

Housing Learning & Improvement Network

Care Services Improvement Partnership **CSIP**

Health and Social Care
Change Agent Team

Commissioning an Extra Care Scheme from Social Services' Perspective - Leicester City Council - *from needs analysis to start on site*

Prepared by **Sue Garwood**, for the Housing Learning & Improvement Network

Key players:

Leicester City Council

Adult and Community services	Responsible for leading the project
Planning and service Development (<i>Social Care Planning</i>)	Strategic framework and bid preparation
Older Persons' Services	Post-bid project development
Supporting People	Project partner
Housing Department	Owned adjacent properties Project partner
Property Department	Owned land on which EC to be developed, as well as adjacent land to be sold for development and allotment holders to the west
Planning Department	Planning consents
Elected Members and Cabinet	General consents
NHS	
Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Trust	Managed neighbouring secure unit
NHS Estates acting on behalf of Leicester health community	Responsible for land sale and negotiations
PCT	Supported the project
Private Developer	Developing land to the north-east of the Extra Care site
Hanover Housing Association	Extra Care development partner and scheme Manager Project partner
Housing Corporation	£1.9 million Social Housing Grant and defined conditions and timescales
Department Health	£1.9 million Extra Care capital grant and defined conditions and timescales

COMMISSIONING AN EXTRA CARE SCHEME FROM SOCIAL SERVICES' PERSPECTIVE – Leicester City – From needs analysis to start on site

Contents	page
Key Players	cover
Introduction	1
Needs analysis and strategic direction	1
Gaining the support of partners	2
Selecting a housing development partner	3
Finding a site	5
Writing and submitting the bid	6
Successful bid	7
Land access	7
Appendices:	
1. Summary of key dates	11
2. Housing Corporation perspective	12

INTRODUCTION

The first new-build Extra Care scheme in Leicester is currently being built. It will comprise 57 apartments of which 43 have one bedroom and 14 have two, with 12 flats (8 plus 4 respectively) available for shared ownership. It is located close to amenities and in the heart of multi-cultural Leicester.

This case study describes the process that Leicester City Council and its partners, Hanover Housing Association, went through to achieve success in its bid to the Department of Health Extra Care Fund and the Housing Corporation for capital grants.

NEEDS ANALYSIS AND STRATEGIC DIRECTION

The Process

This process was led by the Planning and Service Development section of Leicester City Council's Adult and Community Services which developed a comprehensive needs analysis document "Older Persons' Population Needs Analysis". This in turn informed the strategy document "An Extra Care Housing Strategy for Older People in Leicester 2004 - 2007".

Office for National Statistics census data and 2003 based population projections were supplemented by data from a range of other sources including: Supporting People (SP) supply mapping; the 2002 City Council Housing Needs Survey; sheltered housing stock review; cognitive impairment prevalence rates; local and national health statistics; crime data; and their own departmental social care data.

In addition, social work teams were asked to consider how many of those service users with high levels of care, or recently admitted to residential care, would benefit from an Extra Care Housing scheme. The Older People's Forum which comprised older people, councillors and officers was consulted about the idea of Extra Care Housing. Wider national evidence was also used, including the formula contained in the Department of Health's Tool for mapping populations and resources, which gave an indication of how many Extra Care places might be needed in a given area.

Although within Leicester, there was not a capacity problem meeting the needs of the older population through existing services, the lack of night time care, and the absence of an Extra Care option meant that a quarter of older people who moved on from sheltered housing had no alternative but to move into residential care. Furthermore, it was clear that there was a strong need for services that met the diverse needs of people from black and minority ethnic communities.

The agreed strategy at that stage was to achieve the development of one Extra Care scheme with a view to increasing choice along the spectrum of services. This would serve to pilot the value of Extra Care in Leicester and yield valuable experience before deciding whether to embark on a large scale Extra Care development strategy.

With the Benefit of Hindsight.....

A gap in wider understanding about Extra Care housing made effective consultation difficult. Starting to raise people's awareness and understanding of Extra Care earlier in the process would have made consultation and gaining support for Extra Care easier.

Lessons

- Use national data and support - The national evidence and support for Extra Care was invaluable in making the case to all potential stakeholders.
- Understanding Extra Care – Do not underestimate the importance of early and ongoing awareness-raising on the meaning of Extra Care housing

GAINING THE SUPPORT OF PARTNERS

In addition to the development of the Extra Care Housing Strategy, Extra Care and meeting the needs of people from ethnic minorities was given a high priority in the Supporting People Strategy, the Adults and Older Person's Commissioning Strategy, the City Council's Housing Strategy and the Regional Housing Strategy and Investment Plan.

The first meeting of senior managers from Housing, Supporting People and various sections of Social Services (Social Care Planning, Service Director for Older People) was held in April 2003, to launch the housing strategy for older people and discuss the idea of developing Extra Care.

This meeting spawned a project group with representatives from each section to start building relationships and promote the vision more widely. A hasty process was undergone to select a development partner and the first bid to the Department of Health Extra Care Fund was submitted in October 2003.

In March 2004, news came through that the bid had not been successful and once again, Social Care Planning took the lead in engaging with partners to re-start the process.

At a departmental management team meeting in June 2004, attended by the Director of Social Care and Health, all Social Services service directors, Director for Housing and Supporting People Manager, backing was given to developing an Extra Care programme and submitting a bid in the next round. This backing was crucial.

The following few months were devoted to selecting a Development Partner (The process for this is described below.) Once Hanover had been selected, a project group was set up. It was chaired by a service director, and comprised representatives from Hanover, architects, Corporate Property Services, Social Care Property Manager, Social Care planners, Supporting People, Housing Development and Finance. The focus of this group was on finding the site and developing the bid. The senior leadership of this group and its wide membership were vital.

Towards the end of July, a paper was taken to the Supporting People Core Strategy Group and then the SP Commissioning Body to seek commitment in principle to funding the housing related support elements of the scheme.

At a meeting of the Cabinet in August agreement was given to proceed with the application to the Department of Health Extra Care fund, develop an older people's Extra Care Strategy, identify potential sites and select a housing provider partner. In October 2004, Cabinet gave approval to the disposal of the affordable housing element on the Wycombe Road site to Hanover for an Extra Care housing scheme. Cabinet was kept abreast of developments with progress reports from time to time.

Very late in the process two things happened. The decision was made to put in a bid to the Department of Health and the Housing Corporation for half the amount each, rather than to the Department of Health for the whole amount. Also, the process for prioritising proposals to the Housing Corporation changed that year. This complicated the process

and some partners were unfamiliar with it. Hanover, Housing and Supporting People were all very helpful in talking to the Housing Corporation.

News that the bid had been successful came through in March 2005, and the project group continues to meet to drive the process forward and put in place inter-agency agreements and arrangements for when the scheme becomes operational.

With the Benefit of Hindsight...

The Housing Corporation would have preferred being involved earlier in the process. Where a grant from the Housing Corporation is being considered, the Housing Corporation likes to be engaged in the process very early on. They can assist in assessing national and regional strategic fit, and if they understand the local needs – target groups, objectives of the development etc – a joint vision can be established and they can assist in shaping a proposal which meets their requirements. Alternatively, if a proposal is likely to be a non-starter, they can make it clear before significant commitment of resource.

Lessons

- Champions - Having one or two champions with tenacity and commitment are essential. Keeping enthusiasm going can be challenging and mutual support and encouragement from one or two committed people helps.
- Senior level ownership - Commitment and backing at a senior level from all partner organisations is crucial
- Inclusion in strategies – Inclusion in relevant strategies with clear rationale for such inclusion is a pre-requisite to gaining the necessary commitments
- Principles first - Get the principles agreed and signed up to first. Once people are signed up to these they are more likely to find solutions to the challenges.
- Early start - Start the whole process as early as possible, as some aspects need to happen in sequence rather than in parallel.
- Resourcing - It all takes a lot of resourcing and time commitment from staff.
- Housing Corporation - If seeking Housing Corporation funding, start talking to them from the very inception of an idea. They will advise on where they should be involved in a given process and where they are happy to leave the other stakeholders to get on with it, taking into account the circumstances of the particular case.

SELECTING A HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PARTNER

The Process

Leicester City Council is committed to ensuring that its processes are fair and transparent. Selecting a housing development partner was not a process in which the Adult and Community Services had had any experience. The formal procurement process was inappropriate for this exercise, and they were instead guided by Housing Development's process for selecting partners. Their own solicitors checked the process to ensure that it was legally robust and did not tie the Department into a formal contract.

Letters were sent out to known RSLs, private property developers, and residential care managers inviting attendance at a briefing meeting, to be followed up by the submission of a bid to become the development partner. Identifying a wide and fair range of organisations to send the invitations to was a challenge. The bidding process and meeting dates were also advertised on the national Supporting People website.

The brief to potential development partners specified details of the accommodation and facilities required, anticipated tenures and outline staffing configuration. Bidders were given two weeks to submit a bid which addressed these requirements and provided scheme plans, costings and information on experience in a number of specific areas. A panel comprising Housing Development, Social Care and Supporting People shortlisted the bids, applying criteria which matched the original brief.

Selection criteria included:

- Track record
- Delivery of the physical specification
- Management proposals
- Experience of working with people from BME communities
- Experience of working with older people and those with mental health problems
- Examples of innovative experience
- Affordability of rents and stacking up financially

Those shortlisted were invited to interview and one of their existing schemes visited. Following this, scores for performance on each of the criteria, and a recommendation giving reasons, were passed to the Service Director for Adults and Older People's Mental Health who made the final decision. Hanover was duly selected.

With the Benefit of hindsight ...

- Feedback from potential providers was that the timescales for the process were too tight.
- Had the process or timing of the selection of a development partner been different, it would have been good to have had Hanover's involvement and expertise from an earlier stage.
- The Housing Corporation would have preferred to have known about the selection process at an early stage.

Lessons

- Early start - Start as early as possible.
- Provider - Select a provider who has experience and expertise and be willing to listen to them and learn from them.
- Think what you are offering - Providers are being asked to commit a considerable amount of time and effort to a process which, even if they are successful in being chosen as partners, gives no guarantee that the subsequent process – i.e. locating capital funding through a further bid – will be successful. Thus, there has at least to be the inducement of a longer term collaborative relationship which could result in successful joint ventures.
- Balance between clarity and flexibility – Where the local authority has a clear vision of how the scheme should be configured, e.g. who is expected to provide the housing-related support, this should be recorded in the specification clearly and unambiguously, but should be balanced by an openness to discussing the vision with the selected provider, and possibly amending it in a transparent way.
- Housing Corporation engagement – If a Housing Corporation grant is required and even if it is not, local authorities should talk early to the Housing Corporation who can help the authority clarify criteria and assess the appropriateness of potential partners. Where separate development and management partners are envisaged, they can help to ensure synergy between the two.

FINDING A SITE

The process

Having a site was essential to demonstrating deliverability and submitting a realistically costed bid. Very early on in the process, Leicester City Council Property Services were approached to find a suitable site. Essentially, what was being sought was a site well situated for access to local amenities and possibly close to other health and social care facilities so that together they could act as a hub for the surrounding area. It needed to be in the midst of the population it would serve, of suitable size and on flattish terrain.

Many sites were visited by Hanover and Social Care Planning, and ruled out because they were not suitable. Others were excluded for a variety of reasons; too expensive; the land was designated for a different planning use and could not get “change of use” in time. On Section 106 sites, the affordable housing requirement had already been agreed and any changes would have affected the overall financial viability of an existing scheme.

The project management team had numerous meetings, and sites were reconsidered against selection criteria a number of times. In the end, despite all its challenges, there was only one which really fitted the bill. There was no better site available within the necessary time scales.

With the Benefit of Hindsight....

- Social Care planners recognised their own lack of knowledge in relation to property development matters, in particular the timescales involved in site acquisition and their understanding of land values. The terminology, issues and legislative framework were all unfamiliar as capital build development projects tend to be rare in social care. Social care relied heavily on Housing Development Officers’ support in identifying a suitable site.
- It may have helped if Property Services and Planning had been brought in at the stage where the vision for Extra Care was being discussed and the commitment to it agreed, but the focal point of the agreement and commitment was between Housing and Social Care Departments.
- The Project Board had a matrix for site requirements – what was essential and what was desirable – but with hindsight, this could have been improved upon.

Lessons Learned

- Potential does not mean actual - Property services are approached all the time with speculative projects which are looking for sites, and many probably do not come to fruition. Suggestions of sites as potentially suitable do not constitute a definite offer or mean that the site is definitely suitable.
- Making use of the experts – The expertise of those familiar with the issues is invaluable in assessing site suitability, identifying essential and desirable criteria, and understanding the planning and land issues locally.
- Pivotal role of development partner - The development partner’s input was indispensable in selecting a suitable site for development. Hanover acted as a bridge between Social Care Planning and those departments and authorities responsible for physical and financial aspects of the site – e.g. Planners, Property Services, Housing Corporation etc.
- Understand each other’s objectives - It helps if you can understand different department’s agendas from the outset. That way you can find a shared objective.
- Land values - If the council does not hold land specifically for affordable housing developments, work needs to be done with Councillors to identify sites where capital receipts could be reduced to an affordable level.

WRITING AND SUBMITTING THE BID

The first bid to the Department of Health Extra Care Fund, pulled together in haste for the October 2003 round, was not successful, but the feedback was useful in shaping the second bid and also provided valuable experience in the whole process. It gave hope that with additional effort success could be achieved, and helped to increase focus on local inter-agency protocols.

Writing the bid the second time round was relatively easy compared with working on the joint agreements and getting corporate consensus to the bid.

A project management approach was adopted, with the process “owned” and co-ordinated by a member of Social Care Planning. Different parties took on different aspects of the bid, depending on their role and expertise. For example, one person dealt with the strategic aspects while another concentrated more on the detailed workings of the scheme. Hanover took responsibility for the design and capital feasibility aspects, as well as providing material on the management and operational aspects. These were incorporated into, and merged with, Leicester City Council’s input. Drafts were circulated for comments which resulted in redrafting. Hanover staff were determined and positive throughout and readily available to provide information as it was needed, but the bulk of the bid was written and researched by Social Care Planning.

Many drafts preceded the final version which was cohesive, concise and polished.

With the benefit of hindsight....

It would have been better had the whole process got underway again earlier following the failure of the first bid. The Project group could only be set up again in August 2004. The time between the strategic meeting to give the go ahead in June and the launch of the project group in August was devoted to selecting the development partner who was an essential member of the project group and process.

Lessons

- Use of available skills - Make good use of all the local knowledge and skills at your disposal, for example experience from Supported Living in other areas, such as learning disabilities.
- Meeting the brief - Address the brief, but if you cannot honestly tick every box, e.g. intermediate care, have the confidence not to do so. However, justify why you have decided what you will and will not do.
- Valuable experience - It really helped that the staff responsible for writing the bid had had extensive experience or writing official documents – reports, bids etc and so had the necessary skills.
- Final sign-up - Do not under-estimate the time needed to get the final sign-up at the end, as well as all the support documents needed from partner agencies.
- Independent proofreading - Proofreading undertaken by someone not previously involved in the process helps to ensure the text is comprehensible.
- Presentation - Attention to presentation makes an already well thought out bid look polished and professional.
- Development partner - Choosing the right development partner is important.

SUCCESSFUL BID

In March 2005, Leicester learned that its bid had been successful.

The Department of Health identified the following strengths in Leicester's bid:

- The design looked strong with good space standards, range of communal facilities and detail on assistive technology
- The bid was backed up by a detailed assessment of need and a strong whole system strategy around older people of which Extra Care was a key element
- Strong partnership was reflected both in letters of support from a range of stakeholders and an Extra Care project group
- There was clarity on philosophy and dependency mix
- It had well developed plans to support people with dementia including links with community mental health team
- There was a strong social inclusion and BME focus

The Housing Corporation confirmed that from their perspective, the bid was successful for the following reasons:

- It demonstrated long term sustainable need and demand, including for the significant BME community.
- It was clear about the type of accommodation being provided e.g. self contained.
- It showed how the scheme was positioned within the context of overall provision for older people in Leicester
- It identified the level of support it was aiming to provide e.g. medium / high etc and the mix / balance across the scheme.
- Location - this site is in an area with an established BME community with support/ services etc.
- LA support for the scheme, including SP, SSD and Housing was demonstrated.
- Value for Money: the joint funding of the scheme meant that the HC input was complemented by DH capital.
- It clearly linked in to regional and local strategies and SP strategy.
- The scheme included some shared ownership properties for people with some income / equity.

Lessons

- Have a champion and remain determined
- Be open-minded
- Learn from your mistakes
- Be willing to take calculated risks
- Evidence your proposal well

Note: The Housing Corporation provided an analysis of the factors they took into account in assessing the bids submitted for joint funding, and also provide some advice for future bidders. This is included as a separate appendix to the case study.

LAND ACCESS

Leicester City Council was corporately committed to achieving this inward investment to the city. Following the successful bid, their corporate commitment was put to the test as different departments with diverse agendas had to work with one another and other players to make the scheme a reality.

A Serious Hiccough

The site chosen for the scheme was ideally located in the heart of Leicester's ethnically diverse community. However, it was "landlocked" and in order to be viable, vehicular access was essential.

The site was bordered to the north by NHS property, to the West by city council owned allotments, to the east by additional city council land to be sold for development, and to the south by a row of properties along Wycombe Road - a combination of city council properties and some right-to-buy owner-occupied properties.

There was an understanding – possibly incorrect – on the part of Social Services and others that access would be achieved through the demolition of some of the council properties along Wycombe Road. For a variety of reasons this proved not to be feasible. Property Services sought other suitable sites to no avail. Thus, alternative options for gaining vehicular access had to be explored.

The only other possible access route was through NHS owned wasteland which was being sold to a private developer. To the east of this proposed development were private properties known as the Herongate Road Estate. The developer already had planning permission for construction vehicles to go through the Herongate Road Estate. Furthermore, the private developers were required to build a link road from Gipsy Lane north of the NHS land, down to their new development for long-term access. Under the rules of "connectivity" they were obliged to allow use of that road for access to the Extra Care scheme as well. However, this road would not extend as far as the scheme, and the private developers were in no particular hurry to implement any of this, whilst the Housing Corporation and Department of Health grant conditions made timing of the essence. Hanover, who had to raise additional capital through a loan, would not commit to the Extra Care development without certainty that the private developer's project would definitely go ahead - and in time. In addition, the access from Gipsy Lane into the private developer's site would have to be extended to the scheme, and this required additional capital.

Leicester City Property Services were very keen to maximise the value of the land to the east of the scheme to sell it at a good price, whilst the Housing Department's priority was to maximise the opportunities presented by Section 106 of the Housing Act 1996 to deliver affordable housing.

A further complication was that in order to make it all work, NHS Estates had to be persuaded to allow access over their "ransom strip" - a narrow channel of land in which an interest is kept for bargaining and security purposes. The NHS, as other official bodies, is required to demonstrate "best consideration" – that they have made the most of their assets.

Resolution

Adult and Community Services fulfilled the role of keeping all local authority players focused on the desired outcome, talking and negotiating between the different departments.

Property Services in turn engaged with their counterparts in the NHS to work with the private developer to move the process forward as quickly as possible. The developers proved understanding and helpful. For example, they were willing to allow Extra Care construction vehicles to also use the Westbury Estate access route, enabling Hanover to put in for a variation to the planning permission in order to do so.

In addition, Property Services had to ensure that there would be access to the land east of the scheme as well. They therefore agreed to fund the additional link from the private

developer road to the scheme. Hanover in turn submitted an outline planning bid for the rest of the city council land simultaneously with the detailed plan for the scheme, thereby saving the city council considerable time and making the land easier to sell.

NHS Estates had done their bit by speeding up the process with the private developers. In return, Property Services needed to persuade Cabinet to pay the NHS £1million for the ransom strip. Cabinet's initial view was that the NHS were "partners who should be willing to contribute this in the interests of the project". However, they readily agreed once they understood that the amount being asked for the ransom strip was completely normal in building terms, and that the cost was justified by the resultant benefits to the city: £8 million inward investment for the Extra Care scheme, as well as income from the sale of rest of the council's land.

Adult and Community services played honest broker, reminding the parties what would be lost if timely agreement could not be reached.

Timescales

There were certain deadlines which had to be met by the project in order for the grants to be paid. A signed contract, "The Development and Grant Deed", between Hanover and Leicester City Council had a Department of Health deadline of 30th September 2005, and start on site had to be achieved by Mid March 2006.

However, the contract was contingent upon the land sale – it did not make sense to enter into agreements around land ownership when the land had not yet been transferred. And the land sale could not take place until all the access issues had been satisfactorily resolved, and it was clear that the start-on-site date could be achieved. The partners were allowed an extension on the time scale for the contract which was finally signed in January, but there could be no flexibility on the start-on-site date.

Thanks to effective inter-organisational negotiations, the site was acquired and start on site was achieved within the requisite timescale. Thus, the grants could be made and the scheme built.

Lessons

- A project manager - Appoint a project manager who is responsible for co-ordinating the process, liaising with partner agencies and driving the process forward.
- Expect the unexpected - In a process which is so complex, with so many players involved, all of whom have their own objectives, it would be surprising if there were not obstacles and challenges of some kind to be overcome. This case study is a good demonstration of how these can be overcome.
- Keep the lines of communication open – Whilst dealing with these issues, both the Department of Health and Housing Corporation were kept informed and involved.
- Old and new skills - Many staff working for Social Services have a background in social care provision and management. Developing an Extra Care scheme can expose them to a whole new world – planners, property developers and so on – which can be hugely interesting, and a steep learning curve, but which also uses a range of transferable skills and qualities: problem-solving; tenacity and initiative; and negotiation skills.
- Keeping focused – championing the cause - Staff from Adult and Community Services kept focused on the goal – to make the Extra Care scheme a reality. When departmental considerations got in the way of reaching agreement, they continually reminded the different players of the bigger picture, and what would be lost if agreement were not achieved. It needed a tenacious champion to navigate through the complexities and challenges.

- Working towards win-win solutions - Keeping focused was combined with ensuring that all parties understood and respected the legitimate agendas and interests of the other players, and as far as possible sought solutions which addressed rather than flouted them.
- Political Backing – Having strong political backing is a significant bonus
- Timely engagement of stakeholders – Careful thought needs to be given to which departments have a role to play in moving the project forward, and they need to be kept informed and involved at appropriate stages from project inception – planners, highways, street lighting, housing and property services to name a few
- Working in partnership can have a synergistic effect - Had each player ploughed its own furrow the diggers would not be on site now and Property Services might still be applying for outline planning permission.

At the time of writing, the Foundation stone has been laid and the build programme is now in progress.

SUMMARY OF KEY DATES

DATE	EXTERNAL DEADLINES	KEY LEICESTER CITY LANDMARKS
April 2003		Meeting of senior managers in Housing, Supporting People and Adult and Community Services → small project group
October 2003	Department of Health bid due in	Bid submitted by Leicester
March 2004	DH bid announcements	Bid unsuccessful.
June 2004		Meeting of Directors of Social Care and Health, Housing, social care service directors and Supporting People give the go ahead to work towards developing Extra Care and submitting a bid next time round.
June to August		Selection of development partners
July 2004		Reports to Supporting People Core strategy Group and Commissioning Board to secure commitment to SP revenue funding in principle
August 2004		Project group set up primarily focusing on finding site.
August 2004		Cabinet agreement to submit a bid and Cabinet lead appointed.
Period up to October 2004		Older Persons Population Needs analysis
Period up to October 2004		Development of Leicester City Extra Care Strategy 2004-2007
October 2004		Progress reports to scrutiny committees – health, social care and housing
October 2004		Progress report to Cabinet and approval of disposal of affordable housing element of site to HHA for development of Extra Care scheme
November 2004	Department of Health bids due in	
December 2004		Progress report and agreement to development of longer term Extra Care Housing Strategy
March 2005	Announcement of successful bids	News of successful bid
30 th September 2005	Bilateral contract between local authority and housing partner to be agreed and signed	The Development and Grant Deed was signed by the parties in January 2006
Mid March 2006	Start on site to be achieved	Start on site was achieved early March

HOUSING CORPORATION PERSPECTIVE

Leicester Extra Care scheme at Wycombe Road – Joint DoH / HC funded 2005

Introduction

This paper provides a brief summary of the key issues / considerations for the Housing Corporation as part of its assessment in 2005 for investment through a joint Department of Health and HC funding. These will have been taken into consideration for the Wycombe Road development and other similar bids received at that time.

It should be noted that the National Affordable Housing Programme (NAHP) for 2006 /08 bid process set out a number of requirements and criteria that have built on previous bid rounds. Future assessments will take these and any other additional criteria into consideration. These are set out in the NAHP Prospectus and other bidding guidance documents available on our website:

www.housingcorp.gsx.gov.uk

Another point to note is that non–Registered Social Landlords (those that have pre-qualified) can bid for HC funding.

Areas Covered

1. Strategic context – Need / demand
 - The HC takes into consideration housing needs and demand for older persons. Leicester were developing an Older Persons Housing Strategy. Also had looked at extra care provision in the City, in particular for BME communities.
 - The City provided information on the proposals in terms of need / demand for BME communities in particular.
 - They showed how the scheme sits in the context of the overall provision for older people in the City.
 - They considered how the scheme links to the Supporting People team in the City. SP Strategy was referenced to demonstrate the strategic need and priority for extra care housing in the City.
 - They referenced the Regional Housing Strategy and Investment Plan for 2006 /08 to support the input of investment into the scheme.

2. Enabling / Partnership working
 - HC dialogue with Housing Development team to consider planning. Land issues in terms of scheme delivery.
 - Social Services appointed a Project Leader to co – ordinate and deliver the scheme on behalf of the authority. The RSL and Development team met with him and colleagues on a regular basis to identify issues and solutions, one of these being the site issues. This issue was the main delay with the scheme which led to a meeting of all stakeholders including DoH and HC to agree flexibility and a way forward..

- Hanover Housing bid under the traditional route for HC funding and have a track record of Older Persons housing. It is understood that the association was selected by the City following a competition led by Social Services. HC would have liked to have been involved in the selection of a partner and could assist with looking at similar schemes/proposals to benchmark costs at an early stage.

3. Assessment

- Areas considered include:
 - Demand / Need – Long term sustainable demand.
 - Type of accommodation e.g. self contained.
 - Level of support e.g. medium / high etc and the mix / balance across the scheme.
 - Location – BME community .This site is in an area with an established BME community with support/ services etc.
 - LA support – including SP, SSD and housing for the scheme.
 - Value for Money: the joint funding of the scheme meant that the HC input was complemented by DoH capital also.
 - Link to regional, local strategies and SP strategy.
 - Scheme included some shared ownership properties for people with some income / equity.

4. Future Issues

- For the future would want early engagement with HC on needs / strategic context, location, design/ quality (look at the actual specification for rent / sale properties), cost, choice of housing/development partner etc.
- Would want also to explore other models of accommodation and support for older people other than an extra care development.
- Deliverability - need to ensure that planning and land acquisition is deliverable within the timeframes required.
- Ensure that there is early engagement with the Housing Corporation to input into the proposals and establish strategic context for the project.

Investment Manager
 Housing Corporation
 Attenborough House
 109 – 119 Charles Street
 Leicester
 LE1 1FQ

0116 242 4832

Other Housing LIN publications available in this format:

Case Study no.1:	Extra Care Strategic Developments in North Yorkshire
Case Study no.2:	Extra Care Strategic Developments in East Sussex
Case Study no.3:	‘Least-use’ Assistive Technology in Dementia Extra Care (Eastleigh)
Case Study no.5:	Village People: A Mixed Tenure Retirement Community (Bristol)
Case Study no.6:	How to get an Extra Care Programme in Practice
Case Study no.7:	Supporting Diversity in Tower Hamlets
Case Study no.8:	The Kent Health & Affordable Warmth Strategy
Case Study no.9:	Supporting People with Dementia in Sheltered Housing
Case Study no.10:	Direct Payments for Personal Assistance in Hampshire
Case Study no.11:	Housing for Older People from the Chinese Community in Middlesbrough
Case Study no.12:	Shared ownership for People with Disabilities (London & SE)
Case Study no.13:	Home Care Service for People with Dementia in Poole
Case Study no.14:	Intermediate Care Services within Extra Care Sheltered Housing in Maidenhead
Case Study no.15:	Sheltered Housing Contributes to Regeneration in Gainsborough
Case Study no.16:	Charging for Extra Care Sheltered Housing Services in Salford
Case Study no.17:	A Virtual Care Village Model (Cumbria)
Case Study no.18:	Community Involvement in Planning Extra Care: the Larchwood User’s Group (Brighton & Hove)
Case Study no.19	Durham Integrated Team - a practical guide
Case Study no.20	BME Older People’s Joint Service Initiative - Analysis and Evaluation of Current Strategies (Sheffield)
Case Study no.21	Estimating Future Requirements for Extra Care Housing (Swindon)
Case Study no.22	‘The Generation Project’: a sure start for older people in Manchester
Case Study no.23	Developing ECH in Cheshire: the PFI route

The Housing LIN welcomes contributions on a range of issues pertinent to Extra Care housing. If there is a subject that you feel should be addressed, please contact us.

Published by:
Housing Learning & Improvement Network
Health and Social Care Change Agent Team
Department of Health, 2nd Floor
Wellington House
135-155 Waterloo Road
London SE1 8UG

www.changeagentteam.org.uk/housing

Administration:
Housing LIN, c/o EAC
3rd Floor
89 Albert Embankment
London SE1 7TP
020 7820 1682
housinglin@cat.csip.org.uk