

REPORT OF THE INDIVIDUALS OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE IMPACT OF SERVICES ON THE ELDERLY TOPIC GROUP

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 the Ageing Well Event, 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

Havering Housing Services

- 3.1 The group met with the Head of Homes, Housing and Public Protection in November 2012. She informed the group that following the 2011 census it was confirmed that Havering had an older population than the London average as well as compared to the average for England and Wales.
- 3.2 There was a number of housing 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.

- 3.3 There were a number of extra care schemes in Havering including Painesbrook (64 units) and St Ethelburga's (33 units). A new scheme was being developed and was due to open in May 2013. This would be Dreywood Court and would comprise 98 units, 20 of which would be available to the elderly on leasehold terms.
- 3.4 The group was informed that Homes and Housing had a capital budget of £495k in 2013/14 and £495k in 2014/15 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 are not council tenants, there was a Disabled Facilities Grant. This was mandatory where there was a disabled household member. If the disabled person was a child there was no means test, however if the disabled person was an adult there was a nationally defined means test. Under national legislation, the maximum Disabled Facilities Grant was £30,000 whether relating to a disabled child or adult. The Council had agreed a policy that discretionary a grant above the £30,000 cap could be sought although this was extremely rarely required.
- 3.5 The Telecare and Careline service was provided by Homes and Housing. Previously, clients had made self-referrals but 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. When activated, the call centre answers. If a call-out was required a relative was contacted or staff from Havering's Telecare Centre attends. Whether a relative or the Council attended was based on the clients' previously expressed preferences. The charge for the Careline service was £4.37 a week
- 3.6 The Telecare service provided, in addition to the Careline pendant/pull cord, a variety of sensors, for example fall's detectors, flood detectors which automatically alert the call centre when activated. The Havering Telecare Centre team assessed the situation and either a relative or member of the team attended, if necessary. The charge for this service was £6.37 a week. 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 Careline or Telecare service directly.
- 3.7 The group was informed that there was a specific service for people with the early stages of dementia. This consisted of the person having a device, which could be worn like a bracelet or carried in a pocket or handbag. The device would give relatives text alerts as to the person's whereabouts, or they could log online to check the person's movements. The charge made by Havering Telecare Centre and paid by Adult Social Care was a one-off installation fee of £75. There was no on-going weekly charge.

Age Concern Services

- 3.8 The group met with a representative for Age Concern Havering in November 2012. Age Concern was an independent charity that focussed on improving life for older people. Age Concern's work was funded by a range of sources – the Council, grants and trust funds. There was in excess of 250 volunteers at Age Concern Havering, many of whom were older people themselves but found the voluntary work rewarding.
- 3.9 The group was informed that there were two Age Concern day centres that were core funded by the Council. HOPWA House in Hornchurch allowed active older people to take part in activities as they wished. Painesbrook offered a day service for the frail elderly six days a week. There also run community and preventative services including pub clubs and the Council funded “perky pensioners” service which provided reasonably priced meals and outings etc.
- 3.10 Age Concern also offered a befriending service for older people who were housebound or people living alone. This was grant funded however only until June 2013. 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.
- 3.11 A key role of Age Concern was health and health promotion. Support, information and advice were given following a stroke together with a stroke survivors club and a swimming club. Age Concern also ran a cancer awareness campaign to raise awareness of lung, bowel and breast cancer.
- 3.12 The dementia advisory service offered support to more than 1,000 people in Havering. There were peer support clubs for people with early to moderate dementia and support groups for carers which ran fortnightly and were very popular.
- 3.13 Age Concern Havering also ran a charity shop, day trips and holidays. Work was carried out across the borough; however the group discovered that Rainham was difficult to cover fully.
- 3.14 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 OF HOUSING SCHEMES

Housing Schemes in Havering

Cole Court

- 4.1 The group visited Cole Court, which was a modern sheltered housing unit, built for purpose in 1984 and had 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 60's a proven social isolation need was necessary. There were 19 complexes of this type around the borough.
- 4.2 Residents of Cole Court were of differing needs (high, medium and low). The high needs were contacted everyday by the roving warden, whereas those on a medium or high need were not contacted as frequently. All units in the complex had the Careline box installed; this had replaced the old link-line system.
- 4.3 The group was informed that the average rental for a unit was £90-£100 a week, this included all service charges.

Painesbrook Court

- 4.4 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 and Age Concern ran a day centre at the premise. 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.
- 4.5 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.
- 4.6 The group were informed that the rental was standardised and was approximately £219 a week, and this included all their utilities.

Royal Jubilee Court (RJC)

- 4.7 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.

- 4.8 Royal Jubilee Court was made up of three services; Reablement, Sheltered Housing and the Out of Hours Service. Within Anne House was all the sheltered housing, 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.

Telecare Centre (RJC)

- 4.9 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 addition button they could press and have a 2-way conversation with the control centre.
- 4.10 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.
- 4.11 The group was shown the Telehealth equipment, which was in line with the chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD). 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.
- 4.12 The group was informed that the service responded to between 200-250 calls a month, 85% were due to falls, of which $\frac{2}{3}$ of responses prevented the need of a to hospital admission. The service also worked with the Police in respect of bogus callers, the Fire Service in respect of hoarders, as well as Age Concern, Alzheimer's Society and Adult Social Care. There were 3500 clients on the system and approximately 19,000 calls were taken a year.

Dreywood Court

- 4.13 The group met with the Business Co-ordinator at Dreywood Court in December 2012. The scheme was an extra care scheme and was being managed by East Thames. At the time the group visited the site was still being developed and the provider of the care was still in its early stages of tender. 24 hour personalised care, with waking night staff would be provided, and the scheme would be a home for life. 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.

- 4.14 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%.
- 4.15 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 for the shared ownership lease would be to 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 market via an estate agent but subject to the eligibility criteria for residence.
- 4.16 Once the scheme was completed, it was hoped that the site would have laundry support, activity support, a “friends of” group and a Trustee for the Community Activities. The management company were hoping for the whole site to be family friendly.
- 4.17 The group visited a 2-bed show flat and were impressed with the size of the property. The site would have some parking available for both residents and visitors. Residents would be able to have pets; however this would be done on the merit and capability of the resident.
- 4.18 The scheme was handed over and ready to occupy in July 2013 with the first residents moved in by mid-July. The scheme had its own allocation panel, which assessed all applications. As a result of raising awareness of the scheme, Dreywood Court had registered the interest of 393 people, and 127 applications had been considered by the Dreywood Court Extra Care Allocations Panel
- 4.19 By October 2013, there was 100% allocation to the socially rented flats and 15 of the 20 shared ownership flats had reservation deposits made on them, which were awaiting legal conveyance and completion to be finalised.
- 4.20 The Council tendered to find a high quality care provider for Dreywood Court with a track record of providing good personalised care and support services, within an extra care housing setting. The contract was awarded to Sanctuary Home Care (Ltd). All Dreywood Court residents needed to agree to have their assessed care needs met through Sanctuary Homecare and to be able to work with the provider to develop a personalised service. This ensured a consistent level of service, aided flexible delivery of support and removed risks associated with multiple providers delivering care within the service.
- 4.21 East Thames 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.

- 4.22 Sanctuary Homecare began assessing applicants for Dreywood Court 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. Where possible all the care assessments were carried out at the Dreywood Court office to enable individual tailored plans to be developed. In addition any extra adaptations that were required were identified. The assessment of the type and level of care required formed part of the allocation process which was considered by the Dreywood Court Extra Care Allocations Panel when evaluating applications. The overall aim of the on-site care and support team was to work with residents and the landlord to create and maintain a safe, supportive and inclusive environment that promoted independence, health and well-being. The care and support service at the scheme placed the individual at the heart of the support it provided; involved that person in choices about their care and support; promoted positive risk taking, independence, dignity and choice at all times; and had a strong focus on enabling and re-abling.
- 4.23 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 complete 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.

Housing Schemes in Barking and Dagenham

- 4.24 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.

Fred Tibble Court

- 4.25 The group was informed that this was an extra care scheme, and had residents with early onset dementia. The building was formerly a council residential home, which had been reviewed as part of the late 90's review of older person housing.
- 4.26 The scheme comprised 31 units (6x2 beds and 25x1 beds). Nominations for placements came from the Council; however there had been a breakdown in nominations, which had resulted in having 15 void properties in the last year. These had reduced to 4 voids; however it was difficult to get people to take up the units. The nominations had been ranging across need, but 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.
- 4.27 The scheme was to support independent living. There were two support people which were on the site every day to provide activities for the residents.

- 4.28 The group viewed a one bed flat, which was self-contained with a fitted kitchen, bedroom and bathroom/ wet room. 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.
- 4.29 The rental varied, for 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.

Thames View Lodge

- 4.30 This scheme was developed and owned by London and Quadrant Housing. It was a category 2 sheltered scheme and contained 48 units within it. The group met with the Scheme Co-ordinator, who was employed by the Council, therefore whilst the scheme was managed and owned by London and Quadrant; it was supported by council employed staff.
- 4.31 The scheme was centred on independent living. It was made up of 36 flats and 12 bungalows (Hockley Mews). All properties had pull cords and pendants. The residents were contact each day to ensure they were ok, otherwise they were independent.
- 4.32 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 can be made to move the resident into an extra care unit if their needs increased.
- 4.33 Members asked about the number of voids and how they were dealt with. The scheme co-ordinator explained that nomination 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.
- 4.34 The group was informed that 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 the electricity. Communal facilities included a laundrette, a guest room with 2 single beds, a games room, hairdressers and a lounge.
- 4.35 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

Catherine Godfrey House

- 4.36 The group was informed that this was a category two sheltered accommodation. The scheme was owned and managed by the Council. Following a housing review in the late 1990s a number of sites were given to a developer to build sellable properties, and in return they built Catherine Godfrey House.
- 4.37 The group was shown the communal lounge and it was explained that there was involvement of social workers in delivering the care packages. 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 on the scheme were on the alarm system.
- 4.38 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 services available to the elderly and vulnerable residents of Havering and how these compared with those in a neighbouring borough.
- 5.2 The group researched the number of vulnerable and elderly person that were in the borough through the Mosaic database. This resulted in a figure of 99,635 which was considered to be an unmanageable number. Further manipulation of the data was carried out, which resulted in a figure of 11,549 which included people aged 75+, in receipt of single person council tax, housing benefit, a blue badge holder, an Adult Social Care recipient and had a falls admission at Accident and Emergency. Again it was agreed that this figure was still very high.
- 5.3 The group decided that whilst the Mosaic data was good, it only included those people known to the borough and were in receipt of benefits or adult social care. The group agreed that they needed to find a way of targeting those individuals who were living alone, with no family or contact with Adult Social Care as these individuals would be socially isolated.
- 5.4 The group agreed that contact needed to be made with these individuals and agreed on the wording of a letter which could be distributed. Members discussed how this could be carried out and agreed to contact the Safer Neighbourhood Teams, as they would have a more local idea of those people who were socially isolated.

5.5 The group contact the Safer Neighbourhood Teams who agreed that this is something they would be happy to take on and requested that they could distribute approximately 1,000 letters across the whole borough.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 That the Adult Social Care service consider carrying out the printing and in conjunction with the Safer Neighbourhood teams, distribution of the attached letter (Appendix 1), as agreed by the topic group.

6.2 The council to work in partnership with Age Concern Havering to find accommodation where services are currently not provided (Rainham).

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

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 the Council.