration
01708 432441

Policy context:

Findings of the Impact of Services on the Elderly Topic Group

SUMMARY

This report contains the findings and recommendations that have emerged after the Topic Group scrutinised the subject selected by the Individuals Overview and Scrutiny Committees in October 2012.

The financial, legal and HR implications are addressed within the topic group's report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That Members:

1. Note the report of the Impact of Services on the Elderly Topic Group (attached);
2. Agree to refer the report to the next meeting of Cabinet.

<p style="text-align: center;">REPORT OF THE INDIVIDUALS OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE IMPACT OF SERVICES ON THE ELDERLY TOPIC GROUP</p>

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 At its meeting on 9 October 2012, the Individuals Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed to establish a topic group to scrutinise the impact of services on the Elderly
- 1.2 The following Members formed the topic group at its outset: Councillors Wendy Brice-Thompson (Chairman), June Alexander, Pam Light and Linda Van den Hende.
- 1.3 The topic group met on four occasions including two visits. One for the group to look at the housing schemes for the elderly in Havering, and one to look at the schemes available in the neighbouring borough of Barking and Dagenham.

2.0 SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

- 2.1 Following an Ageing Well Event organised for Members, the Committee wished to understand the impact that housing services had on older people generally, older people with disabilities and vulnerable residents in Havering, together with finding out about services available for these groups and how easily the services can be accessed.

3.0 INITIAL PRESENTATIONS

Brief details of the various presentations are shown below:

3.1 Havering Housing Services

There were a number of housing types categorised for older people ranging from ordinary housing with adaptations suitable for the elderly to sheltered and extra care housing as well as residential homes. In Havering there were 19 sheltered housing schemes comprising 894 units. There were two extra care schemes in Havering Painesbrook Court and St Ethelburga's Court. A third scheme was being developed called Dreywood Court. This scheme subsequently was completed and opened in July 2013.

Homes and Housing had a capital budget for aids and adaptations for Council tenants. This covered works such as the installation of stair-lifts, walk-in showers and wheelchair ramps. For similar works for those who were not council tenants, there was a Disabled Facilities Grant. This was mandatory where there was a disabled household member. The Council had agreed a policy that a discretionary grant above the £30,000 cap could be sought although this was extremely rarely required.

The Telecare and Careline service was provided by Homes and Housing. The majority of referrals were now from Adult Social Care. The Careline service consisted of a call button worn on a pendant by service users and/or a pull cord(s) within clients' homes. The Telecare service provided a variety of sensors, for example fall detectors and flood detectors which automatically alerted the call centre when activated. When either the Careline or Telecare equipment was activated, the call centre answered. If a call-out was required a relative was contacted or staff from

Havering's Telecare Centre attended, this was based upon the clients' previously expressed preferences. The majority of people paid for Careline or Telecare themselves. Subject to Adult Social Care's Fair Access to Charging arrangements, Adult Social Care may pay for users' services directly.

3.2 Age Concern Havering Services

Age Concern was an independent charity that focussed on improving life for older people. Their work was funded by a range of sources – the Council, grants and trust funds. There were in excess of 250 volunteers at Age Concern Havering, many of whom were older people themselves but found the voluntary work rewarding.

A key role of Age Concern was health and health promotion. Support, information and advice were given following a stroke. Age Concern also ran a cancer awareness campaign to raise awareness of lung, bowel and breast cancer, together with a charity shop, day trips and holidays. Work was carried out across the borough; however the group had discovered that the Rainham area was difficult to cover fully **(See recommendation 6.2)**.

There were two day centres that were core funded by the Council and run by Age Concern. HOPWA House in Hornchurch allowed active older people to take part in activities as they wished, and Painesbrook Court offered a day service for the frail elderly six days a week. Community and preventative services included a pub club and the Council funded "perky pensioners" service which provided reasonably priced meals and outings etc. A befriending service was available for older people who were housebound or people living alone. There was also a home support service which supplied volunteer handypersons to work in people's homes as well as a list of vetted tradespeople. The Pomelo Care service was committed to improving the quality of life of its clients. It included paid services to carry out domestic care, gardening, personal care and home visits.

4.0 VISITS TO HOUSING SCHEMES

Brief details on the visits undertaken by the group are shown below:

Housing Schemes in Havering

4.1 Cole Court

The group visited Cole Court, which was a modern sheltered housing unit, with 35 one bed flats. The criterion for the units was anyone aged 55 years and over. However for those aged 55 to 60, the client would have to be registered disabled. For the over 60s a proven social isolation need was necessary.

Residents of Cole Court were of differing needs (high, medium and low). The high needs residents were contacted everyday by the roving warden, whereas those on a medium or low need were not contacted as frequently. All units in the complex had the Careline box installed; this had replaced the old link-line system.

The group was informed that the average rental for a unit was £90-£100 a week, this included all service charges.

4.2 Painesbrook Court

The group visited Painesbrook Court, which was a high dependency care home run by Housing 21; however East Living were responsible for the care packages. There were 64 one bed units and the majority of residents suffered from mental health or learning disabilities. The age range of residents was between 59 and 98; however the criterion was a minimum age of 55 but with a high dependency need.

Age Concern ran a very successful day centre at Painesbrook Court, which members were able to observe. Residents were able to participate in the day centre for £2 a session. There were two sessions, one from 10am-3pm and the other from 11am – 4pm.

The group were informed that the rental was standardised and was approximately £219 a week, and this included all their utilities.

4.3 Royal Jubilee Court (RJC)

The group visited Royal Jubilee Court, which was made up of four large houses, Philip, Charles, Elizabeth and Anne. Within Philip House the group visited the bedsits that were being converted so that new shower units and kitchens were being installed to alleviate any shared facilities. There was also new double glazing and radiators being installed throughout the whole scheme.

Royal Jubilee Court was made up of three services; Reablement, Sheltered Housing and the Out of Hours Service. The sheltered housing was located within Anne House, including Hubb1. Hubb 2 was at Holsworthy House in Harold Hill and Hubb 3 was in Garrick House in Hornchurch. Each Hubb included one team leader, three mobile support workers and one activity worker. Each Hubb covered between 6-7 schemes, totalling 19 across the whole borough.

4.4 Telecare Centre (RJC)

The group visited the Telecare Centre and was informed that the service was a 24 hour, 7 day a week service. There was a mixture of different alarms and monitors that could be used, and any response came from the telecare centre. The service was looking to move away from the old pendant style alarm and move towards a wristwatch function. The user could wear the watch, which was fully functioning, however there was an additional button they could press and have a 2-way conversation with the control centre.

Adult Social Care promoted the service as part of the care packages. The service maintained the independence of individuals, so for example if a medicare machine was installed as part of the service, this would administer the medication rather than waiting for a carer to arrive. If however the medication was not taken, an alert would be sent to the telecare centre. Staff at the telecare centre would contact and prompt the user to take their medication.

The group was shown the Telehealth equipment, which were in line with the chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) requirements. This equipment could check vital signs including blood pressure, oxygen and weight if necessary. The equipment

would be linked to a clinician to assess the condition so that intervention can be made at day one. There had been a very successful pilot carried out.

The service also worked with the Police in respect of bogus callers, the Fire Service in respect of hoarders, as well as Age Concern, the Alzheimer's Society and Adult Social Care. There were 3500 clients on the system and approximately 19,000 calls were taken a year.

4.5 Dreywood Court

The group visited Dreywood Court in December 2012 whilst it was still being developed. The scheme was an extra care scheme with 24 hour personalised care, with waking night staff. Residents may start with a very low need, but may need to progress into end of life care in the future, without the need to move from their home.

The scheme comprised 98 one and two bed flats, with 20 for shared ownership. The shared ownership meant that a resident could buy up to 75% of the property, but 25% would remain with East Thames, and therefore there would be no outlay on the 25%. It was clarified that if a next of kin was to inherit the property and they did not qualify for the scheme because of the various eligibility criteria, such as age or need for social care, then they could not move into the property. A clause of the shared ownership lease would require resale to be offered exclusively by East Thames marketing team for the initial 4-6 weeks. After that initial restricted period, the next of kin would be at liberty to sell the property via an estate agent but subject to the eligibility criteria for residence.

Sanctuary Homecare Co. Ltd, won the tender for the 24 hour extra care support and began assessing applicants from April 2013. They established their office at the scheme in advance of the first residents moving in and have had an on-site presence since July 2013. East Thames Housing Group was the Registered Social Landlord responsible for developing the scheme in partnership with the Council. East Thames Group retained landlord responsibilities, issued tenancy agreements and provided on-going housing management. It worked closely with the care and support provider, Sanctuary Home Care Ltd, to ensure the scheme remained a vibrant and inclusive community.

To ensure the moving experience was not a barrier to the most vulnerable and elderly, Age Concern Havering were commissioned to support people to move. The level of support required had been tailored to people's circumstances. In addition a protocol had been developed with the Benefits Service. Each time an applicant moved into the scheme, the volunteers completed the housing benefit forms and verification documents which were collected on a daily basis. This ensured a smooth transition and reduced the burden of unnecessary delays or rent arrears.

4.6 Housing Schemes in Barking and Dagenham

The group visited the neighbouring borough of Barking and Dagenham to see how housing services in other boroughs were run, and to compare them with the schemes in Havering.

4.7 Fred Tibble Court

This was an extra care scheme, and had residents with early onset dementia. The scheme comprised 31 units (6x2 beds and 25x1 beds). Since the scheme was not a secure unit, they were unable to accommodate people with high level dementia need and could not accommodate people who wandered. The scheme was to support independent living. There were two support people who were on the site every day to provide activities for the residents.

The scheme had communal facilities which included a 15-seater cinema, activity room, library and laundry. There was a communal dining area with a chef who provided one cooked meal each day, 365 days a year. This was included in the rental paid by the residents. The rental varied, for a resident on benefits the rental was £120 a month. For self-funders the rental could be between £1200-£1300. The only bills that the residents had to pay were electricity and telephone.

4.8 Thames View Lodge

This scheme was developed and owned by London and Quadrant Housing. It was a category two sheltered scheme and contained 48 units within it. The scheme was centred on independent living. All properties had pull cords and pendants. The residents were contacted each day to ensure they were ok, otherwise they were independent.

Reassessments of residents were carried out every six months to ensure that the care met their needs. With the consent of the resident and/or their family, arrangements could be made to move the resident into an extra care unit if their needs increased.

Members asked about the number of voids and how they were dealt with. Nominations came direct from the borough, however there was a waiting list for properties at Thames View Lodge and therefore there was a swift turnaround of properties. The minimum turnaround time for voids was 4 weeks.

The rental was £30 a month if the resident was on full benefits. The only expense would be their telephone bill, however in the bungalows there would be an additional cost for electricity. Communal facilities included a laundrette, a guest room with 2 single beds, a games room, hairdressers and a lounge.

It was explained that due to the heritage of the area, the residents referred to the area they lived as Thames View, and not Barking and Dagenham

4.9 Catherine Godfrey House

This was a category two sheltered accommodation unit. The scheme was owned and managed by the Council. There was involvement of social workers in delivering the care packages at the unit. Outside carers came in where needed and these were funded by personalised budgets. The scheme was person centred and there were some residents with early onset dementia. All residents who lived at the scheme were on the alarm system.

The group visited the communal facilities including the library, where the council library came once a month to deliver a new selection of books and videos; which residents could borrow. There was also a service run by Age UK who assisted with cleaning and domestic needs.

5.0 FINDINGS

- 5.1 The group felt that they had a full picture of the Council services available to the elderly and vulnerable residents of Havering and how these compared with provision in a neighbouring borough.
- 5.2 Research was undertaken by the Corporate Policy and Diversity team on the number of vulnerable and elderly persons that were in the borough through the Mosaic database. This was carried out to identify as accurate a number as possible of older people who may live alone, are not 'known' to the Council already through claiming benefits or being in receipt of social care services – in other words who might be socially isolated. This amounted to 805 households.
- 5.3 It was agreed that contact needed to be made with these individuals, to find out if they were aware of the social activities and voluntary sector led local services in their area. The Chairman of the Topic Group met with the Corporate Policy and Community Manager, who explained that a second round of the highly successful "Over 65s Consultation" Community Engagement project was soon to be rolled out as part of the Active Living programme. This initiative involved the recruitment of a cohort of volunteers who were provided with training from a range of agencies, and carried out face-to-face outreach consultation with older people in their homes. It was agreed that the 805 addresses would be incorporated into the next phase of the programme, due to start in June 2014, and those residents would be contacted by the council to see if they would like a visit from one of the volunteers, who could then signpost them to support that was available locally if needed.
(see recommendation 6.1)

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 That the individuals identified as potentially being socially isolated are visited by volunteers as part of the next phase of the Council's 'Over 65s Consultation project', which will be carried out in the summer in partnership with Citizens Advice Bureau, as part of the Council's Active Living programme. (see paragraph 5.3)
- 6.2 The council to seek to work in partnership with Age Concern Havering to find accommodation where services are currently not provided (Rainham)(see paragraph 3.2).

7.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During the course of its review, the topic group met and held discussions with the following people:

Rama Krishnan – Age Concern Havering
Sue Witherspoon – Head of Homes, Housing and Public Protection
Claire Thompson – Corporate Policy and Community Manager
Daphne Edwards – Adult Social Care
Claire Carter – Careline and Telecare Manager
Ola Odupe – Mobile Support and Sheltered Housing Manager
Ken Jones – Divisional Director of Housing Strategy,
London Borough of Barking & Dagenham
Councillor Phil Waker – Cabinet Member for Housing,
(London Borough of Barking & Dagenham)
Councillor Linda Reason – Cabinet Member for Adult Services and HR
(London Borough of Barking and Dagenham)
Christopher Boyo – London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
Ben Ramsey – London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

Background papers list

Notes of the Impact of Services on the Elderly Topic Group Meetings:

1 November 2012
12 December 2012
5 February 2013
10 July 2013

8.0 The following comments are submitted by members of staff:

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISK:

The Council run housing schemes are funded from within existing service budgets. Other Council services referred to within this report are also funded from within existing budgets. There are no direct financial implications arising from this report, which is for information purposes. The cost of distributing the letter will be met from existing resources.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISK:

The Head of Adult Social Care will need to consider whether or not the recommendations should be implemented. Legal advice may be required in respect of any data protection and procurement issues arising.

HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS AND RISK:

There are no immediate Human Resources implications as the Council run housing schemes and other services are already fully staffed and funded by the Council.