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Foreword

In 2015, Stroud District Council (SDC) commissioned Ark Consultancy to undertake an in-depth review of its sheltered housing accommodation, to assess the viable options for achieving a sustainable sheltered housing service and to advise on a modernisation strategy. This work followed on from a review carried out by the Chartered Institute of Housing in 2014 which provided a detailed assessment of the sheltered housing support service.

The findings of the Ark Report ‘Sheltered Housing - Getting Better, Getting Fit for the Future’ (Appendix A) resulted in the Council committing to a 10 year modernisation programme which is now in its third year. Within the Ark Report, a number of schemes were categorised as ‘red’ and were considered unsuitable for older people’s accommodation. The Council agreed to dispose of a number of these sites, in order to generate income which is required to reinvest in the redevelopment of some of the red sites to provide better quality, more energy efficient older people and general needs accommodation. The money is also being reinvested in the ‘green’ and ‘amber’ schemes to improve the quality of accommodation and to make it more attractive for current tenants and also future tenants who may wish to downsize. A number of the amber schemes were identified as ‘consider for an alternative use’ therefore in response to this, the Council set up a number of working groups to explore what these alternative uses might be.

This five year Strategy has been developed as a result of the Ark Report and subsequent working groups views to support the delivery of the modernisation programme and to deliver SDC’s vision for its older people’s accommodation in the district. Delivery of the Council’s vision will make its older people’s accommodation more attractive into the future and which will also provide a positive impact on the number of households who wish to downsize - in turn freeing up some of our much needed suitable family accommodation.

SDC knows that the increasing older population is also becoming more diverse, and more people are living into very old age which brings a number of challenges in terms of health and support. It also acknowledges that people’s aspirations for their lives as they age, are changing too. The services SDC commissions and provides, and the way in which it does so, will have to evolve to meet these changing needs and aspirations.

SDC owns a portfolio of 5,071 affordable homes throughout the district. Within this stock, there are over 700 properties which form part of 26 sheltered housing schemes, and are currently let specifically for older people over the age of 60. There are also a number of bungalows and ground floor flats, which are let as general needs accommodation that are also suitable for older people or people with physical needs.

All of SDC’s sheltered housing schemes have communal facilities, such as a communal lounge, kitchen and laundry, some of which are under utilised, and could create additional accommodation which would assist in meeting the increasing need for older people’s housing.

The Council recognises the demographic shift highlighted in the Ark Report, which anticipates a significant increase in the ageing population over the next 20 years. The report confirmed that 41% of households in Stroud are made up of only older people (age 55 and over) and that
Stroud is likely to see an increase of approximately 78.5% of single people of pensionable age retiring in the district. Due to the popularity of the district to people of pensionable age, this increase is likely to impact Stroud more than any other district in Gloucestershire.

This Strategy is formed in a challenging financial climate; however SDC is committed to delivering its vision of “providing good quality older people’s housing which meets a variety of current and future needs – where people want to live.” SDC commits to delivering adapted housing and services which are good quality and provide value for money, with an emphasis on affordability to the tenant and the Council. SDC would like the homes it owns to ‘enable’ older tenants to live as independently as possible within the resources available.

In order to do this, the Council will need to think creatively about how this can be delivered in times of financial constraint, coupled with the current crisis in personal care services. This Strategy links strongly with Stroud’s Corporate Vision of “making Stroud a better place to live, work and visit for everyone” and the Corporate Delivery Plan 2018-2022 priorities, one of which is to implement the sheltered housing modernisation programme.

This Strategy sets further context about how it has been established and the strategic objectives which need to be achieved to deliver SDC’s vision for its older people’s housing. The action plan provides a list of robust actions to ensure delivery of this Strategy, in turn achieving SDC’s vision.

Councillor Chas Townley and Councillor Jenny Miles

Chair & Vice Chair of Housing Committee
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1. Our Local Landscape

The Stroud District is a largely rural area covering 175 square miles in the south of Gloucestershire. Much of the eastern half of the district falls into the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which covers just over 50% of the District’s total land area. The district has a rich built heritage, including 42 conservation areas in a wide variety of towns and villages each of which are unique in character.

Stroud has a population of 118,130 (2017) and over 50,000 households. There are currently 47,640 private homes in the district with 5,071 properties in the ownership of the council and 1,640 housing association homes. The population is predicted to grow to 136,000 by 2041. There are currently over 600 people currently on the waiting list that would be eligible for older people’s accommodation.

There are currently 21,114 young people (aged 0 – 15), 70,802 working age adults and 26,214 retirement age adults. The increase of people of pensionable age is anticipated to rise significantly in the future as a result of rising life expectancy and the demographic impacts of two generations of baby boomers.

The Stroud district benefits from a vibrant community spirit, offering a mix of culture and countryside. The towns benefit from a range of independent cafes and shops all set in a picturesque location, which is proving to be a popular choice to live and retire in, particularly with the larger towns of Cheltenham, Cirencester and Gloucester not far away.

2. The Corporate Context

The Council’s Corporate Delivery Plan 2018-22 (CDP) was published in 2018 (https://www.stroud.gov.uk/council-and-democracy/corporate-plans-and-policies/corporate-delivery-plan-cdp). New challenges for our housing stock include; customer affordability issues arising from welfare reforms, increasing customer expectations, increasing demand and the need to provide more sustainable homes against the backdrop of recent legislative reforms which have significantly affected income streams from 2016-2020. The Council’s key priorities contained in the CDP are:

- **Economy** – help people and businesses grow the local economy and increase employment;
- **Affordable Housing** – provide affordable, decent and social housing;
- **Environment** – help the community minimise its carbon footprint, adapt to climate change and recycle more;
- **Resources** – provide value for money to our taxpayers and high quality services to our customers;
- **Health and Wellbeing** – promote the health and wellbeing of our communities and work with others to deliver the public health agenda.

The Older People’s Housing Strategy supports the CDP and includes key strategic objectives and targets for our sheltered housing assets and appropriate general needs stock to ensure they provide good quality accommodation for older people. It also provides detail on our future
investment strategy through the sheltered modernisation programme and the effect this will have on our assets. The diagram below reflects how the Strategy fits within the wider corporate context.

Diagram 2.1  Link to wider corporate context
3. Setting Our Vision

The subsequent need to set a vision and a strategy for our older people’s accommodation for the next five years was founded on the Ark Report (2015) and the Council’s commitment to deliver the sheltered modernisation programme. SDC completed the improvements to the first scheme in 2018 which opened further discussion about which improvements were priorities and what our older people’s accommodation should be delivering for current and future tenants. The sheltered modernisation programme is fundamental to improving the health and wellbeing of our older tenants. The improvements to the internal and external environment of the first scheme completed (Sherborne House, Stonehouse) had a positive impact on the tenants living there (for example, the construction of external paths not only enabled tenants to access the back door of their property using a mobility scooter for those with mobility constraints; it also provided a space for tenants to walk around outside, so that they could enjoy the benefits of fresh air, sunshine and the opportunity to chat to neighbours, all of which have a profound effect on an individuals’ sense of health and wellbeing.)

A Vision & Strategy group was formed (Terms of Reference Appendix B) with a variety of officers across the council to examine the challenges for older people in the future, particularly during a time of austerity and reduced spend on care and support; with a greater onus on enabling people to live independently in their homes for longer. The focus of this group was solely on current and future SDC tenants, and how some of the future challenges may be overcome. Together a vision was proposed with a number of areas identified which needed further examination and consideration.

One of the objectives was to form a Task & Finish Group (Terms of Reference Appendix C) comprised of elected councillors and officers. The purpose of the group was to explore the expectations of the ‘next generation’ in relation to the council’s older people’s accommodation, which was a recommendation within the Ark Report. In order to follow up on this recommendation, the group commissioned a telephone survey of 500 Stroud district residents which was undertaken by Future Focus Research. The questions in the survey were carefully considered to establish what people want from their accommodation as they age. The survey was open to anyone over the age of 18 and was structured so that all age groups were proportionally represented.

The results of the survey have been fed into this Strategy, so that the council is delivering older people’s accommodation across its stock which is as closely aligned to the expectations of the next generation as resources will allow (summarised in Appendix D).
4. Our Vision

The vision proposed by the Vision & Strategy group is:

“*To provide good quality older people’s housing which meets a variety of current and future needs – where people want to live.*”

In order to achieve this vision, the Council must set strategic objectives, supported by a robust action plan which can be monitored and reviewed on a regular basis.

5. Consultation - What Future Customers Want

The survey commissioned by the Task and Finish Group provided useful, tangible feedback for SDC. The detailed findings of the survey are contained within the ‘Older People's Accommodation Research’ produced by Future Focus Research (*Appendix D*). A summary of some of the key findings are as follows:

- The survey found that two thirds of residents perceived the term ‘Sheltered Housing’ to be associated with older person’s accommodation where 24 hour care is provided. There have been a number of changes to the sheltered housing service over the past 5 years, and the results of the survey suggest that there is a need to re-brand sheltered housing with something which reflects the current service on offer.
- The survey confirmed that 61% of residents interviewed plan to retire in the Stroud district, with the majority having access to friends/family and/or social groups in the area.
- Accessibility and security in and around the home are important to most residents, with good access to healthcare and support services a high priority. When asked what else the communal lounge could be used for, health clinics were the most popular choice.
- The use of communal spaces by outside groups was not as popular, with only 37% of residents believing this would be a good idea – this could be partly due to the priority of living in a secure environment and uncertainty about who would be using the space.
- Access to Wi-Fi in communal areas was considered a priority by 77% of residents interviewed. SDC currently provides Wi-Fi access to tenants in all communal lounges and it is important that this is retained to ensure tenants are able to connect with friends and family.
- Parking and external communal space was important to most residents, which suggests that access to external green space is essential for health and wellbeing as people age as well as the independence which cars provide.
• When asked about various elements in the home which could be provided to enable individuals to live independently, the highest priority was a walk in shower/wet room, however all the elements identified in the question were considered either very important or fairly important to residents.
• The majority of those over the age of 55 had made plans for their accommodation needs for old age.

As a result of these findings, the Task and Finish Group made a number of recommendations to Housing Committee in February 2019 (https://www.stroud.gov.uk/media/971200/item-6b-older-persons-strategy-task-and-finish-group-final-report.pdf), which were approved for inclusion in this Strategy. A summary of the recommendations are detailed below:

• Work towards the development of a range of accommodation for older people, rather than ‘one size fits all’. This may involve the re-designation of some schemes which could potentially be linked to a hub scheme to ensure that access to services is not lost.
• Re-brand Sheltered Housing.
• Improve awareness of our Independent Living options to encourage households to downsize – schemes should become more desirable as a result of the sheltered modernisation programme which is improving communal areas and accessibility to these spaces.
• Consider conversion of communal areas, which are not utilised, to additional accommodation where those communal areas are not suitable to offer genuinely desired facilities for both residents and older people in the vicinity.
• Seek areas of improvement to the Council’s Corporate Asset Management Strategy to ensure that SDC’s older people’s schemes and general needs accommodation enables rather than disables – allowing tenants to live as independently as possible.
• The Older People’s Housing Strategy should seek to enhance partnership working with external agencies to improve support and care provision across the district.
• Undertake further visits to other affordable housing providers to examine the range of accommodation and best practice on offer.
• Carry out focus groups with existing tenants to further examine specific areas within the survey.

These recommendations have been developed into this Strategy, along with the Task and Finish Group’s input into the strategic objectives.

6. Strategic Objectives

Although the issues that face SDC are not uncommon to other local authorities the vibrancy and variety of the local landscape which includes a mix of rural and urban areas, alongside the demographic of our population, do present SDC with some unique challenges. A few of these challenges are, social isolation, access to health and support services, transport links, access to retail and leisure facilities and the lack of a range of good quality older people’s accommodation.
In response to these challenges, and to achieve the Council’s vision, this Strategy seeks to deliver six strategic objectives:

**U N I Q U E**

1. Understand what current and future tenants want from their homes as they age and how this can be achieved.

2. New homes should be designed to be dynamic allowing flexibility and adaptability for the future.

3. Increase the desirability of our older people’s accommodation to encourage downsizing and improve the lives of tenants.

4. Quality homes which provide a range of options which 'enable' tenants to live independently for longer.

5. Understand how affordable our homes and services are for our tenants and SDC.

6. Engage with other agencies and community groups to improve partnership working; reducing social isolation and improving health and wellbeing.

The Council recognises that a number of local authorities and housing associations have undertaken similar reviews in recent years. Whilst it is felt that there is good practice that can be replicated, SDC also understands that the district itself is unique and diverse, therefore it may require a different approach to other housing providers.

The six strategic objectives will provide the ‘unique’ approach that Stroud needs to future proof its older people’s accommodation, to meet the needs and aspirations of its current and future tenants.

These strategic objectives will shape Stroud’s housing stock to provide a range of accommodation which is suitable for a diverse group of older people, whilst remaining affordable in the longer term. The key objectives highlighted should also assist with the crisis in personal care, by enabling tenants to live independently in their homes for as long as possible.
7. Our Range of Accommodation

Currently SDC offers older people's housing in the form of general needs or sheltered housing schemes with a mix of accommodation such as flats, bungalows and houses. Tenants in sheltered housing schemes pay a standard service charge across all schemes, which isn’t necessarily reflective of the service provided by the council and in some cases is heavily subsidised.

The new model proposed, as a result of the consultation undertaken with Stroud residents and the Task and Finish Group’s recommendations will create a range of accommodation options for tenants. This will provide choice for future customers who may not need all of the services provided at a hub scheme and may not wish to pay for services they do not use or need. The new model is set out below:

![Diagram 7.1 Transitional Model - Reflects New Range of Accommodation](image)

The Strategy recommends that to achieve this new model, each scheme is reviewed and categorised as one of the following; 'Independent Living Hub', 'Independent Living +' or 'Independent Living' with a new service charge which is reflective of the service provided in each of the schemes. The service charges will need to be made clear to current and future tenants so that there is complete transparency about the costs of the service. The delivery of this Strategy needs to be undertaken alongside the service charge project and could result in decreases or
increases in service charges. Where possible, the schemes also need to be spread geographically to ensure a range of options in as many areas as possible and to avoid a concentration of hubs in specific areas. The key criteria of the accommodation ranges are:

**Independent Living Hub**
- Communal lounge which can also be used for health clinics, police surgeries and activities for tenants of the scheme whilst also offering this service out to outlying properties which could be affiliated with the scheme
- 100% provision (or as close as possible) of mobility scooter storage and charging points
- Level access provided throughout the building and externally
- Visiting Site Officer
- Support Coordinator visiting as needed

**Independent Living +**
- Communal lounge where tenants can socialise to reduce social isolation
- Improved provision of scooter storage and charging
- These schemes may not benefit from level access
- Visiting Site Officer
- Support Coordinator visiting as needed

**Independent Living**
- No communal lounge - this will be used to create additional accommodation where possible
- Visiting Site Officer
- Support Coordinator can be contacted if needed

---

**Associated Suitable Outlying General Needs Properties**
- There is the potential to incorporate any general needs properties suitable for older people (e.g. bungalows) to any of the Independent Living schemes identified above. This would allow general needs residents access to the enhanced services provided at the Independent Living schemes. This would help to support the future viability of social activities provided at Independent Living schemes.
This diagram shows how the range of accommodation could operate as a hub and spoke model.

- Independent Living Hub schemes will be located around the district with a range of Independent Living + and Independent Living schemes also provided in that locality where possible.
- Independent Living Hubs will be the centre of the Independent Living community for their area. Social activities such as health and wellbeing clinics and recreational events will be organised and held at these schemes and extended to wider residents.
- The residents at Independent Living + schemes would be invited to join in any group activities in the Hub schemes, however they would also benefit from a communal lounge at their own scheme allowing them the ability to socialise, building neighbourly relations and a support network.
- The Independent Living schemes would not have any communal lounge, however they would also be invited to use the Hub or IL + communal lounges and attend any social activities, this will ensure that residents living at these schemes have the opportunity to live independently but still have the ability to socialise when it suits them.
- Any suitable outlying properties, such as existing general needs bungalows which surround Independent Living schemes, could also be given the opportunity to attend activities at the Hub extending the community network.

**Diagram 7.2  Hub & Spoke Model**

**HUB = Independent Living Hub**

**IL + = Independent Living +**

**IL = Independent Living**

**OP = Outlying Properties (general needs bungalows)**
8. Monitoring and Review

Monitoring of the Action Plan:

This action plan (*Appendix E*) will provide a robust method of monitoring delivery of the strategic objectives to achieve the Council’s vision for its older people’s accommodation.

The action plan will be monitored on a bi-monthly basis by the Head of Housing Services, with progress made being reported on an annual basis to Housing Committee.

Review of the Strategy & Action Plan:

The strategy and the action plan should be reviewed fully by the Head of Housing Services by April 2021, with any changes to the strategy reported to Housing Committee.
Document Owner: Kevin Topping, Head of Housing Services

Date for Review: April 2021
Appendix A

Ark Report 2015

‘Sheltered Housing – Getting Better, Getting Fit for the Future’
1. **Introduction**

1.1 Stroud District Council commissioned Ark to carry out an in-depth review of its sheltered housing portfolio to assess the viable options for achieving a sustainable sheltered housing service and to advise on a modernisation strategy. The review involved a number of carefully sequenced steps including:

- A ‘document review’ of the Council’s plans and those of key stakeholders, including Gloucestershire County Council, to understand strategic context;
- A review of stock information including investment plans and forecasts, repairs history and void times and costs;
- Undertaking on-site inspections of the schemes to assess its physical characteristics, the scheme’s setting and neighbourhood surroundings;
- Reviewing the ‘market’ - the location of alternative ‘competing’ provision and likely demand for sheltered housing in the future; and
- Considering the available options and producing a preferred option for each scheme that forms part of an overarching strategy.

2. **Scheme profile**

2.1 The Council’s sheltered housing stock consists of 788 homes in 28 schemes. Almost all the schemes are purpose built and all are at least 25 years old. Over 40 per cent was built over 45 years ago, in the 1960s.

2.2 The stock at an individual scheme level is diverse. Half the schemes comprise of purpose built blocks containing solely flats, while almost a third (32 per cent) comprises a combination of both flats and bungalows. Four schemes (14 per cent) contain just bungalows.

2.3 In terms of size, almost three quarters of the homes have one bedroom. Bedsits account for around 11 per cent and bungalows account for almost 40 per cent of the stock. Only 5 per cent of homes have more than one bedroom. The distribution of the schemes across the district is shown below:
3. **Resident profile**

3.1 Demographic changes mean that sheltered housing tenants are increasingly diverse with a much wider range of expectations, needs and ages. Sheltered housing tenants in 2015 are older and frailer than those who lived in the schemes when originally built – often living with dementia or chronic ill-health. For example, 11 schemes have more than 10 per cent of the residents aged over 90 while nine schemes have more than 40 per cent of residents aged over 80.

3.2 Alongside demographic changes, allocation policies mean that younger people are moving into sheltered housing, some having no care or support needs but others have complex needs, such as substance misuse or with a history of homelessness. Stroud has 3 schemes where more than 10 per cent of residents are aged under 60.

3.3 These ‘imbalances’ make it harder to provide a service that meets all tenants needs and aspirations. Willow Road - a scheme with 24 units serves as an example of this trend. This scheme has over a quarter of residents over 80 and a quarter under 60. Interestingly over 16 per cent of residents are currently working.

4. **The local housing market**

4.1 Stroud district has a population of 112,779 (2011 census) of which 21,977 (around 20 per cent) are aged 65 and over – higher than the Gloucestershire average. The population has increased by 5 per cent in the last decade with the number of over 65s expected to increase by over 60 per cent by 2031.

4.2 Most UK household growth is driven by older people. Overall, 41.0 per cent of households in Stroud are made up of only older people (aged 55 or over) and a further 11.7 per cent contain both older and non-older people. Older people in Stroud are slightly more likely than average to live in social rented housing.

4.3 Analysis carried out by GCC in 2012 on the need for older people’s services identified significant projected growth in the 65+ and 85+ populations over the next 10 years (shown below).

4.4 In Stroud a significant source of growth in household numbers is the projected increase in the number of single people of pensionable age by 78.5% and 2+ pensioner households by 52.9%. This in part reflects Stroud’s appeal to older people. For example, about a third (31 per cent) of market demand across the Stroud and Dursley area originates from retired households.

4.5 In total there are 844 households registered for accommodation suited to older households on the Gloucestershire Homeseeker database - 493 where the head of
household is aged over 65 and a further 351 in the 55-64 age bracket. Over half (58 per cent) of the 65+ group specifically require ground floor accommodation. This means that almost 6 out of every 10 ‘typical’ applicants for sheltered housing (aged 65+) would not wish to be housed in first floor flats at a number of the Council’s homes for example, at Glebelands, Ringfield Close and Jenner Court.

4.6 Overall, we believe that there are over 2000 sheltered homes serving Stroud. This figure includes other ‘competing’ schemes that fall within a natural catchment area that goes beyond the postcode and Stroud’s geographical boundaries.

4.7 The level of competing provision is very high in some areas. For example, in the GL2 area in the north which includes parts of the Gloucester urban area including Hardwicke, the Council’s stock consists of less than 10 per cent of the available provision for rent. Over 30 per cent of sheltered housing provision that may serve residents in the district is found in this postcode area. In addition, competing provision is high in the GL5 postcode area covering Stroud and GL6 which includes Nailsworth and Minchinhampton.

5. Communication and Consultation

5.1 As part of any review of this nature one of the major challenges is to engage with all the stakeholders in an appropriate and timely way. The Council’s ‘Older Persons Housing Project Board’ decided it was best to defer detailed consultation until the outcomes of the review were completed and ‘at risk’ schemes identified. In this way, we will be able to talk to residents, their families/advocates in a more informed and constructive way, encouraging greater ownership and empowerment of residents and in turn leading to increased satisfaction and individual well-being.

5.3 Ark also met with some key external and internal stakeholders over the course of our assignment. The key findings from the consultation are set out in the main report.

6. Asset performance

6.1 Stroud provided void data for the last three years for each of the schemes. This allowed us to review the performance of the schemes from a number of perspectives.

6.2 Our key findings are as follows:

- Repair numbers and costs too high in some schemes
- Void costs in small number of schemes consistently high
- Turnover in some schemes over 20 per cent
- ‘Demand’ problems in some schemes (bedsit and unit size)
- Void times can be too long and some schemes have long-term voids
- The Council needs to ensure its plans are based on robust stock condition data

7. Scheme Assessments

7.1 The most significant stage of this review was the assessment of the schemes. This involved reviewing the asset performance data and local housing market information collected. Most importantly, this stage was informed by an on-site inspection and discussions with local staff.

7.2 Each scheme inspection involves an appraisal of the schemes from a number of perspectives illustrated in the figure below.
7.3 Schemes were categorised using a simple traffic light (Red/Ampber/Green) system to reflect the degree of ‘risk’ they present to Stroud’s ongoing business. The breakdown of results is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Number of Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RED</td>
<td>Cambridge House, Dryleaze Court, Glebelands, Ringfield Close, Willow Road (5 schemes)</td>
<td>173 homes – (57 of 86 bedsits) 22 per cent of homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED/AMBER</td>
<td>Burdett House (1 scheme)</td>
<td>25 homes (6 bedsits) 3 per cent of homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBER</td>
<td>Archway Gardens, Ashcroft House, Chapel Lane, Concord, George Pearce House and Trinity Drive, Grange View, Grove Park Road, Jenner Court, Malvern Gardens, Sherborne House, Springsfields Court, The Beeches, Vizard Close (13 schemes)</td>
<td>336 homes 43 per cent of homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>Ashwell House, Broadfield Road, Draycott, Dryleaze House, Hamfallow Court, Hazelwood, The Corriett, St Nicholas Court, Walter Preston Court (9 schemes)</td>
<td>254 homes 32 per cent of homes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4 The recommendations based on the findings are that:
- 13 schemes including almost half of homes are retained in the longer term in their current form to continue providing older people’s housing. These should benefit from improvements such as:
  - Improving communal entrance, lounge and garden;
  - Creation of scooter stores and improving car parking; and
  - Lift installation where practicable
- 5 schemes are improved for an alternative use. These schemes are not suited to specialist older people’s housing. However, they are probably sustainable as ‘age-exclusive’ or ‘age preferred’ for people aged 50+.
- 3 schemes should be remodelled for continued older people’s use. To ensure these schemes are fit for the future the Council needs to invest in remodelling to
address problems around the quality of the ‘offer’. In this way, the modernised schemes will better meet the needs of older people and ensure they are sustainable in the longer-term. Typical works proposed include:

- Remove bedsits and improve space standards;
- Introduce some 2 bed accommodation; and
- Maximising return by converting ‘specialist’ facilities or other assets

- One scheme should be remodelled for alternative use. In this case the scheme, Chapel Lane, is best suited to return to more general needs provision - probably ‘age-exclusive’ for people aged 50+. Opportunities for redevelopment to provide additional units and revenue returns should also be explored on this site.

- 6 schemes should be decommissioned as older people’s housing. The performance and quality of these schemes is poor and remodelling to meet modern and future needs is not an economic or practical solution. Our presumption is that most of these sites could form part of the Council’s active development programme although a more detailed feasibility study is needed to make an informed decision on redevelopment or disposal.

7.5 Ark has completed a breakdown by scheme of the outline costs to deliver a programme flowing from the preferred option. The total cost is £4,678,800 which captures the improvements or remodelling identified and associated fees. The Council should test the proposed capital costs, unit changes and revenue impacts of the programme with its HRA Business Plan in order better to gauge its capacity to support the proposed changes.

7.6 Below is a ‘pen picture’ review of the Council’s highest risk schemes.

**Burdett House, Stonehouse GL10 2LS**

**Burdett House** was built in 1977 in a predominantly residential area approximately 1 mile away from Stonehouse. It consists of 25 homes – 6 small bedsits, 10 one person flats, (8 can accommodate two people) and 9 one bed bungalows of which 3 are big enough for two people. The flats and bungalows are in a linked block with 8 properties in a lower section away from the main scheme and communal areas.

Car parking is satisfactory but the scheme is not served by a local bus service. This means that some residents (over a quarter of whom are over 80) find it difficult to access local amenities (shops, GPs, PO etc.) and relevant activities.

Access around the scheme is difficult for some less mobile residents. There is no scooter store and the site is sloping. Access to communal facilities for lower section residents is via an external path or a stairlift in the main corridor.

The overall quality of accommodation at Burdett House is poor – although homes have benefitted from improvements the bedsits are small and relatively unpopular. Although there is little ‘competing’ provision the area is well-served by alternative Council accommodation. These factors contribute to very long void times and high level of refusals.

The number and cost of repairs raised each year appear satisfactory. The communal lounge, although well used has an unwelcoming ‘institutional’ feel.
Cambridge House, Dursley GL11 4AZ

Cambridge House is in Dursley in a residential area close to the town centre. It consists of 20 homes - 18 one-bed bungalows, 4 of which can accommodate two people and 2 bedsits. The former wardens’ flat has been converted to create two first floor flats. It was built in 1962 with bungalows arranged as a long terrace accessed off a rear open walkway.

The scheme is not popular and ‘lettability’ is difficult despite being set in an attractive site that is well-maintained and well located for easy access to local amenities. The décor, fixtures and fittings in the communal lounge and kitchen are dated.

There is a high number of long-standing residents with a third over 80 and with 15 per cent over 90. Despite this, the turnover of tenancies and the number of refusals are high. The most common reasons given for refusals are that the property or area is unsuitable or the home is too small.

The overall design and construction falls well below modern standards. Homes are often small, badly arranged with poor natural lighting and insulation. The number of repairs appears satisfactory but repair costs are relatively high which may reflect the age and construction of the scheme.
Categorisation for Action: Red
Preferred Option: Redevelop/Dispose

Dryleaze Court, Wotton-under-Edge GL12 7BA

**Dryleaze Court** was built in 1969 in an attractive residential area close to the town centre and local amenities. There are 63 homes in total, 21 one-bed bungalows, (18 big enough for two people), 21 one-bed flats, 3 two-bed flats and 18 small bedsits.

Dryleaze Court benefits from close proximity to a range of local shops and other amenities. However, access to and from the town is difficult for some residents due to a very steep hill. Despite this, there is no scooter store and limited car parking. This is particularly important as over a third of existing residents are over 80.

Dryleaze Court’s biggest weakness is the poor quality of accommodation. There is a high concentration of bedsits which are small and difficult to let. The scheme itself is relatively unattractive with some evidence of under investment in maintenance and decorative repair.

The number of repairs carried out and spend on repairs and voids are in line with the expected benchmark but arguably lower than the scheme needs. Some homes do not currently meet the Decent Homes Standard and some first floor flats are not served by a lift. Consequently, Dryleaze Court has 18 long-term voids with an average void time of over 850 days.
Glebelands, Cam, Dursley, Gloucestershire, GL11 5NE

Glebelands was built in 1969 and comprises 40 homes of which 23 are bedsits. There are 12 one-bed flats mostly big enough for two people, four two-bedroom flats and 1 one-bed bungalow which can accommodate two people.

The scheme is in a good location, close to the town centre which has lots of amenities including a nearby medical centre. The location does mean that car parking at times can be difficult. A range of communal facilities are provided although they need updating to make them more appealing.

The scheme’s sloping topography and layout with connecting corridors and steps can make access difficult for some residents (over a quarter are over 80). There is no lift access to the first floor or a suitably sited scooter store.

These issues contribute to a high number of refusals, long-term voids and some very long void times. Turnover in the scheme is also very high which is likely to be a reflection of the large number of small bedsits.

The number of repairs carried out is in line with the expected benchmark and the data suggests repairs spend is very low. The reliability of this data should be reviewed as we do not believe that all homes currently meet the minimum Decent Homes Standard.

Ringfield Close, Nailsworth GL6 0HY

Ringfield, Close (including Tanners Piece and Upper Park Road) was built in 1963 in a largely residential area. The split site comprises 26 homes made up of 16 flats, 4 of which have two bedrooms and 10 bungalows, 2 of which have two bedrooms.

All the homes are pebble-dashed Reema ‘Hollow-land’ – a “non-traditional” construction form built to address the acute housing shortage in the post-war era.
The properties are ‘as built’ with patch repairs and some remedial work carried out to sustain their ongoing use.

Inevitably, these homes experience a very high level of repairs and spend. This presents a number of risks to the Council and will continue to do so without significant investment to protect the structure and fabric of homes.

The properties are spacious and in a popular location. The large communal lounge is regularly used. However, turnover of tenancies is high. Car parking is insufficient for resident’s needs, there is no lift access to first floor flats and the scooter store does not meet modern standards.

Willow Road, Stonehouse GL10 2DS

Willow Road comprises 1 one-bed (2-person) flat and 23 one bed bungalows, some small studio-style and 10 that can accommodate two people. It was built in 1965 and has a diverse resident population with over a quarter of residents over 80 and a quarter under 60.

The scheme has an unusual arrangement – sitting as an’ island’ at the centre of a relatively unpopular housing estate surrounded by roads on all sides.

The location means that some residents may feel concerned about safety and security. In addition, access to local shops and amenities is difficult for some residents (about 10-15 minutes’ walk to nearest bus stop, GP and Post Office).

The bungalows themselves form a linked triangular shape with the communal facilities including a relatively small lounge easily accessed at the centre.

Homes often have narrow doorways with raised entrance thresholds. Some of the homes suffer from disrepair and need investment in external elements such as fascias, soffits and windows.

Tenancy turnover is high and the smaller bungalows can be hard to let.
8. Recommendations

8.1 To assist the Council we would make the following interim recommendations subject to further discussion and scoping with the Council.

- Consider the draft report and the findings
- Begin process to conduct the design feasibility work
- Work with residents to set the 'Stroud standard' for sheltered housing and improvement and remodelling plans
- Work with partners to improve local knowledge on ‘demand’
- Improve financial performance and make best use of assets by:
  - understanding stock condition, unit costs and lifecycles
  - Address long-term voids and reduce ‘avoidable’ turnover
- Further improve service quality and efficiency by:
  - Fully understanding service charges
  - Explore opportunities around hub activities
- Develop a clear communication plan
Appendix B
Vision & Strategy Group
‘Terms of Reference’
Older Person’s Strategy – Vision & Strategy Group

Terms of Reference

1. Members:
Kimberley Read, Sheltered Housing Project Manager
Chris Horwood, Project Officer
Lynne Mansell, Principal Sheltered Housing Officer
Emma Keating-Clark, Health & Wellbeing Development Co-ordinator
Lucy Clothier, Principal Accountant
Tim Power, Head of Business Service Planning
Pippa Stroud, Policy Implementation Manager
Laura Stephen, Senior Housing Strategy Officer
Philip Bishop, Housing Advice Manager

2. Purpose of Group:
To collectively share and explore ideas and knowledge, leading to the development of a strategy to address the future increased demand in older person’s housing. The strategy also needs to review existing service provision and consider how this might evolve to meet the changing expectations and needs of our ageing population.

3. Objectives of Group:
- To identify ‘the problems’ which SDC are likely to face over the next 10-20 years specifically in relation to the increasing demographic of an ageing population (this relates to the outcomes and findings of the Ark Report June 2015).
- To generate a healthy discussion to develop a draft vision, mission & objectives - suggesting creative solutions to ‘the problems’. The key discussion points will then be developed into one overall draft for further review and debate at the Sheltered Modernisation Steering Group.
- Review and understand the programme for developing the strategy and the implementation phase.
- Start to develop a communication plan for the strategy.
- Agree some key action points between the group to move the draft strategy forward.
Appendix C

Task & Finish Group

‘Terms of Reference’
Older Person’s Strategy – Task & Finish Group

Terms of Reference

1. Members & Officers:

Cllr Jenny Miles, Labour Party (Chair)
Cllr Chas Townley, Labour Party
Cllr Norman Kay, Green Party
Cllr Julie Job, Conservative Party
Cllr Phil McAsey, Conservative Party
Ian Allan, Tenant Representative (optional)
Sadie Tazewell, Tenant Representative (optional)

Kimberley Read, Sheltered Housing Project Manager
Chris Horwood, Project Officer
Petula Davis, Principal Projects Officer
Lynne Mansell, Principal Sheltered Housing Officer
Lucy Clothier, Principal Accountant
Chris Eadie, Tenant Liaison Officer (additional resource if required)

2. Scope of Group:

“To explore the expectations of the ‘next generation’ in relation to SDC’s older people’s housing.”

The outcomes should enable SDC to develop an Older Person’s Housing offer for its’ current and future stock. The housing offer should be fit for purpose now and for future tenants and should enable flexibility within the stock to adapt to future demands.

The remit of the group does not extend to looking at new build sites, or sites for extra care. It is solely focussed on SDC’s housing stock and does not cover private sector housing.

3. Sources of Information:

There are a variety of methods of gathering information, for example:

- Telephone survey (500 respondents) company would be procured and demographics considered when selecting numbers (phone survey company would analyse the feedback).
- Online survey – based on our website and linked to Facebook and other social media outlets (SDC would need to analyse feedback).
• Refer to feedback and analysis from the Gloucestershire County Council survey undertaken this year around ‘Housing with Care’.
• Arrange site visits around some of the Sheltered Housing schemes. Invite SDC staff from other service areas and possibly tenants for feedback.

4. **Deadline:**

   The group should work towards the following deadlines:

   • To provide a verbal update at December Housing Committee.
   • Provide a written report at February Housing Committee - the report will need to be ready for legal & financial imps by 15\textsuperscript{th} January 2019 with the final report sent to Democratic Services by 22\textsuperscript{nd} January 2019.

5. **Visits:**

   It is recommended that the Task & Finish Group consider visiting a number of SDC’s Sheltered Housing schemes to understand what the current housing offer for older people looks like. It is also recommended that the group visit Sherborne House, Stonehouse which has been modernised recently as a pilot project. This will help the group to understand what can be achieved. Schemes to visit should be agreed at the first meeting.
Appendix D
Future Focus Research
‘Older People’s Accommodation Research’
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1. **Approach to research**

1.1 **Research objectives**

Stroud District Council commissioned Future Focus Research to seek the views of residents and tenants in the Stroud district, to find out what they would like from their accommodation to ensure that it is fit for purpose now and for the future.

1.2 **Methodology**

The research consisted of 500 ten minute telephone interviews with local residents. All interviews were conducted with a representative sample of residents aged 18 and over who live in the Stroud District Council area. The sample was based on the quota controls below, which reflect the demographic makeup of the Stroud District Council area. In addition, to ensure the views were obtained from individuals from all areas of the district, we targeted a proportionate number of interviews in each of the local areas, as follows:
- Gloucester Border Areas
- Stroud Central
- Stroud Border Areas, including Nailsworth
- Stonehouse
- Dursley
- Wotton-Under-Edge
- Berkeley

These areas are grouped together based on the Royal Mail post towns – see Appendix A for details of the postcodes. In addition to area, quotas were also set on age and gender as shown in table 1.1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - 34</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 54</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 74</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questionnaire was designed in conjunction with the Council to ensure the research was able to deliver the intended objectives. Interviews were conducted by a team of trained interviewers.

A sample size of 500 gives a margin of error of +/-4.4% at the 95% confidence interval. Therefore, if 50% of respondents give an answer to a question, we can be sure that the true value lies somewhere between 45.6% and 54.4%.

Please note where charts do not add up to 100 this is due to one of two reasons:
- The question was a multiple choice and respondents may have been given more than one answer
- Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percentage and therefore the total presented in the chart may sum to slightly more or less than 100%.

1.3 **Who did we interview?**

The profile of the 500 interviews is shown in table 1.2 below.

Table 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester Border Areas</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroud Central</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroud Border Areas</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonehouse</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dursley</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wotton-under-Edge</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 – 34</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 54</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 74</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Working status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working status</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed in Stroud district</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed outside Stroud district</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed and actively looking for paid employment</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed but not looking for paid employment</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school/college/university</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g. house person, carer)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White or White British</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where there are differences between any of the demographics, these have been highlighted in the report.
2. Summary

This section provides an overview of the findings of this survey:

**Context**
- 61% definitely plan to retire in the Stroud DC area. Although those who are uncertain about their plans, not surprisingly, increases as age decreases
- Encouragingly the vast majority of those over the age of 55 know what their accommodation plans are for when they retire.
- The majority of residents have access to friends/family and/or social groups in Stroud DC

**Perception of the Term ‘Sheltered Housing’**
- Two thirds associated the term sheltered housing with older person’s accommodation where 24 hour care is provided

**Preference for Rural Town or Market Parish**
- Over a half don’t currently have a preference for rural areas or a market town
- Of the remainder 30% preferred a market town and 12% preferred a rural parish

**Accommodation Needs**
- All elements within the home were considered to be important by at least three quarters of residents
- Most important was a walk-in shower room and an intelligent alarm system
- When asked about communal facilities, the most important was parking and communal gardens
- Most respondents were not willing to pay extra for any facilities

**Access to Services**
- Access to care and support services, shops, healthcare and transport were all considered to be important by the vast majority
- Access to leisure facilities was of lesser importance
- Opinion was divided on whether they would be prepared to travel to access facilities, but older residents were less likely

**The Community**
- Security (both within the building and the groups) was important to most as was living amongst people their own age
  - *Mixed communities* were of much lower importance

**Communal Lounges**
- Health clinics were the most popular choice for use of communal areas
- Just a third were in favour of letting communal areas to outside groups
3. Survey Findings

3.1 Context

The following questions regarding retirement plans were asked at the end of the survey to ensure that they did not influence the respondent’s decision to take part in the survey or their response to any subsequent questions. However, we feel the findings from these questions are best presented upfront, as they provide a context to the results.

Respondents were asked whether they plan to retire within the Stroud District Council area. Overall, 61% said that they were, 9% said that they weren’t, and 30% did not know. See figure 3.1.

![Figure 3.1](image)

Perhaps not surprisingly, the percentage planning to retire within the Stroud area rises with age, from 12% of those aged 18-34, 49% of 35-54s, 93% of 55 – 74s and to 98% of those aged 75+. Almost three quarters of 18-34 year olds (73%) did not know what their plans for retirement are.

When asked about their housing plans for when they get older, 40% did not know what their plans were (rising to 50% of those aged 35 – 54 and to 93% of those aged 18-34).
One in 20 respondents (5%) currently live in specialist housing for older people, rising to 24% (1 in 4) of those aged 75+. The same percentage (5%) told us that they were planning to move to specialist housing, rising to 9% amongst those aged 55 -74. See figure 3.2.
The vast majority of respondents (96%) said that they had either friends, family or access to social groups in the Stroud area, see figure 3.3.

**Figure 3.3**

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents with various types of support networks in the Stroud District]

**Q11 What family and friends, or other support networks do you have in the Stroud District?**

- I have friends living in Stroud District: 84%
- I have family living in Stroud District: 74%
- I have access to social groups / events in the Stroud District: 59%
- I have access to none of the above: 4%

Base: (500)

3.2 Perceptions of the Term ‘Sheltered Housing’
Over two thirds of respondents (68%) agreed, either strongly or slightly, that the term ‘sheltered housing’ suggests older person’s accommodation where care and support are provided 24 hours a day. See figure 3.4.

Men were slightly more likely than women to agree (73% compared to 64%), as were those aged 35 – 54 (79%) and 18 – 34 (76%).

![Figure 3.4](image)

**Q1 Some people have told us that when they hear the term ‘Sheltered Housing’ it suggests “older person’s accommodation where care and support are provided 24 hours a day with a warden on site” can you tell us whether you agree or disagree with this statement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: (500)

3.3 Preference for Market Town/Rural Location

Respondents were then asked whether they would choose a market town or a rural parish if they were to live in some form of older person’s accommodation in the future. Almost 6 in 10 (58%) did not know where they would choose, this rose to 81% amongst 18 – 34 year olds. Of the remainder, 30% would choose a market town and 12% would choose a rural parish. See figure 3.5.

![Figure 3.5](image)
When asked the reason for their preference, the main reason given for choosing a market town was that it's close to shops/healthcare/amenities (72%) and the main reason given for choosing a rural parish was that they had always lived there (34%), see table 3.1.

### Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons - Market Town (Base: 151)</th>
<th>Reasons - Rural (Base:61)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close to shops/health/amenities</td>
<td>Always lived there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always lived there</td>
<td>Safer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busy/less isolated</td>
<td>Like the countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer</td>
<td>Quieter/Relaxing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near/friends family</td>
<td>Prefer way of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quieter</td>
<td>Near friends/family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Accommodation Needs
Respondents were asked to rate the importance of a list of different elements within their home. Most important was a walk-in shower room with no bath (96% very or fairly important), see figure 3.6. This was followed by:

- An intelligent alarm system (95%)
- Level access into and throughout the property (93%)
- The ability for appliances to be located at a height where it reduces the need to bend (91%)
- Energy efficient lighting and heating reducing the environmental impact (88%)
- A video screen which allows you to see visitors and let them in from the comfort of your home (76%)

Those aged 18-34 were more likely to not know how important each of these elements would be than the other age groups (at least 10%).

Whilst men and women rated most elements equally as important, a video screen was more important to women than men (81% compared to 72%).
Respondents were then asked to rate the importance of a list of communal facilities. Most important was parking (85% very or fairly important) and communal gardens and external space (84%), see figure 3.7. These were followed by:

- Wi-Fi (77%)
- Communal Lounge (71%)
- Mobility scooter store/charging area (65%)
- Multi-media such as television/DVD/music (54%)
- Communal laundry (45%)
- Access to a shared computer (28%)

See Figure 3.7

Those aged 18-34 were more likely to not know how important each of these elements would be than the other age groups (at least 15%). The only other notable age difference was that those over 75 were least likely to consider Wi-Fi as important (56%).

With the exception of Wi-Fi and parking, women were more likely to rate all other facilities as more important than men.

3.5 Paying for Additional Facilities
Respondents were then asked whether they would be willing to pay extra for any facilities. At least a half were not willing to pay extra for any of the facilities, see figure 3.8.

A half (50%) were willing to pay extra for Wi-Fi and 44% were willing to pay extra for maintenance of communal gardens and external space and a mobility scooter store/charging area.

**Figure 3.8**

Those aged 18-34 were most likely to not know if they would be willing to pay extra for facilities (at least 10%).

In general, women were more likely than men to say that they would pay extra for things (with the exception of Wi-Fi).
3.6 Access to Services

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of access to different services in terms of the location of the accommodation. Most important was access to care and support services (98% very or fairly important), shops (97%) and local healthcare facilities (97%). Access to public transport links was important to 91% of respondents. Of least importance was access to local leisure facilities (56%), however, this was more important to those aged 18-34 (69%) and to women (64%).

![Bar chart showing responses to Q6a regarding access to services]

**Figure 3.9**

Just under a half (46%) said that they were prepared to travel to access these facilities, and a similar percentage (48%) said that they would not (6% did not know). Those over 75 were least likely to say they would travel to access facilities with 64% saying that they wouldn’t.
3.7 The Community

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of different elements within the community that they may be living in. Most important was security both within the building (95% very or fairly important) and around the grounds (94%). Living amongst people your own age was important to 79% of respondents. Mixed communities were of much lower importance (31%).

![Chart showing the importance of different community elements.](image)

**Figure 3.10**

As previously, those aged 18-34 were most likely to not know how important each of these elements would be (at least 11%).
3.8 Communal Lounges

Respondents were asked what sort of activities would encourage them to use the communal lounges. *Health clinics* were the most popular option with 90% saying that they would use these. This was followed by *police surgery* (53%), *fitness group* (43%), *games afternoon* (40%), *films nights* (38%) and lastly *dance classes* (21%). See figure 3.11.

**Figure 3.11**

When asked, just 37% think it would be a good idea to let the communal space to outside groups, whilst 47% did not think it was a good idea and 16% did not know.
## Appendix A  Local area postcodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Area Name</th>
<th>Postcodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Gloucester Border areas</td>
<td>GL2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.7, 3.4, 4.0, 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Stroud Central</td>
<td>GL5.1, to GL5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Stroud Border Areas</td>
<td>GL6.0 to GL6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Stonehouse</td>
<td>GL10.2, 10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Dursley</td>
<td>GL11.4 to GL11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Wotton-Under-Edge</td>
<td>GL12.7, 12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>GL13.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Action Plan

‘Older People’s Housing Strategy (HRA)’
Action Plan – Older People’s Housing Strategy (HRA)

This action plan details how the Strategy will be delivered to achieve SDC’s six strategic objectives (UNIQUE) and in turn realise the Council’s vision.

1. **Understand what current and future tenants want from their homes as they age and how this can be achieved.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>How will this be achieved?</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Outcome(s)</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Undertake further analysis and exploration of the results from the Older People’s Accommodation Research to deepen SDC’s understanding of the outcomes. Some areas to explore could include:</td>
<td>Undertake focussed user groups with existing or prospective future tenants to obtain information which can further shape the strategic objectives.</td>
<td>Principal Sheltered Housing Officer (LM) Tenant Liaison Officer (CE) Business Support Officer (NP)</td>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>Clear understanding and consultative approach to gathering intelligence to shape the service we deliver.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 Commission the Older People’s Accommodation Research to be undertaken again within 5 years. This will ensure the Council are aware of any changing trends enabling future reviews of this Strategy to reflect current and future demand. | Procure a research company to undertake the same survey of a further 500 Stroud district residents within 5 years. This feedback can be used during the review of the Strategy. | Projects Officer (CW) | November 2022 | First survey undertaken in November 2018. | Data analysis and identification of any trends. |

1.3 Undertake market research to identify any additional tenure options specifically for older people, which may address a future gap in the range on offer from SDC. | Approach other Local Authorities and RP’s to find out what other tenures they offer. | Projects Officer (CW) | October 2020 | Data analysis and potential options for delivering the service in a more effective manner. |

1.4 Carry out a thorough analysis of costs prior to any changes to service provision, and establish the financial viability of these options to tenants and the Council. | The costs of the different ranges of accommodation need to be considered, with regards to affordability to the end user and also the Council. This needs to take place in conjunction with the service charge project, so that tenants are clear about any possible changes to service charges. Where there are any possible increases to service charges, the Council will need to consider whether it can afford to subsidise some of these services and think creatively about how these service charges could be reduced. | Tenancy Operations Manager (PA) Principal Accountant (LC) | April 2020 | Undertake further investigations in relation to service charges. | Transparent approach to true rent and service chargeable items informing choice and cost. |

1.5 Explore all options for funding any additional services. | Consider partnership working with other providers who already operate hub and spoke models, grants from external agencies and funding from external users. | Principal Sheltered Housing Officer (LM) Projects Officer (CW) | September 2020 | Data analysis and potential options for delivering the service in a more effective manner. |
2. **New homes should be designed to be dynamic allowing flexibility and adaptability for the future.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>How will this be achieved?</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Outcome(s)</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>New homes should be built to be accessible.</td>
<td>Where possible – new homes should be built to building regulations Part M4 (2), Part M4 (3) or Lifetime Homes Standard.</td>
<td>Project Manager (KR)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>New homes should allow ease of access to tenants where possible to enable them to live independently.</td>
<td>Project Manager (KR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>The Standard Employer’s Requirements (SER’s) should be reviewed to identify any areas where the specification for new homes can be improved to enable tenants to live independently for longer.</td>
<td>The review should consider what changes could be made such as: • Adaptable kitchen space • Wet rooms • Easily accessible power points • Level access • Wider doors • Improved energy efficiency.</td>
<td>Project Manager (KR)</td>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>Identify any changes which can be made to the specification for new homes which would allow tenants to live more independently as they age.</td>
<td>Programme Delivery Manager (FG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Consider the mix and tenure of housing on sites which may suit older people’s accommodation to continue increasing the amount of housing for this shifting demographic.</td>
<td>Consider sites which are close to health and support services, good transport links and local amenities. Review the ‘older person’s shared ownership’ product and consider introducing this on any suitable sites.</td>
<td>New Homes and Regeneration Manager (LL) Policy Implementation Manager (PS) Head of Housing Services (KT) Principal Sheltered Housing Officer (LM)</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
<td>Ensure the delivery of housing is fit for purpose and meets the needs of future tenants. Introduce a competitive choice of housing options for older people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Review and assess the impact of any additional costs through changes to the SER’s.</td>
<td>Consider whether these costs can be accommodated within the new build scheme costs and understand how this relates and impacts on future asset maintenance costs and affordability to the Council.</td>
<td>Project Manager (KR) Principal Accountant (LC)</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
<td>Ensure that any changes made to SER’s can be accommodated within the HRA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Increase desirability of our older person’s accommodation to encourage downsizing.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>How will this be achieved?</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Outcome(s)</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Continue to invest in the Sheltered Modernisation Programme – improving the quality and desirability of schemes.</td>
<td>Funding the remainder of the green and amber scheme improvements which do not currently fall within the medium term financial plan.</td>
<td>Senior Management Team Housing Committee Principal Accountant (LC)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Agree the priorities for the HRA Medium Term Financial Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 **Re-brand and re-designate sheltered housing to ‘Independent Living Hub’, ‘Independent Living +’ and ‘Independent Living’.** Incorporating a robust communications plan of consultation in line with the service charge project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes made to any references of Sheltered Housing – this should include:</th>
<th>Principal Sheltered Housing Officer (LM)</th>
<th>July 2020</th>
<th>Consultation with tenants to support changes as proposed to ensure there is a smooth transition with minimum disruption and anxiety to existing tenants. Review, designate and implement the new model of Independent Living.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Leaflets and information sheets</td>
<td>Head of Housing Services (KT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SDC website and any other websites where this may be referenced</td>
<td>Support Officer (TBC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Signage at schemes</td>
<td>Communications Officer (RL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Notice boards at schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job titles which reference sheltered housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 **Undertake a review of the current marketing and advertising material of the Council’s older people’s accommodation to see how this could be improved to increase awareness of the range on offer.**

| Understand what current marketing is being used, consider forming a working group of officers to review and amend, also consider with item 3.2. | Projects Officer (CW) | | Ensure the marketing promotes the accommodation and service on offer and make it more attractive to prospective tenants. |
|---|---|---|
| | Communications Officer (RL) | | |

3.4 **Promote and expand the support available for tenants who opt to downsize into smaller accommodation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review current promotion methods and identify how to extend the message. Also see item 3.2 and consider linking together.</th>
<th>Principal Neighbourhood Management Officer (ME)</th>
<th>September 2019</th>
<th>Ensure best use of stock and support those in larger properties to move into smaller homes releasing larger homes for families.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Income Management Officer (PH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications Officer (RL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 **Consider how activities will be arranged and advertised within the Hubs to ensure tenants have access to a range of health clinics and other activities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examine best practice from other Local Authorities and RP’s to find out what has worked well. Consider whether this will be tenant led, or whether this is something which could be accommodated within existing roles in the service team.</th>
<th>Support Officer (TBC)</th>
<th>December 2019</th>
<th>Links to health and wellbeing strategy, also prevention of slips, trips and falls – leading to reduced A&amp;E admissions and other preventative measures to assist independent living, including the recognition of loneliness and other mental health conditions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Sheltered Housing Officer (LM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 **Undertake a review of the allocations process and existing age criteria for our older people’s accommodation to ensure it is fit for purpose, enabling future tenants to live in accommodation which meets their needs.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review the existing allocations process, and consider the current age restriction of 60+. Give consideration to more suitable allocations processes which may involve an assessment of need instead of age. Alternatively, a range of different ages for each Independent Living model which would allow greater flexibility of our assets ensuring they are being used in the most effective way.</th>
<th>Tenancy Operations Manager (PA)</th>
<th>July 2020</th>
<th>Ensure the properties we are offering meet the need of tenants both current and future and remove restrictions to entry to be as flexible as possible.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Implementation Manager (PS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Advice Manager (PB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Quality homes which provide a range of options which ‘enable’ tenants to live independently for longer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>How will this be achieved?</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Outcome(s)</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Undertake a review of general needs bungalows which are located in close proximity to any schemes identified as ‘Hubs’. Consider whether any tenants in existing general needs bungalow accommodation would like to pay to access the activities in the ‘Hub’ schemes. Also consider whether to convert any general needs bungalows to independent living accommodation when they become void and affiliate them to a ‘Hub’ scheme – this would assist by providing additional older person’s accommodation and by potentially reducing service charges to those living in a ‘Hub’.</td>
<td>Principal Sheltered Housing Officer (LM)</td>
<td>December 2020</td>
<td>Co-ordination, use and access to Hubs from general needs tenants.</td>
<td>Co-ordination, use and access to Hubs from general needs tenants. Working towards a cohesive community – promoting a common vision and sense of belonging.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Review the existing Asset Management Strategy to identify any areas which could be improved to ‘enable’ tenants to live independently in their property for longer. This could include replacement of components to help prevent slips, trips and falls. It could also include any items which make appliances or power sockets more easily accessible.</td>
<td>Programme Delivery Manager (FG)</td>
<td>Identify any areas which could improve tenant’s ability to live independently as they age.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Review and assess the impact of any additional costs through changes to the Asset Management Strategy. Consider whether these costs can be accommodated within the HRA 30 Year Business Plan and what other positive or negative cost impacts may be generated to other stakeholders by making these improvements.</td>
<td>Programme Delivery Manager (FG)</td>
<td>Ensure the costs are achievable within the existing HRA provision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Understand how affordable our homes and services are for our tenants and SDC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>How will this be achieved?</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Outcome(s)</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Review existing rents and service charges as part of the service charge project, to understand the cost to tenants and how these may alter with the new model in place.</td>
<td>Service Charge Project.</td>
<td>Subject to Housing Committee Approval</td>
<td>To provide transparency of costs and a review of affordability to tenants and the Council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Consider conversion of any communal areas which are not utilised or where those communal areas are not suitable for conversion, or to offer genuinely desired facilities for both residents and older people in the vicinity.</td>
<td>Project Manager (CH)</td>
<td>September 2020</td>
<td>Provide additional homes for older people at affordable costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Consider how activities will be funded within the Hubs to ensure tenants have access to a range of health clinics and other activities which can be rolled out to outlying properties. Explore any possible funding options from external providers. Consider how these activities could provide the opportunity to generate income to help support the future viability of these social activities.</td>
<td>Principal Sheltered Housing Officer (LM)</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
<td>Support the delivery of activities and increase funding available for the provision of these within Hubs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Engage with other agencies and community groups to improve partnership working; reducing social isolation and improving health and wellbeing.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>How will this be achieved?</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Outcome(s)</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Work in partnership with Gloucestershire County Council to develop their Housing with Care Strategy.</td>
<td>Attend strategic meetings with GCC as necessary.</td>
<td>Senior Housing Strategy Officer (LS) Members</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>To share SDC's vision for housing for older people with Gloucestershire County Council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Explore other partnership working with organisations such as the NHS, or those suggested within the Ark Report to improve the housing options for our tenants.</td>
<td>Review the Ark Report and GCC Housing with Care Strategy and identify any possible partnership opportunities.</td>
<td>Head of Housing Services (KT) Principal Sheltered Housing Officer (LM)</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
<td>Cohesive communities enabling outreach surgeries in communal areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Consider where practical applying dementia friendly improvements and practices across Independent Living schemes.</td>
<td>This will be achieved through the continuation of the sheltered modernisation programme improvements.</td>
<td>Project Manager (CH)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Improvements to the communal areas our Independent Living Schemes to assist the lives of tenants living with dementia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action Plan Owner:** Kevin Topping, Head of Housing Services  
**Review:** Bi-Monthly with annual updates to Housing Committee