



Community & Children's Services Committee

Date: FRIDAY, 15 JANUARY 2016
Time: 11.30 am
Venue: COMMITTEE ROOMS, WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members:

Dhruv Patel (Chairman)	Deputy Catherine McGuinness
Gareth Moore (Deputy Chairman)	Brian Mooney
Randall Anderson	Deputy Alastair Moss
Alex Bain-Stewart	Barbara Newman
Deputy John Barker	Deputy Joyce Nash
Revd Dr William Campbell-Taylor	Emma Price
Deputy Billy Dove	Chris Punter
Revd Dr Martin Dudley	Adam Richardson
Emma Edhem	Delis Regis
John Fletcher	Elizabeth Rogula
Deputy Bill Fraser	Virginia Rounding
Marianne Fredericks	James Tumbridge
Alderman David Graves	Michael Welbank
Deputy the Revd Stephen Haines	Mark Wheatley
Ann Holmes	Philip Woodhouse
Deputy Henry Jones	James de Sausmarez
Alderman Sir Paul Judge	
Professor John Lumley	

Co-opted Members: Laura Jørgensen

Enquiries: Natasha Dogra tel. no.: 020 7332 1434
Natasha.Dogra@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Lunch will be served in Guildhall Club at the rising of the Committee.
N.B. Part of this meeting may be the subject of audio visual recording.

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

Part 1 - Public Reports

1. **APOLOGIES**
2. **MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**
3. **MINUTES**
To agree the minutes of the previous Committee meeting.

For Decision
(Pages 1 - 6)
4. **TERMS OF REFERENCE**
Report of the Town Clerk.

For Decision
(Pages 7 - 10)
5. **THE SAFEGUARDING ADULTS ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2014/15 CITY AND HACKNEY SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD**
Director of Community and Children's Services.
The annual report has been sent to Members via e-mail and hard copies are available upon request.

For Information
(Pages 11 - 16)
6. **THE SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN ANNUAL REPORT 2014/15 CITY AND HACKNEY SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD**
Director of Community and Children's Services.
The annual report has been sent to Members via e-mail and hard copies are available upon request.

For Information
(Pages 17 - 20)
7. **SHELTERED HOUSING REVIEW PHASE 2**
Director of Community and Children's Services.

For Decision
(Pages 21 - 38)
8. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
9. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

10. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

MOTION - That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

For Decision

Part 2 - Non-Public Reports

11. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

To agree the non-public minutes of the previous Committee meeting.

For Decision
(Pages 39 - 42)

12. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

13. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

This page is intentionally left blank

COMMUNITY & CHILDREN'S SERVICES COMMITTEE

Friday, 11 December 2015

Minutes of the meeting of the Community & Children's Services Committee held at Committee Rooms, West Wing, Guildhall on Friday, 11 December 2015 at 11.30 am

Present

Members:

Gareth Moore (Deputy Chairman)	Deputy Joyce Nash
Deputy John Barker	Adam Richardson
Revd Dr William Campbell-Taylor	Delis Regis
Emma Edhem	Virginia Rounding
John Fletcher	James Tumbridge
Marianne Fredericks	Michael Welbank
Ann Holmes	Mark Wheatley
Deputy Henry Jones	Philip Woodhouse
Professor John Lumley	Laura Jørgensen
Deputy Catherine McGuinness	James de Sausmarez
Barbara Newman	

Officers:

Natasha Dogra	- Town Clerk's Department
Philippa Sewell	- Town Clerk's Department
Sabina Johal	- Town Clerk's Department
Ade Adetosoye	- Director, Community & Children's Services
Neal Hounsell	- Department of Community & Children's Services
Chris Pelham	- Department of Community & Children's Services
Jacquie Campbell	- Department of Community & Children's Services
Gerald Mehrtens	- Department of Community & Children's Services
Simon Cribbens	- Department of Community & Children's Services
Lorraine Burke	- Department of Community & Children's Services
Sarah Greenwood	- Department of Community & Children's Services
Mark Jarvis	- Chamberlain's Department
Sam Cook	- Remembrancer's Office
Peter Young	- City Surveyor's Department
Paul Nagle	- City Surveyor's Department

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies had been received from Deputy Haines, Dr Martin Dudley, Emma Price, Alex Bain-Stewart, Elizabeth Rogula, Alderman David Graves, Chris Punter and Patrick Streeter.

2. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

Mr Gareth Moore declared an interest in all housing matters as he was a tenant on the Golden Lane Estate.

3. **MINUTES**

Resolved – that the minutes of the previous meeting be agreed as an accurate record.

4. **NEIGHBOURHOOD PATROL SERVICE**

The Committee received a presentation from Ian Hutchings of Packguard and noted that since the implementation of the Crime & Disorder Act 1997 local agencies had done a lot to tackle anti-social behaviour. It was no longer tolerated and the public could see that their areas are safer.

Members noted that generally people perceived anti-social behaviour in many areas to be less of an issue. However, this offered little comfort to the victims who continued to suffer at the hands of a small minority. This behaviour could cause misery for entire communities and it remains one of social tenants' biggest concerns.

Members noted that to tackle this, in a time where there were increased demands on Police resources, and a necessity to reduce costs, the Patrol Service provided an accountable, open and equal access service on behalf of Social Landlords and Local Authorities to fill the gaps in current statutory provision. These services provided a dedicated and consistent provision in addition to other statutory services to help address local issues and enable other services to take wider action and better support residents, and make these communities even safer.

Members noted that the total cost for this one year pilot scheme would be £70,000. Half of this is being met from the departmental budget of Community and Children's Services and the remainder is the subject of bids for external funding.

Resolved – that the presentation be noted.

5. **TO REVIEW THE TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE**

Resolved – that the terms of reference be agreed by the Committee.

6. **REVIEW OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY GOVERNANCE**

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk stating that in light of how recent national developments had impacted on the way local authorities exercise their health overview and scrutiny function, your Health & Social Care Scrutiny Sub Committee agreed to examine whether there were any areas where its health and social care scrutiny functions could be strengthened, and to evaluate the resource and governance implications.

A report presenting the options available regarding Committee governance was considered by the Health & Social Care Scrutiny Sub Committee at its meeting on 2 November 2015. The Community & Children's Services was now asked to approve the recommendations made by the Sub Committee regarding future governance.

In response to a query regarding the membership of the Committee, Members were informed that the Town Clerk had consulted the Comptroller and City Solicitor; the advice to Officers had been that although the guidance was not statutory it was the recommended course to ensure there were no Member conflicts of interest.

Resolved – that the following be agreed:

Subject to the approval of the Court of Common Council, the **Community & Children’s Services Committee** agreed:

- The Health & Social Care Scrutiny Sub Committee’s recommendation of dissolving the Health & Social Care Scrutiny Sub Committee;
- That no Member of the Community & Children’s Services Committee or the Health & Wellbeing Board should serve on the Health & Social Care Scrutiny Committee;
- In view of the proposed restrictions on the ‘pool’ of Members available to constitute the Health & Social Care Scrutiny Committee, that the new Health & Social Care Committee should be one of those listed as an exception under Standing Order 29(3) in terms of dual Chairmanship;

7. HOUSING AND PLANNING BILL REPORT

The Committee received a report of the Remembrancer advising the Committee of the relevant provisions of the Housing and Planning Bill currently before Parliament. Among other things, the Bill would fund the extension of the right to buy to housing association tenants through requiring the sale of high-value local authority housing, will bring about a shift away from affordable rental housing towards ‘starter homes’ for first-time buyers, and would require higher rents to be charged to social tenants earning high incomes.

In response to a query, Members noted that the Bill would no longer allow the City Corporation to provide lifelong tenancies. These would now be issued on a 2 – 5 year basis with reviews when the tenancy drew to an end. Tenant who already had lifelong tenancies would continue to do so regardless of whether they moved property.

Resolved – that the report be noted.

8. REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGETS - 2016/17

The Committee received the report outlining the annual submission of the revenue and capital budgets overseen by the Committee.

Resolved – that the following be agreed:

- review the provisional 2016/17 revenue budget to ensure that it reflects the Committee’s objectives and, if so, approve the budget for submission to the Finance Committee;
- review and approve the draft capital budget;
- authorise the Chamberlain to revise these budgets to allow for further implications arising from departmental reorganisations and other reviews, corporate projects, changes to the Additional Works Programme.

- If specific service based review proposals included with this budget report are rejected by the Committee, or other committees request that further proposals are pursued, that the substitution of other suitable proposals for a corresponding amount is delegated to the Town Clerk in discussion with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the relevant Committee. If the substituted saving is not considered to be straight forward in nature, then the Town Clerk shall also consult the Chairman and Deputy Chairmen of the Policy and Resources Committee prior to approving an alternative proposals.

9. **HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) AND CAPITAL BUDGETS 2016/17**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services outlining the annual submission of the revenue and capital budgets overseen by the Committee.

Resolved – that the following be agreed:

- reviewed the provisional 2016/17 revenue budget to ensure that it reflects the Committee's objectives and, if so, approve the proposed budget for submission to the Finance Committee;
- reviewed and approve the draft capital budget; and
- authorised the Chamberlain to revise these budgets to allow for further implications arising from departmental reorganisations and other reviews.

10. **COMMUNITY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES BUSINESS PLAN: QUARTER 2 UPDATE**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services informing Members of the progress made during Quarter 2 (Q2 – July to September 2015) against the refreshed 2015–17 Community and Children's Services Business Plan. It showed what had been achieved and the progress made against the five departmental strategic aims:

- Safety and early help
- Health and wellbeing
- Education and employability
- Homes and communities
- Efficiency and effectiveness.

Members noted details of complaints received by the Department at and the Department's budget information. Departmental performance and progress for Q2 were overall good with some areas of outstanding performance. The set target for 13 out of 17 measurable performance indicators for this quarter was achieved or exceeded (the same as Q1) and four were within the tolerance of - 10% of the set target.

11. **OPERATIONAL PROPERTY**

The Committee considered a report of the Chamberlain and City Surveyor in relation to the Operational Property review and noted that this was a cross-cutting Service Based Review which was taking a more strategic view of the operational assets the City of London Corporation had. The review aimed to

identify opportunities to rationalise the Corporation's operational property portfolio and reduce the high and rising cost of property.

Members were informed that this report would now be considered by the Corporate Asset Sub Committee and then the Resource Allocation Committee in December 2015. Services Committees would then receive reports for decision from January 2016 onwards.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

12. MENTAL HEALTH STRATEGY

The Committee received the Mental Health Strategy and noted that it was developed based on the findings of the *Mental Health Needs Assessment for the City of London (2015)*. The mental health strategy set out the overarching aim for more people in the City to have good mental health, and described how the City intended to achieve this. It identified four priorities which are: Prevention, Personalisation, Recovery, and Delivery.

In response to a query, it was noted that the focus of the strategy was delivering better outcomes for residents, rough sleepers and workers. It aimed to improve the mental health of people in the City, keep people well and then ensure we provide effective support when mental health problems do arise. Members noted that the report would now be considered by the Community and Children's Services Committee at their meeting on 11 December 2015.

Members drew Officers attention to two homeless individuals who currently resided in Moorgate station and asked for their status to be reviewed.

Resolved – that the Mental Health Strategy be approved.

13. UPDATE REPORT ON SIR JOHN CASS'S FOUNDATION PRIMARY SCHOOL EXPANSION

The Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services informing Members of the lack of progress on the proposal to expand Sir John Cass's Foundation Primary School to a two-form entry (2FE) school, following a decision at the Sir John Cass's Foundation Board (the Foundation) held in October 2015 to once again refuse to grant a licence in order for the school to expand.

As a point of clarification, a Member raised a query regarding the detail in the report referring to the Foundation's 10% contribution towards capital costs. The Committee were informed that these monies were not being requested by the City Corporation but by the governing body of the school, there being a requirement for Foundation schools to provide 10% of capital build costs. The committee were also informed that subsequently the governing body had asked the Foundation if they would grant a licence for the capital build without a request for the 10% contribution to the build.

Upon taking advice from the Town Clerk, it was agreed that the questions which Members wished to raise should be considered as non-public and therefore the remainder of this item was considered under Part 2.

14. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
There were no questions.
15. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
Members were made aware that staff from the Housing Service had raised nearly £6,000 for the Royal British Legion during the Poppy Appeal 2015.
16. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**
MOTION - That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.
17. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**
Resolved – that the minutes of the previous meeting be agreed as an accurate record.
18. **GATEWAY 1 PROJECT PROPOSAL: PHASE I, GOLDEN LANE COMMUNITY HALL AND ESTATE OFFICE AT BASE OF GREAT ARTHUR HOUSE**
The Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
19. **UPDATE REPORT OF SIR JOHN CASS'S FOUNDATION SCHOOL EXPANSION**
20. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
There were no questions.
21. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
There was no urgent business.

The meeting ended at 1.20 pm

Chairman

**Contact Officer: Natasha Dogra tel. no.: 020 7332 1434
Natasha.Dogra@cityoflondon.gov.uk**

Agenda Item 4

Committee: Community and Children's Services Committee	Date: 15 January 2015
Subject: Review of the Terms of Reference.	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Decision

Summary

1. There are two proposed amendments to the Committee's Terms of Reference. These both arise from the review of the Corporation's grant-giving activities, which the Committee considered in July 2015.
2. The Committee agreed to take responsibility for allocating grants from the Combined Relief of Policy Charity. This has been added to the draft Terms of Reference at Appendix A.
3. The Committee also agreed to review with the Education Board the most appropriate governance arrangements for the Combined Education Charity and City Educational Trust. A further report will be submitted to both Committees in the coming months to facilitate this. Until final arrangements are agreed by both Committees, it is recommended that the Committees take joint responsibility for allocating grants from these funds. This has been added to the draft Terms of Reference at Appendix A as item f). A similar addition will be considered by the Education Board when that Board reviews its Terms of Reference on 14 January 2016.

Recommendations

The Committee is recommended to:

- a) Approve the terms of reference as attached (appendix A)

Contact:

Natasha Dogra

Telephone: 020 7332 1434

Email: Natasha.Dogra@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

YARROW, Mayor	RESOLVED: That the Court of Common Council holden in the Guildhall of the City of London on Thursday 23rd April 2015, doth hereby appoint the following Committee until the first meeting of the Court in April, 2016.
---------------	---

COMMUNITY & CHILDREN'S SERVICES COMMITTEE

1. **Constitution**

A Ward Committee consisting of,

- two Aldermen nominated by the Court of Aldermen
- up to 33 Commoners representing each Ward (two representatives for the Wards with six or more Members regardless of whether the Ward has sides), those Wards having 200 or more residents (based on the Ward List) being able to nominate a maximum of two representatives
- a limited number of Members co-opted by the Committee (e.g. the two parent governors required by law)

In accordance with Standing Order Nos. 29 & 30, no Member who is resident in, or tenant of, any property owned by the City of London and under the control of this Committee is eligible to be Chairman or Deputy Chairman.

2. **Quorum**

The quorum consists of any nine Members. [N.B. - the co-opted Members only count as part of the quorum for matters relating to the Education Function]

3. **Membership 2015/16**

ALDERMEN

- 2 David Graves
- 1 Sir Paul Judge

COMMONERS

10	The Revd. Dr. Martin Dudley.....	Aldersgate
5	Joyce Carruthers Nash, O.B.E., Deputy	Aldersgate
3	Dhruv Patel	Aldgate
2	Michael Welbank, M.B.E.....	Billingsgate
1	Patrick Thomas Streeter	Bishopsgate
10	William Harry Dove, O.B.E., J.P., Deputy.....	Bishopsgate
1	Kevin Malcolm Everett, D.Sc., Deputy.....	Candlewick
1	Emma Edhem	Castle Baynard
9	Catherine McGuinness, M.A., Deputy	Castle Baynard
3	Alastair Michael Moss, Deputy.....	Cheap
9	The Revd. Stephen Decatur Haines, M.A, Deputy.....	Cornhill
2	John Alfred Barker, O.B.E., Deputy.....	Cripplegate
7	Gareth Wynford Moore.....	Cripplegate
2	Mark Raymond Peter Henry Delano Wheatley.....	Dowgate
5	Virginia Rounding.....	Farringdon Within
2	Ann Holmes.....	Farringdon Within
2	Emma Charlotte Louisa Price.....	Farringdon Without
3	Adam Fox McCloud Richardson.....	Farringdon Without
2	Philip John Woodhouse.....	Langbourn
8	Elizabeth Rogula.....	Lime Street
6	Henry Llewellyn Michael Jones, Deputy.....	Portsoken
4	John Fletcher.....	Portsoken
9	Brian Desmond Francis Mooney, M.A.....	Queenhithe
4	Marianne Bernadette Fredericks	Tower
10	William Barrie Fraser, O. B. E., Deputy.....	Vintry

Together with the following Members in place of the seven Wards (Bassishaw, Bread Street, Bridge, Broad Street, Coleman Street, Cordwainer and Walbrook) not making appointments on this occasion as well as the one Ward (Queenhithe) making only one of its two permitted appointments:-

Randall Keith Anderson
Alex Bain-Stewart J.P.
The Rev.d Dr. William Goodacre Campbell-Taylor
Professor John Stuart Penton Lumley
Barbara Patricia Newman, C.B.E.
Christopher Punter
Delis Regis
Vacancy

4. **Terms of Reference**

- To be responsible for:-
- (a) the appointment of the Director of Community & Children's Services;
 - (b) the following functions of the City of London Corporation (other than in respect of powers expressly delegated to another committee, sub-committee, board or panel):-
 - Children's Services
 - Adults' Services
 - Education
 - Social Services
 - Social Housing (i.e. the management of the property owned by the City of London Corporation under the Housing Revenue Account and the City Fund in accordance with the requirements of all relevant legislation and the disposal of interests in the City of London Corporation's Housing Estates (pursuant to such policies as are from time to time laid down by the Court of Common Council)
 - public health (within the meaning of the Health and Social Care Act 2012), liaison with health services and health scrutiny
 - Sport/Leisure Activities
 - management of the City of London Almshouses (registered charity no 1005857) in accordance with the charity's governing instrumentsand the preparation of all statutory plans relating to those functions and consulting as appropriate on the exercise of those functions;
 - (c) the management of The City of London Corporation Combined Education Charity (registered charity no. 312836);
 - (d) appointing Statutory Panels, Boards and Sub-Committees as are considered necessary for the better performance of its duties including the following areas:-
 - Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee
 - Health & Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee
 - Safeguarding Sub-Committee.
 - (e) to take responsibility for allocating grants from the Combined Relief of Policy Charity, in line with annual funding and priorities agreed by the Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee.
 - (f) to take joint responsibility, with the Education Board, for allocating grants from the Combined Education Charity and City Education Trust, in line with annual funding and priorities agreed by the Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee.

Agenda Item 5

Committee(s):	Date(s):
Safeguarding Sub Committee	17 December 2015
Community and Children's Services Committee	15 January 2016
Health and Wellbeing Board	29 January 2016
Safer City Partnership	TBC
Subject: The Safeguarding Adults Annual Report for 2014/15 City and Hackney Safeguarding Adults Board	Public
Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services	For Information

Summary

The CHSAB is the key statutory body for agreeing how the relevant organisations in City and Hackney will co-operate to safeguard and promote the welfare of adults in that locality, and for ensuring the effectiveness of what they do.

The establishment of Local Safeguarding Adults Boards was an important element of The Care Act 2014.

The core statutory functions of the CHSAB are as follows:

- to develop and publish a strategic plan setting out how they will meet their objectives and how their member and partner agencies will contribute
- to publish an annual report detailing how effective their work has been
- to commission safeguarding adults reviews (SARs) for any cases which meet the SAR criteria.

This report provides background information on the work of the City and Hackney Safeguarding Adults Board (CHSAB) - as set out in the CHSAB Annual Report 2014/159 see appendix 1).

The Annual Report provides detail on progress against the 2014/15 priorities, key developments during the year, activity data and 2015/16 priorities.

The report also provides background information regarding the governance and membership of the Adult Safeguarding Board.

Recommendation

The report is for information only.

Main Report

Background

The CHSAB meets its statutory objectives and safeguards adults through the following functions:

Developing policies and procedures for safeguarding and promoting the welfare of adults at risk of abuse and neglect in the City and Hackney. This includes The Self-Neglect (& chronic hoarding) Protocol.

Communicating to relevant organisations in the City and Hackney the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of adults at risk of abuse and neglect, raising their awareness of how this can best be done, and encouraging them to do so.

Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of what is done by the local authorities and board partners individually and collectively to safeguard and promote the welfare of adults at risk of abuse and neglect and advise them on ways to improve.

Produce and publish an annual report on the effectiveness of safeguarding in the local area.

Participating in the local planning and commissioning of adult's services to ensure that they take safeguarding and promoting the welfare of adults at risk of abuse and neglect into account.

Putting in place procedures for ensuring that there is a co-ordinated response by the authority, their Board partners and other relevant persons to an unexpected death of a vulnerable adult.

Undertaking safeguarding adults reviews where abuse or neglect of an adult is known or suspected, an adult has died or an adult has been seriously harmed, and there is cause for concern as to the way in which the authority, their Board partners or other relevant persons have worked together to safeguard that adult.

Terms of Reference of the CHSAB:

- Agree and review multi-agency City and Hackney safeguarding adults policy and procedure for protecting vulnerable adults, taking into account statutory requirements, national guidance and London regional policies

- Maintain an annual business plan, setting priorities for preventing and addressing abuse of vulnerable adults, and produces and disseminates an annual report.
- Monitor incidents of abuse and neglect, reviews trends and acts where appropriate to improve services and support to vulnerable adults.
- Regularly evaluates how agencies and providers safeguard vulnerable adults, by introducing rigorous quality assurance and scrutiny systems across partner agencies.
- Agree a serious case review protocol and reviews and learns from situations where safeguarding arrangements may have been inadequate.
- Maintain a programme of training and development on safeguarding vulnerable adults for staff across agencies in the statutory, independent provider and voluntary sectors.
- Develop and promote arrangements for adults at risk and carers to be well-informed about safeguarding arrangements and provide opportunities for service users and carers to influence and feedback on their effectiveness
- Promote public awareness of safeguarding as an issue for all citizens and engage the wider community in helping to prevent abuse and neglect and to report where they have concerns.

The CHSAB is made up of a Board with senior representatives from its member agencies covering both the City and Hackney, an Executive Group and various sub-groups which undertake the Board's business.

The City Of London has its own Safeguarding Adults Sub Committee that meets on a bi-monthly basis and reports on its work to the City of London Adult Wellbeing Partnership and the CHSAB.

The Independent Chair

The chair of the CHSAB is independent from local agencies and organisations in order for the CHSAB to exercise its local challenge function effectively. The chair is supported by the CHSAB Board Manager and the Head of Safeguarding Adults. Both these roles also support the wider partnership and are an available resource for all agencies engaged in the business of the CHSAB.

The chair has a crucial role in making sure that the Board operates effectively and secures an independent voice for the CHSAB. The chair should act objectively and distinguish their role as CHSAB chair from any day-to-day role.

The Independent Chair of the CHSAB is jointly accountable to the Chief

Executive of the London Borough of Hackney and the Town Clerk / Chief Executive of the City of London Corporation.

The Independent Chair meets regularly with both Chief Executives, the DASS roles covering both areas and the respective Lead Members. There is a defined governance protocol that sets out how the CHSAB works with City & Hackney Safeguarding Children's Board (CHSCB) and the Health and Wellbeing Boards / Community Safety Partnerships across both areas

Membership

The membership of the Board includes representatives from the following agencies:

- London Borough of Hackney Adult Social Care and Public Health
- The City of London Community and Children's Services
- The City of London Police
- The Metropolitan Police Service – Hackney Borough
- London Probation Service
- Hackney Council for Voluntary Services
- Homerton University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust
- NHS City and Hackney Clinical Commissioning Group
- East London NHS Foundation Trust
- Lead Members from the City of London and Hackney Council
- London Fire Brigade
- Barts Health NHS Trust
- Hackney Health watch
- Community Safety Partnership
- Older People's Reference Group
- Housing

The Lead Members in both Hackney and the City of London act as 'participant observers' of the Board in line with statutory requirements.

Current Position

The following summarises some of the headlines specific to the City of London, as set out in the Annual Report;

- The Annual Report highlights that The Department of Community and Children's services (Roadmap to Outstanding Services) Business Plan 2015-17 has as its number one strategic priority, Safeguarding: "Ensuring effective arrangements are in place for responding to safeguarding risks, promoting early identification and support to prevent escalation of issues and keeping children and adults at risk safe."
- The City of London Adult Social Care Team has lead statutory responsibility for safeguarding adults at risk, carried out in partnership with agencies from health, police, voluntary sector etc..

- City of London Adult Social Care Service currently knows of 350 people, either placed outside the city in residential, nursing or supported living placements or living in the city.
- The Adult Social Care Service comprises of an in-house reablement service of three and an Occupational Therapist. There are five social workers (one locum social worker in addition to the establishment to cover the additional Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards work) including one Approved Mental Health Professional, a Care Navigator (a one year pilot with Age UK), two finance and administrative support officers, the Senior Practitioner, the Team Manager and Service Manager. The team takes on all safeguarding work that comes in.
- In February 2015 an external independent quality assurance audit was undertaken in relation to all 2014/15 practice within Adult Social Care, both operational and strategic. An Improvement Plan, alongside a tool kit, a case audit and Safeguarding Adults Team appraisal objectives have been developed as a response and will be presented to both subcommittees for approval in the autumn.
- The number of safeguarding alerts received from April 2014 to March 2015 was 29. 22 were within the City of London. In 2013/14 were 28 with 16 were within the city. In 2012/13 there were 20 with 14 within the City.
- As a host authority, City of London has hosted three safeguarding cases from Bart's Health Trust as regards alerts raised pertaining to transport.
- There are currently 32 Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards cases, two of which are pending in the Court of Protection as they involve supported living situations. There are nine Relevant Person's Representatives currently working with people in placements.
- The Notice the Signs Safeguarding Awareness Raising campaign was a key feature of 2014 work in the City and the campaign to residents has been a great success in relation to an increase in the number of community referrals, including those from residents. The written feedback from five public consultations within the city over 2014 and early 2015 has shown that adult safeguarding has been placed on the public's agenda and this, together with the 2015 safeguarding training under the Care Act, has really raised the profile of safeguarding being "Everyone's Business". This has been evidenced by the rise in alerts received to the service.
- All Adult Social Care staff have Safeguarding Adults training that is appropriate to their experience and grade as part of their appraisal objectives.

This training is accessed via the London Borough of Hackney as partners of the Safeguarding Adults Board.

The Annual Report also highlights priorities for 2015/16 including ;

- City of London Police to look at options for a 'virtual' Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub and although this will start with children only cases, the service will be looking to progress to adults in due course.
- To work with the independent Board chair through the corporate Board structure to deliver the key objectives contained within the safeguarding strategy.
- To continue to offer quarterly City of London Safeguarding Champions forums to maintain Safeguarding and "Notice the Signs", as a core skill for all public facing departments throughout the Corporation of London.

Corporate & Strategic Implications:

The City's role in safeguarding vulnerable and at risk adults, as set out in the Annual Report, contributes to the fulfilment of the priorities of the Department of Community and Children's Services Business Plan and the Adult Wellbeing Plan.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications from this report.

Conclusion:

The report has provided members with information on the findings of the 2014/15 Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report. This has included setting out the new statutory requirement to have Safeguarding Adults Boards, including details regarding Membership, Terms of References and headline progress.

Appendices:

Safeguarding Adults Annual Report for 2014/2015, City and Hackney Safeguarding Adults Board

Background Papers:

Chris Pelham
AD People Services

T: ext 3234
E: chris.pelham@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committee	Date:
Community & Children's Services Committee	15 January 2015
Subject: The Safeguarding Children Annual Report 2014/15 City and Hackney Safeguarding Children Board	Public
Report of: Director of Community & Children's Services	For Information

Summary

This report gives an overview of the City of London safeguarding children arrangements for 2014/15 as reflected in the City and Hackney Safeguarding Children Board (CHSCB) annual report 2014/15. The annual report provides detailed information of the work undertaken by partners and the CHSCB to ensure robust safeguarding arrangements are in place, as required by Working Together to Safeguard Children statutory guidance, (March 2015). The annual report is attached to this report as an appendix.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to: Note the report.

Main Report

Background

1. The City and Hackney Safeguarding Children Board (CHSCB) is governed by the statutory guidance in "Working Together to Safeguard Children 2015 and the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) Regulations 2006. The two key requirements for LSCBs as outlined in the Children Act 2004, are to co-ordinate the safeguarding work of agencies and to ensure that this work is effective.
2. There is also an expectation that LSCBs will be influential in strategic arrangements to improve performance in the care and protection of children. This has been taking place through the continued engagement with the City and Hackney Safeguarding Adults Board (CHSAB) and the respective Health and Wellbeing Boards and Community Safety Partnerships across both the City of London and Hackney.
3. In 2014/15 there was a concerted effort to raise the visibility of the City of London's profile within the joint board. This was achieved through having a clearer focus on City's safeguarding requirements through the formation of a City Executive Group. The Independent Chair of the CHSCB chaired this meeting and the focus of this group is to progress the CHSCB business plan in relation to the City context.

Current Position

4. The CHSCB Annual report for 2014/15 clearly defines the City context, data, progress and future development, which ensures that the City's profile is definable within the report. The following performance information in regard to the Children and Families Team for 2014/15 was included in the report;
 - There were 81 contacts recorded, this is a 63% increase on 2013/14.
 - There were 20 referrals accepted for a statutory assessment, this averages out as being similar to the previous three years.
 - There have been no re-referrals in the last two years.
 - Analysis of performance identified that referrals accepted for a statutory assessment remained low.
5. The report identifies the role of the CHSCB in offering support and challenge in the launch of the City of London's Thresholds of Needs document, by supporting its launch and by offering challenge to partner agencies around the low referrals rate. Police were also asked to refer all contacts through to the Children and Families Team, this included non- City residents. This assisted in the profiling of Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) in the City of London.
6. Although there are no known children who have been victims of CSE in the City, the Children and Families Team have completed a review of all open cases and identified less than 5 with associated vulnerabilities because they had gone missing in 2014/15. These cases were discussed in the City Multi-Agency Sexual Exploitation group (MASE). The City of London and partner agencies are also prompting awareness around CSE with hotels and businesses in the City through Operation Makesafe.
7. In April 2014, it became mandatory for healthcare professionals to record Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) in the patients' health care records. Changes to the Serious Crime Act mean that all health care professionals, teachers and social workers are required to report known cases of FGM. Part of the role of the CHSCB is to influence and monitor the effectiveness of the partnership response to FGM. Training has taken place through lunch time seminars in the City provided by CHSCB.
8. The report identifies how the CHSCB will be monitoring the City's response in implementing the Prevent strategy and how the City responds to radicalisation by holding agencies and the Safer City Partnership to account for its continued response in terms of awareness raising, recognition and response.
9. The annual report identifies the work that is going on in relation to domestic violence and abuse in the City of London. The Safer City Partnership initiated a comprehensive review of domestic violence and abuse in 2014 and this will be subject to further monitoring by the CHSCB in terms of influence on arrangements to safeguard children and young people.

10. The report identified that the City of London have their own action plan for children missing from home, care and education and this is monitored through effective multi agency arrangements in place that provide a coordinated response when children go missing. In 2014/15 no children were reported as missing from home. There are unique challenges for the City as the majority of its children are educated outside the local authority or in the private sector which can make it difficult to track those children missing from education. Significant work has been undertaken to tackle this issue which will be reported in the 2015/16 Annual Report.
11. The report also contains information on the progress of the Local Authorities Designated Officer (LADO) for the City of London and the concerns around the low number of referrals in 2014/15 including how this is monitored and challenged by the CHSCB. Private Fostering was also covered within the report, with a brief résumé of what action had been taken in 2014/15 to raise the profile of Private Fostering. It was acknowledged that even with this awareness raising there have been no private fostering arrangements identified for the past three years, this is being addressed as a priority for the CHSCB for 2015/16.

Conclusion

12. The annual report identifies the progress that the City of London has made during 2014/15 in regard to its safeguarding duties and responsibilities. The CHSCB has offered independent challenges to the City of London and partners through the City Safeguarding Executive group. The report has a clear City focus, which defines the City context and needs, outlining how the City is meeting these needs, as well as the priorities going forward into 2015/16 ;
 - Early Help; the CHSCB will continue to evaluate the effectiveness of early help services through the use of its Learning and Improvement Framework.
 - To develop arrangements for children who are subject to domestic abuse.
 - The CHSCB will agree and sign off the Neglect strategy and associated action plans.
 - CHSCB will monitor the progress of the actions on the Neglect strategy plan.
 - Further assurance work will be undertaken to test learning.
 - The CHSCB will continue to oversee actions required to support the strategy on children missing.
 - CHSCB will gain a better understanding as to the reason why children go missing through the return interviews carried out by Action for Children.
 - There will be further scrutiny on those children who go missing in education.
 - To analyse the outcome from the Harmful Practices audit and implement any associated actions.

- Implement and monitor Prevent strategy.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – City and Hackney Safeguarding Children’s Board Annual Report 2014/15

Pat Dixon

Safeguarding and Quality Assurance Service Manager

T: 020 7332 1215

E: pat.dixon@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committee	Dated:
Community & Children's Services	15 01 2016
Subject: Sheltered Housing Review Phase 2	Public
Report of: Director of Community & Children's Services	For Decision

Summary

In November 2014, your Committee approved a number of recommendations arising from the Sheltered Housing Review Phase 1. These included the adoption of a strategy to build 'lifetime homes' on all estates so that tenants can remain in their homes as they grow older. They also included a detailed study of Mais House, the City's sheltered housing scheme in Lewisham. This report presents the work done so far to consider options for the future of Mais House.

The Sheltered Housing Review identified a drop in demand for traditional sheltered housing and a strong preference for people to be enabled to stay in their own homes and communities in the future. Mais House has been in particularly low demand and requires a significant amount of work to be done to bring it up to a reasonable standard. Some ideas for the Mais House site have been identified in a report commissioned from a firm of consultants. However, before these can be worked up in more detail, there is a fundamental decision to be made about whether, in the future, Mais House remains a sheltered scheme for older people only, or whether it becomes a general needs development, open to residents of mixed ages.

The City's Housing Strategy, as approved by Members, identifies a demand for more general needs homes. Initial discussions with the London Borough of Lewisham suggest that this is also the case there, particularly as the borough already has an over-supply of homes for older people with low support needs. There is, then, a strong case for refurbishing or redeveloping Mais House as a lifetime homes scheme, providing accommodation suitable for people of all ages.

However, many of the current residents at Mais House have expressed a strong desire for it to remain a sheltered scheme. Many have told us they are happy there and do not wish to move, other than on a purely temporary basis. We therefore need to consider how to achieve the City's aim to provide homes to meet housing need, whilst taking into account the individual needs and wishes of the existing Mais House residents.

The report sets out the situation and the views of residents. It outlines the support that will be available to residents should it be necessary to move them to alternative accommodation, even temporarily, and proposes some measures which would go

some way to meeting their wishes, should Members decide that Mais House cannot remain a solely sheltered scheme.

Recommendation

That Members decide that they wish to either:

- Refurbish and retain Mais House as a wholly sheltered housing scheme for letting to older people only and instruct the Director of Community & Children's Services to proceed as outlined in paragraph 59 or;
- Redevelop Mais House as a lifetime homes scheme with general needs units open to people of all ages, and instruct the Director of Community & Children's Services to proceed as outlined in paragraph 60 or;
- Redevelop Mais House as a lifetime homes scheme of one bedroomed units, prioritised for older people, and instruct the Director of Community & Children's Services to proceed as outlined in paragraph 61.

Main Report

Background

1. In 2013-14, the Housing Service, with the involvement of Members, conducted the first phase of a Sheltered Housing Review. The purpose of the review was to look at the City's existing social housing provision for older people and to consider what changes might be needed to reflect national policy and the changing needs and aspirations of people regarding accommodation for their later years. The review included consultation with existing sheltered housing residents and focus groups with City residents to explore their views.
2. The review found that the majority of people today do not view traditional sheltered housing as an attractive prospect, and that most people wish to stay in their existing homes as long as possible. Changes in health and social care policy promote this path, and new technology offers increasingly sophisticated ways of providing support.
3. In September 2014, the Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-committee recommended to the Community & Children's Services Committee that
 - a. future strategy should be to provide lifetime homes, suitable for older people, on every estate as far as possible;
 - b. officers were to commission detailed studies of each of the City's existing sheltered housing schemes, taking into account the need to fund the development of lifetime homes and identifying options for the future of each scheme;
 - c. a paper identifying opportunities for building lifetime homes on existing estates be brought to this Sub-Committee.

4. The Grand Committee subsequently agreed these recommendations. Since then, extensive work has taken place on a number of potential developments on our estates, all of which would comprise lifetime homes and would also include a proportion of wheelchair accessible homes. Feasibility work and prioritisation of schemes is ongoing.
5. It was agreed that the first detailed study should be of Mais House. This was because this building has the most pressing need for upgrading, is poorly located and is in low demand from potential tenants. A Gateway 1 paper was taken to Corporate Projects Board in June 2015 and a company, Evolution, was appointed to carry out a study and produce some ideas. The study has not yet been fully completed, as some additional work has been requested, but it is apparent that there are some broad principles to be decided before the study and the ideas it will put forward can be presented to Members and explored in detail.
6. The study of Mais House is only part of Phase 2 of the Sheltered Housing Review. This phase will also include reports for Isleden House sheltered flats, Harman Close and the City of London and Gresham Almshouses. This work is being commissioned at present and will be presented to Members at a later date.

Mais House

7. Mais House is a traditional 'hotel' style sheltered scheme (a main entrance and all flats being entered from corridors) built in 1974 and situated in Lewisham. It comprises 63 flats. It is designed to provide accommodation for older people with low-level support needs and a high degree of independence.
8. There are currently 52 residents at Mais House, ranging in age from 61 to 92. Two have lived there more than 20 years. Their ages can be broken down as follows:

Age	Number
60-69	19
70-79	16
80-89	13
90-92	4

9. The majority of flats are bedsits. These have become increasingly unpopular everywhere, and it is now recognised nationally that older people should not be expected to downsize their lives to the extent that they can fit into one room. There is also recognition that geographically dispersed families mean that many older people need space for visitors and that the trend for grandparents to provide crucial child care also means they need more space. Although some residents at Mais House have said that they prefer their bedsits, many have criticised the lack of space.

10. As well as failing to meet modern requirements for space, bedsits are extremely difficult to adapt to accommodate wheelchairs, walking frames and other needs as people grow older.
11. The scheme has several communal areas, including a kitchen and a large room originally used as a dining area where meals were provided to residents. Kitchens in individual flats are extremely small, as they were not designed for residents to cook for themselves. This has been the subject of negative feedback from some residents.
12. Mais House is located at the top of Sydenham Hill. There are splendid views, and these are clearly enjoyed by the residents. However, the nearest facilities (shops, doctors' surgeries, trains etc) are some distance away. There is a bus stop opposite the scheme, which is on three bus routes, so there is access to public transport and current residents tell us that they use this to reach local amenities.
13. Many existing residents tell us that they are happy with the location of Mais House. It is, however, cited by prospective tenants as a disadvantage. Most people on the City's waiting list come from other housing estates. Mais House is a long way from these so to move there requires them to uproot from their existing communities and support networks at a time when they are increasingly reliant on them.
14. The principles and understanding of what older people need have changed significantly since Mais House was built. The ideal location for accommodation for older people with low support needs is one which encourages them to remain healthy and active by being able to walk to shops, health facilities etc. This is not possible for most people at Mais House. Residents are generally reliant on buses, cars and taxis to go anywhere. The withdrawal in recent years of a shopping bus provided by the local council has meant that the only practical way of shopping at the local supermarket is to take a taxi, which costs £10 for a return trip.
15. There has been low demand for accommodation at Mais House for some years. Other sheltered scheme vacancies are filled from the City's waiting list but this has not been possible at Mais House and officers have promoted it through adverts in the local press and through Lewisham's Choice Based Lettings system. It has, however, remained unpopular. Since the end of Phase 1 of the Sheltered Housing Review, vacancies have not been advertised or filled, as it was felt that the flexibility of having some empty properties may be needed.
16. A full-time Scheme Manager is based at the site, although does not live there, and is supported by a cleaner. The Manager's role is not to provide care, which remains the responsibility of the local authority and health services, but to give housing-related support which helps people stay independent as long as possible. This includes maintaining a support plan for each person, paying regular visits to check on them, giving advice and information to help with day to day issues, liaising with care providers and families where appropriate and organising events and activities to combat social isolation.

17. Part of the brief to the consultants was to look at the current condition of the building and reviews it against the Decent Homes Standard. This has flagged up that, to meet the Standard, smoke seals need to be installed on doors and remedial repairs are required to ensure that windows open. Our Property Services colleagues will be ordering this work to be carried out. In other respects the units are compliant with the Standard.
18. However, it should be noted that we have already identified extensive work which is needed to improve general standards. This includes the replacement of the current, single-glazed windows, new boiler plant and hot water and heating systems, rewiring, new kitchens, bathrooms and flooring, a new fire alarm system and an asbestos survey. All of this work needs to be carried out at Mais House even if nothing else is done

London Borough of Lewisham

19. The LB Lewisham has carried out its own review of accommodation for older people as part of the research for its Housing Strategy 2015-2020. Although the review highlighted that the % of people aged over 65 in the borough is increasing, it identified that there is an over-supply of housing specifically for older people with low support needs, even taking into account demographic trends.
20. Therefore, LB Lewisham is focusing investment in extra-care housing to meet a wide range of housing and social care needs. It is piloting an enhanced investment standard on six sheltered schemes and investing further in twelve others pending further consultation and options appraisals. Where possible schemes will be retained and improved. However, some may be redeveloped for general needs housing or extra-care housing.
21. Initial discussions with officers from LB Lewisham have confirmed that the retention of Mais House as sheltered accommodation is not essential to their plans. They acknowledge that Mais House flats have proved unpopular, even when marketed through their own Choice Based Lettings scheme, and recognise that the current accommodation and location is far from ideal.
22. Given these factors, officers from Lewisham have indicated that they are supportive of the City's wish to explore options for Mais House and that they would welcome the provision of more general needs properties, to which they would have some nomination rights. They have offered support to City officers in the event that it is necessary to find alternative accommodation for some or all of the Mais House residents, and discussions have already taken place about the availability of some places in a brand-new extra-care scheme.

Views of existing residents

23. Mais House residents were consulted in 2014 as part of Phase 1 of the Sheltered Housing Review. Most expressed dissatisfaction with the condition of the building and the fact that major works such as windows replacements had been

promised some year ago and not been delivered. There were also comments about the size of flats and, in particular, the fact that kitchens are inadequate, as well as unhappiness with the lack of redecoration. Residents, however, appreciated many aspects of life at Mais House, in particular having a Scheme Manager.

24. Since the end of Phase 1, we have held four residents' meetings – in March, May, August and October of this year. In March, residents were made aware that the future of Mais House was under consideration and that Members would, in due course, be making a decision about it. They were told that all possibilities, from refurbishment to redevelopment, would be considered, and that no decision would be made until the end of 2015. Residents were, understandably alarmed and some expressed a hope that they could stay at Mais House. They were assured of the extensive support which would be in place for them, whatever option was chosen, and that, in the event of a redevelopment, we would work with everyone to find suitable alternative homes. However, some residents immediately approached officers and said they wished to move anyway and would like to take advantage of this opportunity.
25. In May, officers returned to go through the information again and were accompanied by the Chairman of the Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee, Virginia Rounding, who was able to provide additional reassurances to residents.
26. In August, officers introduced the architect who had been commissioned to undertake a study of Mais House. She explained the purpose of her work and what she would be doing. Messages about support and timescales were repeated.
27. In October, a further meeting was held in order to keep residents informed. The meeting was attended by Ann Holmes, Deputy Chairman of Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee. This meeting was used to outline to residents the broad options for Mais House as outlined in paragraphs 35-41 of this report, to give more information about support and to explain the decision making process.
28. The May and October meetings were attended by a representative from Lewisham Pensioners' Forum, whom we invite to all meetings to provide some independent scrutiny. This representative has been extremely valuable in giving residents some perspective, in view of the changes taking place across Lewisham, and urging them not to simply reject the City's proposals out of hand.
29. At each meeting, some residents have expressed concern about the future of Mais House and the uncertainty of this period before a decision is made. This, of course, is entirely understandable and officers have enormous sympathy for the residents, some of whom have lived at Mais House for many years. We have endeavoured to be completely honest with them without causing unnecessary anxiety, but it is clear that they need a decision as soon as possible. They have also expressed frustration that major works have not been carried out in previous

years. Again, this is understandable and officers have repeatedly apologised for this failure.

30. At August's meeting, it was agreed that a survey should be carried out to capture residents' views and wishes. The survey revealed that most of the residents feel they have support needs and would prefer to stay in sheltered accommodation. Some residents still prefer sheltered accommodation even if they feel they have no support needs. However, others have expressed preferences for general needs. Although it is clear that many are happy at Mais House, there are a number who are willing to consider alternative accommodation. Three residents stated that they wish to stay at Mais House and would not indicate any alternative preference. Anonymised feedback from the survey is included at Appendix 1.
31. At October's meeting, a resident called for a straw poll asking which residents wished Mais House to stay a sheltered scheme, for older people only. The 31 residents present were unanimous in wishing this. Residents expressed concerns living in a community of mixed ages, with noise and security being cited as potential problems.
32. Although many people express a preference for larger flats, there are a small number who say they wish to remain in bedsits. This would appear to be largely for financial reasons as their rent is not covered by Housing Benefit and they are, therefore, self-funding.
33. In addition to the meetings, officers have held regular surgeries at Mais House. Both the Sheltered Housing Manager and the Area Manager make pre-advertised visits to the scheme to sit and talk to individual residents who wish to discuss questions and concerns with them privately. Many residents have said that they prefer this to the wider meetings, where there is always a risk that one or two residents will dominate any discussion. The officers have been able to offer extensive reassurance and information and have helped some residents who have expressed a wish to move as soon as possible.
34. In summary, the wish of the majority of existing residents is for the minimum possible change and for refurbishment work to take place, with Mais House remaining a sheltered housing scheme.
35. This paper has been circulated to residents prior to your meeting, and their comments and questions invited. Those comments and questions will be provided, in full, to Members either at or prior to the meeting.

Ideas for the refurbishment or redevelopment of Mais House

36. The consultants have, so far, identified ten ideas for what could be done in terms of building work at Mais House.
37. These ideas can broadly be categorised into three options:
 - a. Refurbish Mais House but keep it as a sheltered scheme;
 - b. Refurbish it as a general needs development;

- c. Redevelop the site, building as many lifetime homes as possible for general needs use.

38. At a meeting in October, these options were explained to residents. At that point it was expected that these would be the options presented to Members of your Committee in January. However, in examining the issues involved, it has become apparent that there is a fundamental principle to be decided upon before ideas and options for the building itself can be explored.
39. This fundamental principle is whether or not, in the long-term, Mais House is needed as a wholly sheltered housing scheme or whether it should be changed to a general needs scheme of lifetime homes in order to meet current and future housing need.
40. A decision on this principle needs to be made before further work is undertaken. Once the decision is made, Housing & Neighbourhoods officers can engage appropriately with residents to help them plan, and the Housing Programme Board can then move forward to identify a range of suitable proposals for the work to be carried out that can then be brought back to Members.
41. At this stage, then, the work carried out by Evolution has not been presented, but will be brought to Members once it is complete and the initial decision has been taken.

Proposals

42. The refurbishment and retention of Mais House as a sheltered scheme would, in the short-term, meet the needs and wishes of the people who live there at present. Those residents are, quite understandably, anxious about the future and would seek reassurance that change will be kept to a minimum. They are concerned about the prospect of living in a mixed-age community and have made it clear that this is not the wish of the majority. It is essential that the views and feelings of the residents are considered carefully and taken into account.
43. However, it is also important that Members consider the future and what sort of accommodation will be appealing to people as they grow older. Retaining and investing in accommodation which will not be wanted in the future is a financial risk and fails the many households in desperate need of housing. If Mais House stays sheltered housing but the demand for it continues to fall, then Members will almost certainly be faced with having to reduce the age threshold in the future and make it a mixed-aged community after all.
44. This is, then, a very difficult situation, and one which requires Members to balance their responsibilities to existing residents against the need to provide more homes of types which meet housing need and demand.
45. Further work is needed to look at the different ideas for what building and redevelopment work could be done at Mais House. However, it has become clear that, before this can happen, Members need to make a decision about the

overall use of the site in future and whether it should remain a sheltered housing scheme only, or whether to widen it to include other tenants.

46. Officers therefore, propose that, at this stage, there are three options for Members to consider:

- a. Refurbish Mais House and retain it as a wholly sheltered scheme;
- b. Refurbish or redevelop Mais House as a lifetime homes scheme, with properties made available to general needs tenants of all ages;
- c. Refurbish or redevelop Mais House as a lifetime homes scheme, but make provision through the design and allocations policy for it to be prioritised for older people, rather than including family-sized units.

47. Refurbishing Mais House and retaining it as a wholly sheltered scheme

would be popular with the majority of existing residents and give the least disruption for them. It is the option least likely to require residents to be moved into alternative accommodation (known as 'decanting') other than during the works, and would require the lowest capital outlay.

48. However, this option would not address the problems of poor location, reliance on transport to access local amenities and low demand at Mais House. It does not fit with the City's overall strategy and the requirement for more accommodation to meet general housing needs. It also does not address the over-supply of this type of housing for over 55s in Lewisham. Although a good solution for existing residents in the short-term, it is likely that the question of Mais House remaining sheltered accommodation would have to be revisited in the near future if demand continued to decline and the flats became even more difficult to let.

49. Redeveloping Mais House as a lifetime homes scheme available to general needs tenants of all ages would better meet the City's housing need and that of Lewisham. It would provide a higher number of homes, contributing to the strategies of both boroughs. It could provide homes for families which would be in high demand. Overall, it would be a better longer-term solution for Mais House than leaving it as a purely sheltered scheme.

50. However, it would be unpopular with many of the existing residents, who have made it clear that they would not welcome living in a mixed-age community. Although they would have the option to return, it is likely that the redevelopment would take 2-3 years, so all residents would have to be moved for that period, even if some chose to return with floating support once the new homes were finished.

51. Redeveloping Mais House as a lifetime homes scheme, but prioritised for older people would also provide more homes, thereby contributing to the delivery of the City's strategies and to meeting Lewisham's housing need. There is high demand for one bedroomed properties for people aged 45 plus (who are now eligible under the City's Allocations Policy for these properties rather than bedsits) and for couples.

52. This option has the advantage of addressing some of the concerns of existing residents. As the homes would be unsuitable for families, there would be no children in the community. A Local Lettings Plan could be agreed to prioritise applications from older people, thus restricting the age range of the community further. The nature of the design might also be considered – for example, the creation of a number of units designated specifically for older people, with a separate entrance, to increase security. Residents could be consulted about this as plans were developed.
53. Such provision would alleviate some of the fears of existing residents with regard to living in a mixed-age community and might make Mais House a more attractive proposition for residents who wished to move back to it, with floating support, once it is complete.
54. However, whether provision of this nature was practicable and desirable would depend on whether there was clear evidence that there would be demand for it. It would also be subject to planning agreement from the London Borough of Lewisham, as planners there might be more in favour of family-sized units.
55. The need for residents to move out for a period of 2-3 years whilst works were completed would remain. It is likely that some residents would still not regard this option as desirable as, although the age range of the community would be restricted, it would still not provide them with the wholly sheltered housing that they prefer. These residents would need to be found suitable alternative sheltered accommodation on a permanent basis.

Officer view

56. Given the findings of the Sheltered Housing Review it is the officer view that the work needed at Mais House is an opportunity to achieve more extensive change which will better meet housing need in the future. The decision is, of course, for Members, but officers would recommend the redevelopment of Mais House site as a lifetime homes scheme.
57. However, it is important that everything possible is done to recognise the wishes of the existing residents. Having listened to their views on a number of occasions, we would recommend that Members choose the third option and that plans are made to redevelop Mais House as a lifetime homes scheme prioritising older people.

Recommendations

58. Members are requested to select one of three options.
59. **Option 1: Refurbish and retain Mais House as a wholly sheltered housing scheme for letting to older people only**
If this is selected, the next steps for officers would be to:
- Communicate the decision to residents;

- Develop detailed options for the refurbishment programme and produce costings;
- Through the Housing Programme Board, follow the necessary projects and procurement processes;
- Develop a plan for supporting residents through the works and for making alternative arrangements for housing as appropriate.

60. Option 2: Redevelop Mais House as a lifetime homes scheme with general needs units open to people of all ages

If this is selected, the next steps for officers would be to:

- Communicate the decision to residents and put into place immediate support arrangements;
- Appoint a Project Manager to manage all arrangements and support for residents;
- Develop a Support Programme for residents and bring this to the Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee for approval;
- Develop detailed options for the redevelopment of the Mais House site as part of the Housing Delivery Programme and seek pre-planning advice from the London Borough of Lewisham;
- Through the Housing Programme Board, follow the necessary projects and procurement processes.

61. Redevelop Mais House as a lifetime homes scheme of one bedroomed units, prioritised for older people

If this is selected, the next steps for officers would be to:

- Communicate the decision to residents and put into place immediate support arrangements;
- Appoint a Project Manager to manage all arrangements and support for residents;
- Develop a Support Programme for residents and bring this to the Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee for approval;
- Develop detailed options for the redevelopment of Mais House as part of the Housing Delivery Programme, with design features focused on older people, and seek pre-planning advice from the London Borough of Lewisham;
- Consult further with existing residents, people on the City's housing waiting list and the London Borough of Lewisham to explore what features might be incorporated to make the development more suitable for older people;
- Through the Housing Programme Board, follow the necessary projects and procurement processes.

Proposed support for residents

62. Whichever option is chosen by Members, it remains the City's responsibility to provide housing for the residents which is suitable for their needs. **All residents will be offered the opportunity to return to Mais House following work,** although, unless Mais House is retained as a sheltered scheme, this will be with

floating support, rather than an on-site manager, and may not be suitable for more frail residents.

63. If Mais House is simply refurbished as a sheltered scheme, it is possible that, by using the accommodation which is currently vacant, we could reduce disruption and the need to move out during the work. However, we cannot be sure of this – it may be that a temporary decant is necessary anyway. We will make provisional plans for this event.
64. If it is decided that Mais House will become a lifetime homes scheme and extended or redeveloped, we will need to make more extensive arrangements. There will be a range of options available to residents for rehousing them either permanently or temporarily. These will include:
- a. Moving to sheltered accommodation at Harman Close, Isleden House or the Almshouses in Lambeth. This would suit people who feel that they need on-site support and wish to stay with the City as a landlord but do not mind relocating to a different area.
 - b. Moving to alternative sheltered accommodation in Lewisham. This would suit people who need on-site support but wish to stay in the local area. We would agree a reciprocal arrangement with Lewisham to offer a property to someone on their waiting list for every one of our residents they house in this way.
 - c. Moving into general needs accommodation, either at Sydenham Hill estate (depending on availability) or on one of our other estates. Our Allocations Scheme allows this if a sheltered scheme is being decanted. It would suit people with no or very low support needs (floating support could be offered as needed, but these homes, unless new, would not meet lifetime homes standards so would only be suitable for active and independent tenants). It would also offer people the chance to move to a larger property if they wished, as applicants aged 45+ are now eligible for one-bedroomed properties.
 - d. Moving into new general needs homes on one of our estates. All new homes will be built to lifetime home standards and will, therefore, be suitable for older people. In particular there will be flats available at Avondale Square Estate next year – as these are located next to Harman Close, any older resident could have use of the communal facilities there and would be supported by the Harman Close Scheme Manager. There are also likely to be opportunities for moving into new flats at Golden Lane Estate. These might suit people who wished to move into the Square Mile and be supported by the City's Adult Social Care Team as well as the estate staff. A number of other schemes on different estates are being considered at present. If it is decided to proceed with any of these, they might also present opportunities, depending on when properties became available.

- e. Moving into an extra-care scheme in Lewisham. This would suit people with higher support needs who perhaps should no longer be in sheltered accommodation anyway. The London Borough of Lewisham has already offered us a number of places at a brand-new extra-care scheme and we are in discussion with some residents about this opportunity.
 - f. Moving away from London to live in a coastal or rural area. We already operate a scheme to facilitate moves for people wishing to do this, and some Mais House residents have said they wish to take this option.
65. All possibilities will be discussed in full with residents. We plan to appoint a Project Manager (PM), experienced in decanting sheltered housing schemes, to move forward with the Sheltered Housing Review and to work on an individual basis with each resident and, if appropriate, their family. That PM will support the resident throughout the process, from the time that a decision is announced to the point where they are settled and happy in their new home. The PM will explore the needs of the individual with them, working with the local authority and other agencies as needed, to find a solution which meets the needs and wishes of the tenant as far as can possibly be managed. Every effort will be made to keep friends together where this is possible and the needs of the individual tenant will be paramount throughout.
66. The PM will also make all the necessary arrangements for people to actually move, putting in place any support and organisation needed to make the process as easy as possible for the individual. This will include arranging for compensation for those residents who would qualify. For example, residents who have to be rehoused permanently would be eligible for statutory home loss payments (currently £5,300) and disturbance payments for reasonable expenses incurred in moving. Allowances and compensation, where appropriate, will be agreed with Members in advance so that we can give residents clear information about their entitlement.
67. It is anticipated that the decant process would take up to two years, given the need to proceed with enormous sensitivity and to take time and care to find the best approach for each individual. A decant plan created in liaison with Lewisham's Adult Social Care and Housing teams would be brought to the Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee and this would include a communications programme, agreed in liaison with the Corporate Communications Team.
68. It is worth noting that in most instances where sheltered schemes are decanted for a period, residents offered the chance to move back after works have taken place rarely do so. Usually, despite their fears and anxiety, they settle quite quickly into their new homes and, although liking the security of knowing they *could* move back, prefer not to have any further disruption.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

69. The refurbishment or redevelopment of Mais House contributes to the delivery of the first priority of the City's Housing Strategy, which is to increase the supply of

homes. Within this priority is a commitment to “build more affordable housing on our estates to help City residents and tenants and those in need in neighbouring boroughs, and generate additional funding through sales and rental income for future investment”.

70. It furthermore contributes to the delivery of the Departmental Business Plan Priority 4 – Developing strong communities and ensuring that people have a decent place to live. Within this is a commitment to ‘Build new homes and develop sustainable neighbourhoods’.

Implications

71. Whatever decision is made about the future of Mais House, it will require significant financial investment. The cost of simply carrying out essential work is estimated at £3m. The cost of extending or redeveloping will depend entirely on the scheme chosen, but will be significantly more than this. A redevelopment will require more capital investment, but will also give options for funding, including the potential for developing some homes for sale. Detailed costings and funding plans will need to be developed as part of the next stage of work.

72. The main risk associated with Mais House remaining a sheltered scheme is that, if demand continues to decrease, then the City will have made a financial investment but will be left with hard-to-let properties. This will result in a reduction in income to the Housing Revenue Account. If this happens, the City could mitigate against the risk by reviewing the status of Mais House as a sheltered scheme and extending eligibility to other age groups.

73. If Mais House is redeveloped, the key risk would be reputational damage from having to move existing residents into alternative homes, on a temporary or permanent basis. However, the decommissioning of sheltered housing schemes is now quite commonplace in many local authorities due to a general fall in demand. We would mitigate against this risk by:

- a. Working with the corporate Communications Team on key messages;
- b. Appointing a Project Manager to provide dedicated, one to one support to residents and their families;
- c. Agreeing a support programme with the Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee;
- d. Working with the London Borough of Lewisham, our own Housing Needs Team, livery companies and other agencies to identify suitable options for housing residents.

74. There will be legal implications in respect of provision to be made for moving residents from their existing homes. These will be fully addressed in the Support Programme.

75. In terms of HR, there will be a need to appoint a suitably experienced Project Manager on a part-time basis for a period of two years. The cost of this, which is estimated to be in the region of £30k pa can, ultimately, be capitalised and

included in the project budget but, until then, will be met from the HRA and Supported Housing budgets.

76. The Property implications will be managed by the Housing Programme Board. This is chaired by the Director of Community & Children's Services and will assume responsibility for the moving forward of proposals for the building once your Committee has made a decision about the sheltered status.

Conclusion

77. There is still a considerable amount of work to be done before a clear, detailed plan for Mais House is available. Options will have to be fully costed and considered, planning advice sought and the corporate projects process followed. However, first there needs to be a decision about the overall direction for Mais House – whether it is to continue in the longer-term as a wholly sheltered housing scheme, or whether it is to be redeveloped for wider housing use.

78. This decision is important in determining the direction to be taken, but it is also very important for residents. They are, understandably, very concerned about the future of their home and want some certainty. It is hoped that Members are able to make a decision so that they know what will happen next and so that officers can provide whatever support is needed.

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Responses to Mais House resident questionnaire, August 2015
- Appendix 2: (to be tabled): Comments and questions relating to the report received from residents, January 2016

Background Papers

- Sheltered Housing Review Phase 1 – report to Community & Children's Services Committee, November 2014

Jacquie Campbell

Assistant Director, Housing & Neighbourhoods

T: 020 7332 3785

E: jacquie.campbell@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Mais House Residents Survey
Summary of responses

Total number of responses: 37

Residents' comments are unedited except where necessary to preserve anonymity.

1.	Is it important to you to live in sheltered housing rather than a general housing estate? (* two respondents did not answer this question)	Yes 28	No 7
2.	If you answered yes to question 1, what is important to you?		
	The monitoring alarm system	20	
	Support from a scheme manager	25	
	Daily checks	16	
	Secure building access	27	
	Something else (see comments below)	4	
	<i>'I am satisfied with the size of the flat I live in now. Anything bigger may be more than I can afford.'</i>		
	<i>'The above questions are very important to me.'</i>		
	<i>'Before I lived in Mais House I had to climb two flights of stairs in Mais House there are no stairs I have to use because with the lift it makes all parts easily reached.'</i>		
	<i>'Keep the scheme manager.'</i>		
3.	What is important to you in the area you live in?		
	Friends within the building or in the area	16	
	Family living nearby	22	
	Good transport	31	
	Easy access to GP and health services	29	
	Local amenities for instance shops restaurants, cinema, library	28	
	Something else (see comments below)	7	
	<i>'Stability. I would like to continue life at Mais House.'</i>		
	<i>'I have been very happy here since I moved into my flat and when I have an emergency the scheme manager and Link line have always come to my rescue.'</i>		
	<i>'Keep our scheme manager.'</i>		
	<i>'It is often very difficult to get an appointment at Wells Park GP. For the amenities mentioned above a bus is required.'</i>		
	<i>'Local football team that I support'</i>		
	<i>'Safe, quiet area.'</i>		
	<i>'Off road parking.'</i>		
4.	What kind of support do you consider you need to help you remain living independently?		
	No support	9	
	Scheme manager as currently provided	27	
	More support than you currently have at Mais house – if so what do you think you need? (See comments below)	4	
	<i>'Under discussion at present.'</i>		
	<i>'Filling in important forms that need to be sent.'</i>		
	<i>'I need the scheme manager to help and advise me on the mundane things in</i>		

	<i>life. As life goes on this can be valuable help’.</i>
	<i>‘CCTV camera outside my flat.’</i>
5.	<i>Any other information you would like to tell us?</i>
	<i>‘I am horrified at the thought of re-locating at this stage of my life. Mais House has provided the only stable address at which I have lived since (retirement) this has now rapidly disappeared.’</i>
	<i>‘I would like to stay here because we are all friends we are a close family. We help each other and support each other. We find the manager very helpful. She always supports us if we need help and helps us fill in forms and explains letters.’</i>
	<i>‘A new flat in Otto close would be very welcome, failing that I’m quite content with my accommodation size being as it is, however the windows and heating system do need sorting plus there seems to be quite a problem with various bugs, insects and clothes moths making an appearance from nooks and crannies here and there. Having a carpet doesn’t help. I wish I had put in an alternative floor covering at the start as I am very quiet and respectful of those below me anyway.’</i>
	<i>‘I don’t want to leave Mais House or my flat.’</i>
	<i>‘I had to take out a bank loan which I paid off over 18 months. Then I had to ask for a second loan which I am again paying over 18 months at £63 per month. I need these loans to enable me to cover my living expenses. I am not spending wildly but my pension income is not great. I worry that I may not be able to pay my rent if the new flats are more expensive. I look forward to having an individual meeting.’</i>
	<i>‘I do not want to leave Mais house. My flat and accommodation suits me. I am disabled and all the amenities I need are here at Mais House and in my flat.’</i>
	<i>‘I would like a one bedroom sheltered housing property please.’</i>
	<i>‘Keep the scheme manager.’</i>
	<i>‘Keep the scheme manager.’</i>
	<i>‘I would be very happy to move to the Almshouses in Brixton eventually. Not yet, it would be too much upheaval.’</i>
	<i>‘Would like to stay on the estate. Would consider other areas depending what is on offer.’</i>
	<i>‘I would rather stay in my home in Mais House but the uncertainty of what is going to happen when it will happen, for how long the disruption is like living on a precipice. During the first meeting Jacquie Campbell asked if we had any ideas of where we would like to move to. A flat in Lamma Green could solve my problem. Thank you.’</i>
	<i>‘The only thing I need is a living room it gets a bit cramped when all the grand kids come to visit me.’</i>
	<i>‘Emergency pendant only.’</i>

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank