Appendix – Summary of the second round of roadshows

1.1 The second round of road shows was conducted at 19 of the 24 Council sheltered schemes between (some smaller schemes were 'twinned' up) between 8 September and 14 October 2008. 237 Residents talked to us at these events. Ward councillors attended some of the meetings.

1.2 At each meeting, there was a short presentation either by the Head of Housing Management for sheltered housing or Older Persons Housing Manager. This was normally followed by a short question and answer session and informal group discussions with feedback from each group at the end. Larger group discussion was held at a few schemes where it was not feasible to have smaller group discussion.

1.3 All residents were invited by letter, which included an information leaflet giving background information on the different proposals.

1.4 The discussions focused on a number of key areas:

- A proposal to increase the number of scheme managers but with an increased cost of approximately £4.00 per week being levied.
- A proposal to introduce team based working using the A proposal to implement floating support using the existing number of scheme managers without additional service charge.
- A discussion about residential scheme managers.
- A discussion around the out of hours service and whether the current mobile response element of the service should be changed.

2. More Scheme Managers – the 'Traditional Plus' model

2.1 The majority of residents were reluctant to pay for additional scheme managers. An increase in other utility bills and a limited income/pension was often sited as a reason why this couldn't be afforded. Views received included:

- "Personally I don't think so"
- "A lot of people haven't got this money"
- " I can afford it but most people can't"
- "We are Ok with a part time Scheme Manager here" (A resident at one of the smallest schemes with shared Scheme Manager at present)
- "All tenants, not just sheltered, should pay this service charge"

2.2 Some residents were worried that any charge would increase in future years.

2.3　At some schemes which shared a scheme manager, residents didn't think that there was sufficient work for one full time scheme manager for each scheme and felt that the current working arrangements were sufficient.

2.4　A minority of residents said that they valued the scheme manager service and if this was the only way they could retain their scheme manager, they would be willing to pay the additional money.

3.　Team Based Working

3.1　A majority of residents who expressed a view at the roadshows said that this was the best of the three options. Views received included:

- "I vote for that"
- "the best way to go"
- "I like this one"
- "Not much difference to this service now"
- As long as it's carefully managed"
- "A good compromise - we can keep our Scheme Manager without paying more"
- "As long as the smaller schemes do not suffer"
- " If we can keep our Scheme Manager in the team"

3.2　Many residents thought that this was the best way of allocating staff resources and thought it was unfair that scheme managers often had very different workloads, based on the size of their schemes.

3.3　Some thought that this model was quite similar to the one already provided.

3.4　There were however some questions which residents commonly raised when talking about team working:

- Where would scheme managers be based?
- How would residents contact a scheme manager when off site?
- Would there still be an alarm service?
- What would happen if everyone within the team went sick or left?
- What amount of time would a scheme manager spend on site?

3.5　Some were not keen on this idea and wondered how a team could get to know all residents and what would happen if the team workers were off site.

4.　Floating Support

4.1   Overwhelmingly, residents said that this was the worst option and were very reluctant for this to be considered or discussed at all. Views received included:

- "No, no, no"
- "This leaves the rest of us out"
- "The third option is out"
- "It's a non-starter"
- "No way!
- "Why are we even talking about this?!"

4.2   Where comment was made, the following concerns were commonly noted:
- There wouldn't be anyone on site to turn to.
- Security would be compromised and no-one would look after the building.
- There would be no continuity of service and familiar faces of staff might be lost.

5.   Out of Hours Service.

5.1   The majority felt that it was important to have some form of alarm service.

5.2   The majority of residents didn't feel that it was necessary to have a mobile response service where someone was available to attend in person. Indeed, some residents were surprised that there was a mobile response service, as their expectation was that when they used the alarm, the emergency services would be called.

5.3   However, a few residents who had a mobile officer attending to them said it was useful.

5.4   Residents said that the council should look at different types of service and different service providers – especially if savings could be made.

5.5   Residents said that what they wanted was a quick response service when they pulled the alarm, and where there was criticism of the existing service, residents complained that it was sometimes too slow in responding.

5.6   Residents who had a pendant alarm felt this to be useful and that these
        should be made widely available.

5.7   There was sometimes discussion about access to keys in an emergency – some residents said that neighbours could be key holders.

5.8   Views expressed included:

- "most emergencies require the emergency services"
- "if it's an emergency, call me an ambulance"
- "CareLink take time to come out - what is needed is the emergency service response"
- "Sending people out can delay emergency help"
- "Look at a system that links directly to emergency services, cut out the response centre"

6.   Residential Scheme Managers

6.1   Generally, residents accepted that the continued provision of a residential based service was not viable as staff could not be recruited
        to live-in posts. There were very mixed views as to if residential working
        was beneficial. One scheme where the service had recently changed to
        non residential strongly preferred the new arranangement.

There were a number of common responses in this discussion:

- The existing scheme managers should be allowed to stay until they stopped working for the sheltered housing service.
- If they do not want to live on site then the council should rehouse them
- The council should let the former manager's flats as sheltered units.

Consultation Roadshows – September/October 2008 Summary

Date	Site	Attendees	Majority Preference
September 8	Elwyn Jones Court	17	Team model
September 9	Jubilee Court	7	No consensus
September 11	Leach Court	24	Team model with the proviso this does not disadvantage smaller schemes
September 12	Hazleholt	5	Team model
September 15	Evelyn Court	6	Team model

September 16	Rosehill Court (with residents of Ainsworth House)	12	Team model
September 18	Laburnum Grove	19	Team model if carefully managed.
September 22	Sloane Court (with residents of Lavender House)	15	Traditional plus with additional service charge
September 23	Elizabeth Court (with residents of Woods House)	15	Split between traditional plus with additional service charge and team models
September 24	Sanders House	16	Team model
September 25	Southease (with residents of Walter May House)	18	Team model
September 29	Stonehurst Court	6	Team model
September 30	Manor Paddock	9	Team model
October 6	Broadfields	13	Team model
October 8	Lindfield Court	13	Team model
October 9	Churchill House	14	Team model
October 13	Jasmine Court	10	Team model
October 14	Somerset Point	18 (30)*	Split between traditional plus with service charge and team models

Notes: * - At Somerset Point, some non residents attended the event as it took the place of a regular coffee morning.

Helen Clarkmead 17/10/2008   Appendix consultation summary v2