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Executive Summary

In 2008 the Council identified a need to undertake a review of its Sheltered Housing due to a number of emerging concerns with:

- low demand
- High turnover
- Difficulties in letting void properties, resulting in increased void periods
- Inflexibility of accommodation in terms of access and adaptability

The specific aims of the review are to:

- Highlight investment requirements to ensure existing social housing stock continues to meet the needs of older people.
- Inform investment decisions in new housing provision or services.
- Promote choices of accommodation for older people.

All the Council's sheltered housing properties are located within schemes. A sheltered housing scheme is generally a group of flats or bungalows where all residents are older people.

The Council's existing sheltered housing consists of a large proportion of bed-sit accommodation which is generally viewed as the least popular accommodation type by residents. It is these bedsits that present the Council with the highest level of voids amongst older persons housing stock.

The first stage of the review was to analyse void and lettings data for all sheltered housing schemes in an attempt to present a 'snapshot' of current demand.

All data recorded on 3rd November 2008

- The total number of voids within sheltered housing schemes currently stands at 53; this represents 10.83% of total dwelling numbers.
- The average length of a current void is over a year
- There are 5 sheltered housing schemes with a very high level of voids, at approximately 20% or higher, these being Babington Court, Riversdale Court, St Peters Court, Martin Court and Aingarth
- Of particular concern are Babington Court and Martin Court where the average length of current voids is 555 days and 1104 days respectively.

The Council owns 15 sheltered housing schemes across the borough covering a total of 489 dwellings.
In order to prioritise schemes in relation to the need for intervention a scoring matrix was developed focusing on factors such as demand, current service provision, suitability and maintenance expenditure. A desktop assessment for each Sheltered Housing scheme was then carried out with Service Managers, the schemes were placed in the following order of priority for further investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Ranking</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Longcliffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Babington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aingarth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dudley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fielding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Beresford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sorrel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>St Michaels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>St Peters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Arnold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Riversdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>St Pauls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Grays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scheme visits and findings

A site visit and appraisal was carried out for each Sheltered Housing scheme. The appraisal focused on a number of different factors including scheme layout, appropriateness of design, physical quality of accommodation, access and development opportunities.

Following site inspections, the poorest performing scheme in terms of physical attributes was Babington Court, closely followed by both St Michaels Court and St Peters Court.

Grays Court sits at the top of the list and represents in terms of the assessment, the best performing scheme. Grays Court has recently benefited from a major re-modelling programme, the schemes performance is a reflection of this previous investment.
Martin Court and St Pauls Court also scored very highly. Both schemes are in popular locations with good access both internally and externally and have experienced some recent re-modernising.

Sheltered scheme visits and inspections enabled the Council to identify the major shortfalls of each development and highlight possible options for scheme improvements.

All scheme findings and resulting development options were discussed with representatives from the Councils ALMO, Charnwood Neighbourhood Housing (CNH).

The form of options considered came under 4 main categories

1) Decent Homes works

These are items that are ultimately required under the Decent Homes programme such as new kitchens, bathrooms and windows. Funding is only available subject to a 2 Star allocation following the Audit Commission inspection taking place early 2010. Even if 2 Stars are awarded, it has been announced by Central Government that funding will not be available until 2011.

2) Small scale scheme improvements

These are items that would not necessarily ensure the complete long term demand for a scheme but may make the scheme more attractive to some potential occupiers and improve the quality of live for existing residents, items include lift installation and conversion of a storage rooms into mobility scooter storage.

3) Scheme re-modelling

These are major scheme improvements that are intended to address the low demand units within each scheme; options include converting bedsits into self contained 1 bedroom flats.

4) Site redevelopment

In some instances the most viable option to address long term demand is the complete demolition of a scheme and the subsequent development of a more appropriate purpose built scheme.

Proposed scheme options

In consultation with CNH, the most appropriate investment options for each Sheltered Housing scheme were established. It is intended that this information is used to inform future investment decisions relating to Sheltered Housing.
It is important to highlight that at this stage these options have been identified for further investigation only. Although costs have been identified, these are purely indicative. Further investigation on each option individually will enable accurate costs to be established and full appraisals undertaken. Further consultation will take place with residents once the Council is in a more informed position on the specific realistic scheme options. No resources in terms of funding have yet been formally identified.

Estimated costs to address each scheme vary widely and the availability of resources will play a part on the programming of works and potential timeframes.

There are a number of lower cost options that can increase demand in the short term such as installing lifts or creating a scooter storage facility, however will not necessarily ensure that housing stock meets the needs of older people in the long term.

Because of the inherent problem of minimal low demand for bedsits in the future the preferred options for the long term involve conversion or redevelopment works. This is because the inherent problem with most of the Councils Sheltered Housing development is the accommodation available, bedsits form the majority of units throughout the Councils stock. Whilst significantly more expensive, converting schemes into and developing more appropriate accommodation is therefore a better option if the Council is serious about ensuring the long term sustainability of its Sheltered Housing schemes.
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1.0 Introduction

1.1 Aims and Objectives

As people live longer, the number of older people as a proportion of the population increases and this in turn needs consideration in terms of housing options and services. The retirement accommodation market has changed; new forms of sheltered housing have been developed in recent years. Older peoples aspirations for housing have changed. There is evidence to suggest that there is now a mismatch in the type of accommodation in demand and the type of accommodation the Council has available.

The Council has decided to undertake a review of its Sheltered Housing due to a number of emerging concerns with:

- low demand
- High turnover
- Difficulties in letting void properties, resulting in increased void periods
- Inflexibility of accommodation in terms of access and adaptability

The specific aims of the review are to:

- Highlight investment requirements to ensure existing social housing stock continues to meet the needs of older people.
- Inform investment decisions in new housing provision or services.
- Promote choices of accommodation for older people.

1.2 Background

There are two main reasons for carrying out this review. Firstly, in recent years the Council has been faced with an increasing number of difficult to let bedsits and flats within sheltered housing schemes. Whilst part of this problem can be attributed to the design of accommodation, there may also be other issues which could affect the long term viability of sheltered housing.

Secondly, with housing applications for older people accounting for a significant proportion of the Councils Housing Register, it would appear that there is a high level of unmet need. However, how can housing for older people be seen as a priority for investment when certain accommodation designated for this group is standing empty?

The absence of appropriate housing at any time in life severely inhibits well-being, but never so more in the older age. For this reason the aim of the review is to ensure that older people have access and choice to appropriate housing.
1.3 National Context

There have been a number of significant national policies issued over the last few years which recognise the needs of older people. They include:

*Lifetime Homes, Lifetime Neighbourhoods: A National Strategy for Housing in an Ageing Society.*

In February 2008 the government published a national housing strategy giving older people greater choice and addressing the challenges of an ageing population.

At the heart of the strategy are proposals to future proof new housing provision, a focus on age friendly neighbourhoods together with increased support for older people to remain in their homes.

*Quality and Choice for Older People’s Housing*

A Strategic Framework seeks to address the many problems and opportunities for older people in securing decent, affordable and suitable housing. It sets out five key areas for policy and service development.

- Diversity and Choice
- Information and advice
- Flexible housing provision
- Quality
- Joint working

*National Strategy for Housing in an Ageing Society (2008)*

The Government has set a target to see Lifetime Homes built in Lifetime Communities. Specifically, the Government wants to see all new homes built to Lifetime Homes Standard by 2011 in the public sector and for the private sector by 2013.

The Government also recognises that older people need homes which are both warm and secure. As a result, Government have set targets to reduce fuel poverty (by 2010 for vulnerable households and 2016 for all households) and the national Warm Front Scheme will play a critical role in helping achieve such objectives.

*The Decent Homes Standard*

The Government has made a commitment to making all social housing decent and increasing to 70% the proportion of vulnerable people in decent private housing by 2010. Although it has been acknowledged that for some providers this time frame will need to be extended, the Decent Homes Standard is still a central plank of a commitment to increase standards in social housing.
1.4 Local Context

Charnwood Borough Council Housing Strategy 2005 – 2010

The Strategy identifies key aims for housing. It also highlights priorities within each of these aims. These priorities were felt to be those that would have most impact on achieving the aims within current and expected resources.

Aim 2 of the Housing Strategy is Balancing Housing Markets with priorities including giving closer consideration of the type and size of housing provided locally and making provision for the aging population.

Aim 3 is the Delivery of Affordable homes with priorities including more flexibility in housing provision and achieving more specialist housing.

An Asset Management Review relating specifically to sheltered housing will contribute towards meeting these aims.

Homelessness Strategy 2008

The Homelessness Strategy identifies that there is currently an adequate supply of accommodation and support for (homeless) older people. However due to the aging population and the need for more flexible models of provision there is a requirement to analyse how the needs of older people will be met as the older population grows.

Supporting People: Five Year Strategy 2005-2010

The Strategy identified older people with support needs/frail elderly/older people with mental health problems/dementia, in respect of Extra Care, floating support and home improvement agencies as Priority Level A.

Charnwood Borough Councils Older Persons Housing Strategy 2008 Action Plan

“Ensure older peoples housing meets needs and aspirations”. It highlights how it is important to make the best use of existing social housing in the context of changing demands and expectations. An action arising is to “undertake a review of current local authority older persons housing provision and develop a long term plan for each scheme”.

Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)

The Leicester and Leicestershire SHMA makes a number of recommendations about older people that are of relevance to this review. The SHMA recommends what types of housing are attractive to older households.
2.0 Needs and Demands

2.1 Population Growth

Nationally the growth of older people as a proportion of the population is likely to create new challenges in terms of the range of services needed. Based on 2001 figures 8.2% of the population is thought to be over 65 years. By 2031 this is set to rise to 25% of the population. In housing terms this creates a number of issues. Although the majority of older people will continue to live in their own homes the need for supported, sheltered and care environments is likely to increase. The current national provision of 1 million bed spaces is thought to be inadequate.

The population of the borough is approximately 162,000 compared to 153,461 in the 2001 census, showing an increase of 5.5%. The borough is one of the largest districts in England. The population is anticipated to grow by a further 5% by 2016.

The most significant growth is in the population of the over 65 age group. A steady increase is anticipated up to 2016 with the largest increase projected to occur between 2011 and 2016 (+4,700; +16.6%)

The “older” retirement group, those 80 and over is projected to grow by almost 47%, 2,700 more people by 2016. This group represents 8,600 people in the area by 2016 that are much more likely to have care and support needs.

2.2 Disability and Illness

With an ageing population comes issues related to mobility, with long term limiting illnesses becoming prevalent. The ‘older’ retirement group, those 80 and over, who are much more likely to have care and support needs, grows by 46%, 2,700 in the borough by 2016. 18% of households within the borough contain somebody with a disability. Of households with a disability, some 28% have outstanding support/care needs. The Charnwood Borough Council Housing Needs Survey 2003 identified that 65.8% of all disabled household members were over the age of 60.

2.3 Demand

Within the SHMA the housing requirements of a range of different groups were considered. In relation to Older People it has identified that provision of low level care for older people will need to increase by some 50% in the county, and by 25% in the city, if the projected demographic changes occur. The city will need around another 400 residential and nursing home places by 2025, while the county could need some 1,500.

The SHMA identified that higher levels of under-occupancy are amongst older households and especially the aged over 50 ‘empty nesters’. At a more detailed level this can be seen to be higher in the rural and suburban areas, and lower in the city and towns; and higher for owner occupiers than for tenants. These households make up the core of the demand for older persons housing but unless provision can be made more attractive to encourage them to move it will only be at the point they
reach crisis and are unable to maintain existing accommodation that they will look to move.

There are currently 590 applicants on the Councils housing register featuring a household member under 60, yet there are still significant vacant older persons properties within the borough.

3.0 Supply and Demand of Older Persons Accommodation

3.1 Supply of Older Persons Accommodation

At the time of the 2001 census the tenure breakdown for older people within Charnwood was broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure/age</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>75-84</th>
<th>85+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>88.88%</td>
<td>84.84%</td>
<td>75.53%</td>
<td>64.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>6.49%</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
<td>16.31%</td>
<td>18.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other social rent</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>4.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rent</td>
<td>3.59%</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>6.56%</td>
<td>11.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current level of SP funded services in Charnwood relating to older people is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frail Elderly</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Accommodation</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Alarms</td>
<td>1477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Charnwood Borough Council Sheltered Housing Stock

Charnwood Borough Council has a total housing stock of 5868 properties. The property types can be broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>% of total Stock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedsit</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>6.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungalow</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>9.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>2375</td>
<td>40.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>2555</td>
<td>43.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maisonette</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5868</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the Councils sheltered housing properties are located within schemes. A sheltered housing scheme is generally a group of flats or bungalows where all residents are older people. All developments provide independent, self contained homes with their own front doors. There are usually some common facilities that all residents can use, such as a residents lounge, a guest room, a garden and often a laundry.
Schemes have their own manager or warden either living on site or mobile, whose job is to manage the scheme and help arrange any services residents need. Properties are usually linked to a careline service so that residents can call help if needed.

The Council’s existing sheltered housing provision consists of a large proportion of bed-sit accommodation which is generally viewed as the least popular accommodation type by residents. As detailed later in the report, it is the sheltered schemes that present the Council with the highest level of voids amongst older persons housing stock. It is for these reasons that the Sheltered Housing Review focuses solely on Council-owned sheltered housing schemes.

The Council owns 15 sheltered housing schemes across the borough. All these schemes are managed by the Council’s ALMO, Charnwood Neighbourhood Housing (CNH). All schemes included within this review are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schemes</th>
<th>No. of Bedsits</th>
<th>No. of Flats</th>
<th>No. of Bungalows</th>
<th>Total Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aingarth, Loughborough</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Smith House, Shepshed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babington Court, Rothley</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beresford Court, Shepshed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Court, Sileby</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Road, Loughborough</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fielding Court, Loughborough</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray’s Court, Barrow</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longcliffe Road, Shepshed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Court, Anstey</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riversdale Court, Birstall</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorrel Court, Mountsorrel</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michaels Court, Thurcaston</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Pauls Court, Syston</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peters Court, Syston</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Sheltered Scheme Review covers a total of 460 properties.
3.3 Sheltered Housing Lettings

The table below now shows Charnwood Borough Council lettings to older person's accommodation and RSL lettings to over 60s within the borough.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CBC lettings to older persons accommodation</th>
<th>RSL lettings to over 60's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There has been a noticeable reduction in the number of lettings to older people by RSL's although CBC lettings have remained relatively consistent.

In the last 12 months (to 4\textsuperscript{th} June 2009) 207 older peoples properties became empty.

As of 3\textsuperscript{rd} November 2008 there were 106 older person's properties empty. 13 of these have been empty for over 2 years with 2 of them being vacant for over 7. It is clear that whilst on the surface there is a healthy waiting list for older person's properties, in practice there is a mismatch between supply and demand.
4.0 Sheltered Housing Review - Desktop Study

4.1 Void Data

The first stage of the review is to analyse void and lettings data for the sheltered housing schemes listed above in an attempt to present a ‘snapshot’ of current demand. This data can then be used to prioritise schemes for further investigation.

Please note that all data analysed within the desktop review was recorded on 3rd November 2008. It was felt that the original data should not be updated over the timeframe it took to compile this report to maintain a level of consistency in terms of figures used. Within the conclusion of this report updated figures on voids will be presented to give a more current snapshot.

The table below shows performance of each scheme in relation to three indicators:

1) Total number of current voids
2) What this figure equates to as a percentage of the total number of units within the scheme
3) Average length of current voids.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme name</th>
<th>Total units</th>
<th>Total voids</th>
<th>% of scheme void</th>
<th>Average length of current void</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aingarth</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>57 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Smith House</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>127 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babington Court</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>555 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beresford Court</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>321 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Court</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>755 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Road</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>43 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fielding Court</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>178 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray’s Court</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longcliffe Road</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>71 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Court</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>1104 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riversdale Court</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>154 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorrel Court</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michaels Court</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>262 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Pauls Court</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peters Court</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>261 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Snapshot Summary

- The total number of voids within sheltered housing schemes currently stands at 53; this represents 11.52% of total dwelling numbers.
- The average length of a current void is over a year.
- The level of void rent loss for Sheltered Housing schemes based on current voids only has amassed to approximately £125,000.
- There are 5 sheltered housing schemes with a very high level of voids, at approximately 20% or higher, these being Babington Court, Riversdale Court, St Peters Court, Martin Court and Aingarth.
- Of particular concern are Babington Court and Martin Court where the average length of current voids is 555 days and 1104 days respectively.
- At the other end of the scale, there are 3 schemes that have a relatively healthy level of voids of below 5%, these being Arnold Smith House, Durham Road and Grays Court. Sorrel Court and St Pauls Court both have void levels at zero.

Putting the data into chart format illustrates more clearly which schemes are poorer performing in terms of the 3 desk top indicators.

4.3 Total Void Numbers

![Scheme total void numbers](image)

Clearly shown within the graph above, the 3 sheltered housing schemes with the highest void numbers are Martin Court, Babington Court and St Peters Court.
4.4 Voids as a percentage of total scheme number

Babington Court is shown as the worst performing scheme in terms of voids as a percentage with 25% of the scheme currently vacant. Martin Court and St Peters Court are again very poor performing with void numbers equalling vacancy levels of approximately 20%. Whilst Riversdale Court may not be in the top 3 in terms of void numbers, a total of 5 empty units equates to a vacancy level of almost 21%.
4.5 Current Average Void Length

The target void turnaround time for Charnwood Neighbourhood Housing and Charnwood Borough Council allocations is 25 days. Referring to the chart above, 3 schemes stand out as having serious problems in terms of the length of current voids, Martin Court, Dudley Court and Babington Court.

4.6 Overall Scheme Performance

Based on the data above, to illustrate the performance of individual schemes in relation to the three indicators combined, a traffic light system of rating has been applied.

In order to sort the data, the results for each indicator have been divided into quartiles. A quartile is any one of the values which divide the data set into four equal parts. Quarter 1 represents the lowest 25% of the data, quarter 4 represents the highest 25% of the data. In the case of the sheltered housing scheme indicators a higher quartile rating equates to a poorer performing scheme.

The table within appendix A illustrates in which quartile each sheltered housing scheme sites under each performance indicator.

Schemes that are poor performing on all accounts have been rated as red. Schemes where results are mixed have been rated as amber. Where schemes are top performing on all accounts, a green light has been applied.
**Red schemes**

Babington Court  
St Peters Court  
Martin Court  
Dudley Court

**Amber Schemes**

Riversdale Court  
Aingarth Albert Promenade  
Beresford Court  
St Michaels Court  
Fielding Court

**Green Schemes**

Longcliffe House  
Arnold Smith House  
Durham Court  
Grays Court  
Sorrel Court  
St Pauls Court

**4.7 Waiting list data**

In an attempt to indicate current demand for each sheltered housing scheme within Charnwood Borough Council, a waiting list has been generated for the void property types at all schemes effected.

A waiting list will comprise all applicants who have expressed an interest in the property type and location within the Borough selected. The waiting list will not
produce a report showing applicants interested in a specific scheme, it works on location and property types only.

The chart below illustrates number of people on the waiting list against void property types within each scheme. As already stated, people on the waiting list have expressed an interest in the area only and will not necessarily accept an offer of accommodation in that particular scheme.

![Housing Register Applicants Chart]

(The data relating to the table above can be found within appendix B)

The clear pattern emerging is that there are significantly fewer applicants on the Housing Register for bedsits compared to flats. In general the number of applicants on the Housing Register for flats appears relatively healthy. This appears to support the notion that there is a mismatch in the supply of Council owned sheltered accommodation and borough wide demand.

5.0 Scoring Toolkit

The next section of the review is to gather views of service managers who oversee the running of the Councils Sheltered Housing schemes. Charnwood Neighbourhood Housing (CNH) who manage the Councils sheltered accommodation were asked to provide details on whether they feel each scheme is providing a quality service. They were also asked to provide details on current and projected levels of maintenance spend and whether these levels are acceptable.

The purpose of this additional review is to further highlight individual scheme performance over a range of factors.

In order to record this data, a scoring toolkit was devised which enabled the service provider to rate each heading inline with the options supplied. An example of a completed questionnaire and explanation of the scoring system can be found within Appendix C.

Whilst the voids analysis exercise was intended to highlight and group the performance of individual schemes in terms of current void levels, the scoring toolkit...
will provide an idea of overall scheme performance relating to a number of different factors. Using a scoring mechanism will enable the schemes to be ranked in order of overall performance. It is intended that the ranking sequence will be used to determine the order of scheme site visits, i.e. schemes at the top of the list are the poorest overall performers and therefore should have priority for a scheme visit to assess possible works.

The scoring toolkit contains the following headings.

**Demand**

This is data on void levels and potential applicants on the Housing Register. Data has been transferred from the desktop review of void performance.

**Are the services provided appropriate currently?**

The purpose of this part of the appraisal is to assess whether each scheme is appropriate for the needs of current tenants.

**Are the services currently delivered likely to be appropriate to the needs of future tenants?**

This question is intended to look at the sustainability of the scheme. If the accommodation is not likely to meet the needs of future tenants, void levels are likely to increase further.

**Is the scheme suited to the service provided?**

This question concentrates on the physical state of the accommodation; does the design of the scheme lend itself to providing a quality service?

**Current and projected costs**

This question is designed to compare outgoing costs on maintenance and accommodation improvements for each scheme over the last 5 years. It also asks for the anticipated Decent Homes costs. The question is intended to highlight schemes where expenditure and expected expenditure on maintenance is higher than typically anticipated.

*Based on current voids and rent levels, what is the total level of rent loss accrued as of 2\textsuperscript{nd} December 2008?*

This question is intended to rank schemes based on void rent loss.

*With regards to each scheme location, does the supply of similar services outweigh current demand?*

If an area already has a large supply of similar accommodation, this is likely to affect demand levels for Council owned stock. Where this is the case, it may be considered inappropriate to expend large sums of money making alterations to
Council accommodation when there is insufficient demand within that village for the level of sheltered accommodation available.

A table showing the scoring toolkit results can be found within the appendix D.

5.1 Scoring Toolkit Summary

5.2 Demand

- Martin Court is clearly the worst performing scheme. This has already been illustrated within the first section of analysis on void performance.
- Aingarth, Babington Court and Dudley Court also score very poorly in terms of void performance.
- According to the data, St Pauls and Grays Court have the highest levels of demand out of all sheltered housing schemes.

5.3 Current service provision

- Babington Court, Fielding Court and Longcliffe Road are the least appropriate schemes in terms of current service provision.
- Durham Court, Grays Court, Martin Court, Riversdale Court, St Michaels Court and St Pauls Court all score very highly indicating they provide the most appropriate services at the current time.

5.4 Are the services currently delivered likely to be appropriate to the needs of future tenants?

- Babington Court again comes out as one of the poorest performing schemes.
- Aingarth and Beresford Court also scores very poorly meaning that these are potentially the three least sustainable schemes going forward and will suffer from an increasing level of voids.
- Grays Court, Riversdale Court and St Michaels Court all score maximum points, indicating that these schemes will meet the needs of future tenants ensuring long term demand for the accommodation.

5.5 Is the scheme suited to the service provision?

- The scheme clearly physically least suited to the service that it provides is Longcliffe Road. The schemes main areas of downfall are that it has very limited facilities and design features for people with a disability. Its performance in terms of energy efficiency is very poor. The scheme has no facilities for visiting staff.
- Longcliffe Road also scores poorly through location, there are limited facilities within close proximity of the scheme such as shops, doctors and public transport links.
- Grays Court is the scheme most suited to the service provided scoring almost maximum points. The scheme has recently undergone significant re-modelling works and is located in a central location.
5.6 Current and projected costs

- Expenditure and anticipated expenditure at St Michaels Court in Thurmaston has been identified as being least acceptable. Average maintenance costs per unit over the last 5 years, including that on responsive repairs (cyclical and planned) and voids was £1,059.68.
- To provide comparison, costs attributed to St Peters Court were considered most acceptable over the last 5 years. The average maintenance cost per unit was £293.99.

5.7 Void rent loss

(Void rent loss calculations can be found within appendix E)

- The schemes that have accumulated the highest estimated levels of void rent loss are Dudley Court and Martin Court. Martin Court is at the top of the pile, as of 3rd November 2008 rent loss accrued based on current voids only was estimated at £56,000.
- As of 3rd November 2008 there were 3 schemes that had no voids, these being Sorrel Court, St Pauls Court and Grays Court. Void rent loss at these three schemes was therefore at zero.

5.8 With regards to each scheme location, does the supply of similar services outweigh current demand?

- Aingarth, Babington Court and Sorrel Court are all in locations where it is viewed the current supply of sheltered accommodation already outweighs the level of local demand.
- For all the remaining scheme locations, it is viewed that supply of and demand for sheltered accommodation is pretty much in balance.
5.9 Scheme priority

For every scheme, scores under each heading were added together to provide a total scheme score. It was then possible to rank schemes using total scores to determine a priority order for scheme visits.

The priority list resulting from the scoring toolkit is set out below:

(The full list showing final total toolkit scores can be found within appendix F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Ranking</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Longcliffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Babington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aingarth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dudley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fielding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Beresford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sorrel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>St Michaels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>St Peters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Arnold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Riversdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>St Pauls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Grays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.0 Scheme inspections

6.1 Purpose

As already stated, the priority list above determines the order of visits for scheme inspections. The schemes at the top of this list have been classed as overall the worst performing and are therefore treated with priority in terms of inspection.

A scheme visit is required to assess the physical quality of the accommodation and its surroundings. The visit is also used to identify possible options for scheme improvement.
6.2. Scheme appraisals

In order to ensure a consistent approach to both scheme inspections and assessment a scheme appraisal sheet was set up to record the quality of each development on site. A scoring mechanism would also provide a means of ranking schemes in order of quality once visits complete and can be used as evidence behind any decision for future works.

An example of a completed scoring appraisal can be found within appendix G.

The scheme appraisals measure a number of physical factors that are important within a sheltered housing development. Each factor is divided into four different headings representing varying quality. The first heading represents schemes providing below the bare minimum expected of any sheltered housing scheme, the next heading represents schemes just about achieving the bare minimum. Schemes within the third column provide what you might say that little bit extra although nothing special and the fourth column are schemes that within that heading really have the ‘wow factor.

The factors used within each heading are:

- Majority unit type
- Fixtures and fittings
- Heating
- Lift access
- Accessibility
- Range/quality of communal facilities
- Location with regards to shops and amenities
- Transport links
- External environment
- Decent Homes Status

6.3 Scheme visits

Scheme visits were carried out in line with the scheme priority list. However, minor alterations were made to the order where it made sense geographically.

Scheme visits were carried out on the following dates:

7th January 2009

- Longcliffe Road, Shepshed
- Beresford Road, Shepshed
- Arnold Smith House, Shepshed
14\textsuperscript{th} January 2009

- Babington Court, Rothley
- Dudley Court, Sileby
- Sorrel Court, Mountsorrel
- Martin Court, Anstey

16\textsuperscript{th} January 2009

- Aingarth, Loughborough
- Fielding Court, Loughborough
- Durham Road, Loughborough

23\textsuperscript{rd} January 2009

- St Peters Court, Syston
- St Michaels Court, Thurmaston
- Riversdale Court, Birstall
- St Pauls Court, Syston
- Grays Court, Barrow upon Soar

6.4 Scheme Appraisal Team

It was important to draw on experience and knowledge of sheltered accommodation from within the Council and Charnwood Neighbourhood Housing to carry out as accurate assessment as possible on each scheme. Advice was also sought from outside the CBC/CNH relationship in the form of The Housing Solutions Group who have experience in the re-modelling and conversion of sheltered housing developments. They were often able to look at the scheme from a slightly different perspective providing sometimes more radical proposals for scheme improvements. To summarise, the assessment team comprised an officer from:

- The Development and Enabling funding – CBC
- Warden Services – CNH
- Investment and Regeneration – CNH
- The Housing Solutions Group
6.5 Scheme Appraisal results

The table below highlights individual scheme scores and has been sorted into order. The lowest scoring schemes are at the top of the list and represent according to the appraisal, the poorest quality development in terms of physical attributes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme name</th>
<th>Appraisal score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babington</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michaels</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peters</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longcliffe</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beresford</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riversdale</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aingarth</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fielding</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorrel</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Pauls</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following site inspections, the poorest performing scheme in terms of physical attributes was clearly Babington Court, closely followed by both St Michaels Court and St Peters Court. These three schemes each scored approximately only half of the forty points available.

The main reasons behind Babington's low score were the accommodation comprising purely bedsits and poor access. St Michaels and St Peters also comprise majority bedsits only but also score badly on the internal condition of units.

Grays Court has been awarded the greatest number of points and represents the best performing scheme. This result was anticipated bearing in mind the schemes recent re-modernising.

Martin Court and St Pauls Court also scored very highly. Both schemes are in excellent locations in terms of local amenities and public transport links, have good access both internally and externally and have experienced some recent re-modernising in the forms of new kitchens / bathrooms. St Pauls Court also has a very desirable outdoor amenity space.

The results from the scheme appraisals do differ from that of the initial scoring toolkit. It is important to point out however that whilst the scoring toolkit did in
part include factors linked to the physical quality of the scheme, it also considered issues connected to demand and supply, voids and maintenance spend. Scheme appraisals focused solely on the schemes physical attributes and the surrounding environment. There were consistencies on some levels, for example for both assessments Gray Court and St Pauls Court were considered the top performing schemes. At the other end of the scale, Babington Court and Longcliffe Road consistently scored very poorly and were amongst the worst performing schemes for both assessments.

6.6 Scheme inspection sheets

For each site visit a further inspection sheet was used to record findings, observations and comments relating to every scheme. It was felt an inspection sheet was necessary to ensure a consistent approach to all scheme visits and to act as a prompt to the assessment team.

The inspection sheet contained the following headings

- Existing site layout
- Internal layout
- Communal areas/facilities
- Appropriateness of design for existing and potential user requirements
- Physical quality of the accommodation
- Recent major works
- Volume of internal redundant space
- Access arrangements
- Parking and vehicle circulation
- Development land available within scheme
- Surrounding land use
- General site constraints
- Location of voids
- Adaptability and flexibility
- Site opportunities

The headings above are designed to provide an overall impression of the scheme, what it consists of, how it’s laid out, what facilities are available. Headings are also used to record observations that have enabled the previous scheme appraisals to be completed accurately and to highlight key positive or negative aspects of each development.

Further headings are designed to identify opportunities for scheme improvements on all scales. An attempt has been made to encourage the assessment team to look at the development potential within the site as well as opportunities for improvement.

6.7 Scheme inspection results

The following pages contain a write up of key findings from each sheltered housing scheme visit. Rather than simply insert the completed scheme inspection sheets, findings relating to each scheme have been summarised. The summary details an
introduction to the scheme through a description of location, surrounding land use and site layout. Recent major works have then been set out to highlight any recent attempts at improving the accommodation. The summary then attempts to identify significant positive and negative aspects of accommodation.

Each summary will also contain an overhead photograph, site plan and floor layout for each scheme.

The last section of the summary details opportunities for major scheme improvements. It is important to stress that some opportunities are certainly more realistic than others. It is the intention of this section to set out opportunities for possible further investigation. Costs and feasibility of each opportunity have not been explored; each option will require significant further investigation to establish the level of viability.

The report also recommends options or a combination of options for further investigation; these however are by no means set in stone.
6.8 Longcliffe Road, Shepshed

Total units: 28

Unit mix:
20x 1 bedroom flats
8x 2 bed bungalow

Current voids: 2
% of scheme void: 7.14

Warden: Mobile

Priority ranking: 2

Scheme location

All units are located on Longcliffe Road in Shepshed. Longcliffe Road runs between Grange Road and Anson Road and is situated approximately 1.2 miles from Shepshed town centre.

Shepshed is located approximately 3 miles to the west of Loughborough just off junction 23 of the M1 motorway.

Surrounding land use

The surrounding land use is entirely residential. Ownership is varied, there is some Council owned stock a number of which have been acquired through the right to buy. There are a number of privately owned dwellings and some Housing Association owned stock believed to be FCH.

Site layout

The accommodation at Longcliffe is located on both sides of the road. To the north there are eight 2 bedroom bungalows with private gardens to the rear. There is also a communal lounge with kitchen and bathroom along with a guest room. This area has been created through conversion of two adjacent bungalows. Parking is available through driveways in front of each property, there is also parking space for a small number of vehicles within the lay-by on Longcliffe Road.

On the opposite side of the road there are five individual blocks of flats with four apartments in each. All blocks are over two storeys. Communal gardens are located to the rear of each block. Some parking is again available off street.

Recent major works

The former warden’s bungalow and adjacent bungalow has been converted into a communal lounge and guest room.
Flats had new kitchens installed and windows replace in 2006 under the Decent Homes contract

**Works required under Decent Homes**

- All apartment blocks at Longcliffe Road require electrical upgrades

Estimated cost: £125,000

The electrical upgrade costs are currently programmed within the Decent Homes works. Please note however that funding for these works is subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following there Audit Commission inspection in early 2010. Even if 2 Stars are awarded, it has been announced by Central Government that funding will not be available until 2011.

**Quality of current accommodation**

**Positive**

*Bungalows*

It is felt that there are no major issues connected to the bungalow accommodation.

**Negative**

*Location*

Longcliffe Road is located on the edge of Shepshed. Transport is required in order to access local facilities within Shepshed. Shepshed itself is a relatively poorly served town in terms of local amenities.

*Access*

With reference to the apartment blocks, the blocks have no lift access which prevents access for some residents to the upper floor accommodation.

Wheelchair users find movement within the communal corridors difficult due to the narrow corridor s and stairwells.

*Decoration*

The decoration of communal areas appears satisfactory
Scheme opportunities

**Option 1 – Re-designating apartment blocks as general needs accommodation**

Due to the narrow corridors and stairwells within the communal areas of the five apartment blocks, an option to consider is de-designating the accommodation into general needs.

Due to location of the two sets of accommodation, the bungalow units the opposite side of Longcliffe Road could remain as sheltered.

The scheme is managed by a mobile warden, therefore removal of the apartments from the sheltered housing stock would not impact on the workload of a residents warden.

There is a high demand for general needs 1 bedroom units in Shepshed. As of 16th June 2009, there were 321 applicants on the Councils Housing Register who qualified for 1 bedroom accommodation and expressed in interest in being re-housed within Shepshed.

If a programme of de-classifying the sheltered apartments did go ahead, a further option would be to convert the communal lounge and guest room back into a sheltered bungalow. There is a high demand for bungalow accommodation across the borough. However, in relation to the guest room within Longcliffe Court, any proposals for conversion are likely to be met with some resistance.

One of the major risks associated with re-designating some of the sheltered units within a scheme is the mixing of two very different client groups within the same development. The process of re-designating the properties and providing support in terms of tenancy management will need to be carried out appropriately in order to minimise this risk and potential impacts.

**Option 2 – Re-designating apartment blocks under the Central Alarm System (CAS)**

The Central Alarm System is where units are fitted with a pull cord linked to a central ‘call centre’. A warden will still visit all residents once a week. People in CAS accommodation are generally not as high need in terms of support as those in sheltered accommodation.

The difficult access arrangements combined with the fact that flats are situated in individual blocks rather than within a scheme means that the units might be better suited to those with lesser support needs.

Re-designating under CAS would avoid the risk of mixing client groups which can be associated with re-designating as general needs.
**Option 3 – New build apartment block**

Subject to further investigation, the land to the rear of block 1 – 7 Longcliffe Road offers some potential for further development.

Any new development would need to incorporate the garden area to the rear of the block and the garages and access adjacent to units 83 and 85 Griffin Close which it is understood are owned by FCH.

It would only be worth considering this option if the existing blocks on Longcliffe Road were to be re-designated as general needs accommodation.

If this option were to be given consideration, further investigation would be required with a number of agencies including, FCH, Charnwood Borough Council Planning Department and Leicestershire County Council Highways Department before any further progress is made.

**Recommended option**

**Option 1 – Re-designating apartment blocks as general needs accommodation**

The design of the apartment blocks on the south side of Longcliffe Road is inappropriate in terms of use as sheltered accommodation. There are a high number of applicants on the Housing Register for 1 bedroom accommodation in Shepshed. With this in mind it is felt the best course of action would be to re-designate the twenty sheltered 1 bedroom flats as general needs accommodation in an attempt to meet some of the existing housing need within Shepshed.

In terms of managing the mix of clients groups that will result from a re-designation – it is felt that because Longcliffe flats are the other side of the road to the bungalows and units will not share any communal space, the risk of any negative impacts are relatively small.

If the majority of accommodation is converted to general needs accommodation it would appropriate to convert the communal lounge and guest room back into a bungalow.

**Recommended option – cost estimate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decent Homes requirement – Electrical upgrade to apartment blocks</td>
<td>£125,000 (5x £25k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion of communal lounge and guest room back into bungalow accommodation</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.9 Babington Court, Rothley

Total units: 28

Unit mix: 20x bedsits
8x 1 bedroom flats

Current voids: 7
% of scheme void: 25

Warden: Residential

Priority ranking: 1

Scheme location

Babington Court is located on the corner of Woodgate and Howe Lane in Rothley. The scheme is situated in the south west of the village a short distance from the village centre and its associated amenities.

Rothley is situated six miles north of Leicester on the old A6 road.

Surrounding land use

Surrounding land use is entirely residential. To the north west of the site is a development of Council owned general needs properties. Within Rothley, the Council owns a further twenty sheltered bungalows and four flats for the elderly.

Site layout

The accommodation at Babington Court is located in a single block. The block comprises two storeys but over three different levels to take into account natural level changes.

The scheme is made up of majority bedsits and some 1 bedroom flats. Communal bath and shower rooms serving the bedsits are provided two per corridor. Flat units benefit from self contained bathrooms. The accommodation block also provides a communal lounge, kitchen and laundry, a warden’s office, a guest room, post room and some smaller sitting areas. On the top floor there is a wardens flat which is a 2 bedroom unit.

Externally there is a small but pleasant communal garden area over two tiers which is maintained by residents of the scheme. There is a small car parking area the other side of the block for use by scheme residents.
Recent major works

Some modernisation works have recently been carried out on kitchens within bedsits.

Gas warm air heating units were installed within all units in 1996. Scheme windows were replaced in 2001.

Works required under Decent Homes

- Babington Court requires an upgrade of the incoming electrical supply and complete re-wire.

Estimated cost: £90,000

The electrical upgrade costs are currently programmed within the Decent Homes works. Please note however that funding for these works is subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following there Audit Commission inspection in early 2010. Even if 2 Stars are awarded, it has been announced by Central Government that funding will not be available until 2011.

Quality of current accommodation

Positive

Location

The scheme is located in the centre of Rothley. Rothley is one of the more desirable villages within the borough and has a good range of local facilities.

External Environment

Babington Court has an attractive and well kept garden area in the centre of the development. A large number of units within the scheme benefit from views into the communal garden.

Negative

Scheme environment

Units on the lower ground floor feel isolated. On the day of visit, the corridor within this area appeared dark and uninviting.

The whole scheme appeared almost sterile and lacking in atmosphere. At the time of visit, some void units were being used for storage; it is assumed any items would be removed when potential occupiers come to view.
Access

There is no lift up to the top floor which severely restricts the allocation of units within this area.

The scheme is built on a hill which may create access issues for some elderly residents.

Unit design

The design of the new kitchens in bedsits is poor, for example the location of the cooker means occupiers are unable to use the bottom cupboard unit. A void has been left within the majority of units where the old boiler has been removed; however this has not been left as a usable space. Appliance provision is poor, a Baby Belling and table top fridge are provided in each unit.

Maintenance

The roof is over 40 years old and required re-facing
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Scheme opportunities

Option 1 – Bedsit conversion

Where there are adjacent bedsits, there is potential to ‘knock through’ to create a 1 bedroom flat out of two bedsits.

In most instances there are only two adjacent bedsits before adjoining either a corridor end, a stairwell or an existing flat. There is limited opportunity to create two flats out of three bedsits rather than one flat out of two bedsits. Adopting this approach throughout the scheme would significantly reduce the total number of units and may raise issues in the future in terms of the viability of the scheme.

Currently there are two sets of adjacent bedsits, units 22 and 23 and units 18 and 19. These units have been held as voids for over 2 years. Conversion work on other bedsits within the scheme would involve decanting residents while works on-going.

On each corridor there is a store room and a communal sitting/quiet area. It is possible that these spaces can be incorporated into any bedsit conversion work. For example, the store room on the lower ground floor adjacent to unit 22 could be used to create a larger apartment or space permitting, provide two 1 bedroom flats in place of 2 bedsits and a store room. This layout is mirrored on each floor.

If all bedsits are converted into flats, there is no requirement for communal bathrooms, this offers further space for conversion.

The cost of similar conversion work at other Council owned sheltered schemes increased significantly after it was ruled that fire breakers between units would need to be extended into the loft area. The extra cost prohibited further extension of the scheme and would have to be taken into account when assessing the viability of works at Babington Court.

A programme converting bedsits into flats would remove from the scheme difficult to let bedsits and would contribute significantly to ensuring the long term sustainability of Babington Court.

On top of a bedsit conversion project, to ensure long term demand for accommodation within Babington Court, additional money will need to be expended to improve other areas of the accommodation, for example: redecoration of communal areas. The issue also remains that there is still no lift access to the top floor.

The Council will need to consider that a significant amount of money will need to be spent to create a possible 20 unit scheme that may only extend the lifespan of the scheme for say 20 years?
Option 2 – Improvement of communal areas

Redecoration of communal areas, specifically corridors in the lower block would help in combating the lack of natural light. A considered colour scheme would assist greatly in making communal areas more cheerful and inviting. The use of softer lighting and even putting pictures on the wall will add further to the ambiance of corridor areas.

Appropriate redecoration of the communal lounge will also improve the look of the scheme and increase its usage. This will further improve the community atmosphere within Babington Court.

It would be important to involve the residents in the choice of any colour scheme as ultimately they will live with the final result.

This would be a relatively low cost option that could make a big impact on the desirability of Babington Court. When elderly people view empty units they are more likely to accept an offer of accommodation if they feel comfortable with corridors and communal areas.

However, it is important to take into account that at the end of any redecoration works, the actual form of accommodation will remain the same. Whilst initially option 2 may help marginally in reducing the number of voids, it is not really addressing the sustainability of Babington Court by ensuring long term demand.

Option 3 – Site disposal

Rothley is considered one for the more desirable villages to reside within the borough and house prices tend to reflect this popularity. Looking at properties for sale currently on RightMove, there are apartments in Rothley with an asking price of up to £299,000.

With this in mind, an option the Council may wish to consider is to sell the site for development purposes. This would remove a scheme that currently carries a large number of voids and is considered difficult to let from the Housing Revenue Account. Sale of the site would generate a capital receipt for the Council.

It would be deemed most appropriate that the site is sold to a Housing Association for affordable housing development.

A sale would not be able to proceed whilst occupied with residents. This option would therefore involve moving residents into alternative accommodation or delaying any sale until the scheme emptied naturally.

There are other matters to take into consideration connected to this option such as whether the Council could secure consent to dispose of the site, whether to market the existing accommodation as it stands or to market a cleared site. Further
consultation would need to take place with Charnwood Borough Councils Planning Department.

**Option 4 – Council new build**

Local Authorities are now able to bid for grant direct from the Homes and Communities Agency to once again build ‘Council Housing’. In brief, the Authority must provide free land, funding for development can be raised through HCA grant and prudential borrowing. Any proposals for development must be considered alongside the anticipated announcement concerning changes to the Housing Revenue Account.

The Council could consider re-development of the site. This approach would enable the Council to retain ownership and management of the units and would benefit from the rental income.

**Recommended option**

**Option 3 and Option 4**

In light of problems attached to Babington Court, including the level changes throughout the site, the reduced number of units a programme of conversion works would result in and the on-going maintenance liability of the scheme, it is considered that the most appropriate option would be the demolition of the site for further development of affordable housing.

At this stage it is difficult to advise whether a sale to a Housing Association for affordable housing development is the best option or whether the Council opting to carry out its own development would be the most appropriate method of delivery.

A sale of the site to a private developer with no specific affordable requirement other than in the line with the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document is likely to generate the highest capital receipt for the Council.

**Recommended option – cost estimate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition costs</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build cost of new development – 24x 1 bedroom flats</td>
<td>£1,700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed option is to demolish Babington Court to enable redevelopment of the site. Costs associated with Decent Homes works are therefore not applicable.
6.10 Aingarth, Loughborough

Total units: 26

Unit mix: 14x bedsits
12x 1 bedroom flats

Current voids: 5
% of scheme void: 19.23

Warden: Mobile

Priority ranking: 3

Scheme location

Aingarth is situated between Albert Promenade and the A6 Leicester Road in
Loughborough.

Loughborough town centre is a short walk from Aingarth, there are also a number
of local shops within close proximity of the scheme running along Leicester Road.

Surrounding land use

The immediate surrounding land use is almost entirely residential dominated with
large privately owned dwellings.

Site Layout

Aingarth was built in 1981. The scheme comprises a total of 28 units, the
accommodation being made up of fourteen bedsits and twelve 1 bedroom flats.

The accommodation is split over three two storey blocks, the first block being the
original house. The house contains a communal lounge, conservatory, kitchen and
laundry along with office facilities for staff.

The main house was extended in 1981 to provide additional space for sheltered
accommodation.

The remaining units are located over blocks A and B, comprising a mix of both
apartment and bedsit accommodation. All bedsits have their own self contained
bathroom.

Flats 26 and 28 in block B have direct access from outside rather than via a
communal corridor, however steps to the first floor are steep. The first floor unit is
currently void and access may discourage some applicants from accepting the
property.
The Lodge is a Grade II listed building that was formally used as the Wardens accommodation providing a 3 bedroom house. Aingarth is now covered by a mobile warden with The Lodge being used for general needs accommodation.

Externally the blocks of accommodation are divided by attractively landscaped communal areas. Limited scheme parking is available within the scheme.

**Recent major works**

The windows to blocks A and B were replaced under the Decent Homes contract in 2006.

**Works required under Decent Homes**

- Scheme re-wire
- New heating system
- New kitchens

Estimated cost: £162,000

The items listed above are currently programmed within the Decent Homes works. Please note however that funding for these works is subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following their Audit Commission inspection in early 2010. Even if 2 Stars are awarded, it has been announced by Central Government that funding will not be available until 2011.

**Quality of current accommodation**

**Positive**

*Living environment*

Aingarth offers relatively spacious bedsit and apartment units for sheltered accommodation. The main house provides a large lounge and conservatory for communal use with views out into the landscaped grounds. The accommodation is split into three small blocks which maintains an element of privacy for the elderly occupiers.

The decoration throughout appears good. The scheme is generally well maintained; the landscaped grounds are in good condition.

**Negative**

*Age of accommodation*

The main problem with the scheme is that only limited modernisation works have been carried out since it was built in 1981. As detailed earlier in this review, older
peoples aspirations for accommodation have changed, whilst in affect the accommodation at Aingarth has stood still.

Accommodation on offer

Over half the scheme is made up of hard to let bedsits which increasingly have no place in a modern sheltered housing development. However, it is important to highlight that all bedsits have their own bathroom or shower room.

Communal facilities

The communal facilities are not well used. The lounge and conservatory take up a large area that seemingly provides little benefit to residents.

Communal landscaping

Whilst landscaping in the communal grounds is in good condition, residents complain that it is ‘too much’. Large mature trees, thick shrubs etc mean that little natural light can get through to the gardens. Residents have previously requested that the whole area is opened up to provide a lighter, safer and more spacious environment to enjoy.
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Scheme Options

Scheme options are limited through the Grade II listed building consent affecting the Lodge. The main house and blocks A and B are within the curtilage of a listed building, any proposals for development must therefore be sensitive to this listing.

Due to the layout of units within each block, there is limited opportunity for converting bedsit units into apartments. This will severely restrict the long term sustainability of the scheme.

**Option 1 – Better marketing of available units**

The scheme is in a good location close to local amenities and Loughborough town centre whilst at the same time being in a green, leafy setting offering privacy to residents.

Better marketing of the scheme may encourage elderly people who wouldn’t necessarily consider Council owned sheltered housing to apply for accommodation?

Marketing of units can take the form of adverts in the local paper. Aingarth is situated on Leicester Road which is one of the main routes into Loughborough. ‘Accommodation to Let’ boards positioned on the Leicester Road side may generate increased levels of interest. Internet sites such as Right Move can be used to advertise properties for rent; it may be worth investigating using such sites to advertise hard to let Council properties? Word of mouth is often one of the best means of advertising, discussing with existing residents the need for new residents to occupy existing voids may help to generate further interest locally for the accommodation at Aingarth.

**Option 2 – Unit modernisation**

Some flats and bedsits contain the original kitchen as installed in 1981. It appears that some bathroom units have been replaced, some still contain the original fittings. Units would present a more attractive offer of accommodation with modern kitchens and bathrooms.

The communal landscaping within the centre of the scheme needs addressing to open the area up and allow more natural light. This will create a safer environment for tenants to enjoy.
Option 3 – Stair lift installation

Access to the first floor of the main house is available via stairs at both sides of the building. Stair lift installation might be possible within one of the stairwells. This would open the accommodation up to a greater number of applicants.

Due to the angle of stairwells, this option will require further investigation to establish whether feasible.

---

Recommended option

Option 1 – Better marketing of available units and
Option 2 – Unit modernisation

Bedsits already have their own self contained shower / bath rooms. Further modernising the units by installing new kitchens and bathrooms where required would make the units more appealing to potential occupiers. The scheme already has the benefit of being in an excellent location.

Addressing the complaints raised by residents in relation to the nature of the communal landscaping will provide a safer and more attractive living environment.

Once works complete it will be important to market the units appropriately so that elderly people looking for accommodation are aware of the benefits Aingarth has to offer.

Due to the layout of scheme, conversion of bedsits into 1 bedroom flats is only possible in one instance.

Recommended option – cost estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheme re-wire (Decent Homes)</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New heating system (Decent Homes)</td>
<td>£60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New kitchens (Decent Homes)</td>
<td>£72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal landscaping</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved marketing campaign</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**6.11 Dudley Court, Sileby**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total units:</th>
<th>34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit mix:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16x bedsits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14x 1 bedroom flats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4x 2 bedroom flats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current voids:</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of scheme void:</strong></td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warden:</strong></td>
<td>Mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority ranking:</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scheme location**

Dudley Court is located on Cossington Road in Sileby, a short distance from town centre amenities. Sileby is a large village with a population of approximately 9000. The town is situated in the centre of the borough halfway between the main A6 and A46 trunk roads.

**Surrounding land use**

Surrounding land use is almost entirely residential. A railway track lies just to the east of the site.

**Site layout**

The majority of accommodation is situated over a single block. There is also a small separate two storey block of four 2 bedroom sheltered flats adjacent to the main entrance of the scheme.

The main block comprises a mix of bedsits and 1 and 2 bedroom flats. The main block also contains a common room, laundry, kitchen, store room, office and post room. The separate block contains a further four 2 bedroom flats.

Bedsits contain a toilet room only. Bath and shower facilities are available communally on each corridor.

There is a large former wardens flat on the first floor with a small external terrace area.

Externally there is a small parking area and two garages for use by residents. The scheme is set in well maintained landscaped grounds comprising mainly grassed areas with mature trees.
Recent major works

Within the last three years a number of bedsits have been successfully converted into 1 and 2 bedroom flats. New windows were installed throughout the scheme in 2001.

Works required under Decent Homes

- New heating system
- Scheme re-wire
- Kitchens
- Bathrooms
- Windows

Estimated cost: £300,000

The items listed above are currently programmed within the Decent Homes works. Please note however that funding for these works is subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following there Audit Commission inspection in early 2010. Even if 2 Stars are awarded, it has been announced by Central Government that funding will not be available until 2011.

Quality of accommodation

Negative

Lift provision

Lift access to first floor accommodation is via a stair lift only.

Bedsit layout

Within the bedsits themselves, there is no room to install a proper shower/bath room. The layout of the kitchens is poor.
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**Scheme Options**

**Option 1 – Continuation of bedsit conversion**

A programme of converting two adjacent bedsits into a 1 and 2 bedroom flat was carried out in 2006/2007. This programme came to an end when it was made regulation that the fire breakers in-between individual units were extended into the loft area. This increased conversion costs and prohibited future expansion of the programme.

All current void units are difficult to let bedsits. Some remaining bedsits still have potential for conversion into flats. For example flat 7 on the ground floor and 23 on the first floor are adjacent to communal bathrooms. Potentially it would be possible to incorporate the bathrooms into the flat area to create 1 bedroom flats.

Flats 8 and 24 are adjacent to store rooms, again this space could be incorporated into the bedsit area to create 1 bedroom flats.

On the ground floor, unit 16 could expand into the adjoining post room to again create a 1 bedroom flat.

Flats 6 and 22 are next to communal sitting areas, flats 1 and 17 next to bathrooms and guestrooms. Once more these areas offer potential for bedsit conversion.

This programme would however leave some corridors without a communal bathroom facility. Not all remaining bedsits offer potential for expansion. Further investigation would be required into the possibility of installing alternative bathroom facilities.

**Option 2 – Installation of self-contained bathrooms within bedsits and bedsit expansion**

Providing bedsits with self contained bathrooms may assist in increasing levels of demand for the units.

An alternative to Option 1 above would be to use the bathrooms between units 7 and 8 and 23 and 24 to create showers rooms for each so essentially you are left with four bedsits with ensuite.

This programme would again however leave some corridors without a communal bathroom facility. Further investigation would be required into the possibility of installing alternative bathroom facilities.

Within the majority of bedsits a large cupboard is located off the lounge/bedroom. There is potential for the cupboard to be incorporated into this space to create a larger living area. How much difference this option would make to the attractiveness of a bedsit is questionable, already limited storage space is also being lost.
**Option 3 – Scheme improvements**

There are some opportunities to improve facilities within the scheme that will make it more appropriate for existing users and future occupants.

Currently there is no facility for mobility scooter storage. Scooters are abandoned throughout the scheme. The post room is an ideal size and location for a scooter room, access to the room is possible both through the main entrance hall and externally.

Store rooms which appear scarcely used offer potential for lift shaft installation. This would increase the number of suitable applicants for upper floor accommodation.

**Option 4 – Further expansion of Dudley Court**

The landscaped area to the south of the block adjacent to Manor Drive offers some potential for further development. For example it might be possible to continue the build line of the terrace adjacent to the scheme fronting Manor Drive.

If Option 1 were to be progressed, the total number of units within the scheme would be reduced. Also adopting Option 4 would create additional accommodation, sustaining the total unit number within the scheme.

A large area of amenity space would be lost through this option. Extra units may put further strain on the already limited parking facilities.

Before this option is progressed, further consultation is required with the appropriate agencies.

**Option 4 – Sale of part of the land at Dudley Court to finance other scheme improvements**

The triangular plot of land that sits between the terrace of houses running along Manor Drive and the Dudley Court accommodation block is unused by residents. This area of the site fronts and has access to the main road.

Subject to further investigation this area of the site could provide potential for further residential development.

A sale of this site on the open market for private development may generate a capital return that could be used to fund other scheme improvements.
Recommended option

Option 1 - Continuation of bedsit conversion and
Option 3 – Scheme improvements and
Option 4 – Sale of the site to fund other scheme improvements

Installing self contained shower and bathrooms does not remove the fact that the Council will still be offering dated accommodation in the form of bedsits. In terms of accommodation of offer, the scheme is already relatively popular. It is felt that to ensure long term demand hard to let bedsits will need to be converted into more popular 1 bedroom flats where possible throughout the scheme.

Works would have to incorporate the additional cost of extending fire breakers between flats into loft areas. This cost meant that the previous conversion scheme came to a halt.

Combining a programme of conversion works with scheme improvements such as the provision of a mobility scooter storage room should make the scheme significantly more sustainable for the long term.

It is worth investigating the possibility of selling part of the site for private development as this would part finance the scheme improvements listed above.

Recommended option – cost estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New kitchens, bathrooms, windows, heating and re-wire (Decent Homes)</td>
<td>£300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converting remaining 16 bedsits and adjacent communal spaces into a number of 1 bedroom flats</td>
<td>£310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion of post room into buggy storage</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of through floor passenger lift (via store rooms)</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following the Audit Commission inspection in early 2010, a proportion of the £300,000 listed above can be used to finance the cost of conversion works, i.e. newly created flats will still require new kitchens, bathrooms and windows.
6.12 **Fielding Court, Loughborough**

**Total units:** 46

**Unit mix:**
- 24x bedsits
- 21x 1 bedroom flats
- 1x 2 bedroom flats

**Current voids:** 4

**% of scheme void:** 8.7

**Warden:** Resident

**Priority ranking:** 5

---

**Scheme location**

Fielding Court is located on the corner of Craddock Street in the centre of Loughborough. All town centre amenities are within a short walking distance from the scheme.

**Surrounding land use**

Surrounding land use is a mix of residential, small business units and retail.

**Site layout**

The scheme comprises a total of 46 units with the accommodation being a mix of bedsits and 1 bedroom flats.

The accommodation is split into two blocks, old and new. The old and main block was completed around 1975. The old block comprises entirely bedsits along with a warden's office, a large communal room with kitchen, a locker room, post room laundry and wardens flat.

The common room is situated in the centre of the old block. The common room section of the building is single storey; therefore accommodation on the first floor within the old block is split into two halves with access between only possible via the ground floor.

Bedsits have toilet rooms only; bath and shower facilities are shared. All flats are recessed beyond the corridor walls.

The new block was added in the mid 1980's and contains entirely 1 bedroom flats over two storeys. Each flat is accessed from the outside direct rather than via a communal corridor. Flats on the upper floor are accessed via an external first floor walkway.
The rear first floor of the old block can also be accessed directly from the first floor of the new block via a veranda.

The new block includes lift provision to the first floor. The veranda to the old block therefore also provides rather indirect passenger lift access to the rear first floor.

Externally, there is secure parking available for residents. There are also two small amenity areas either side of the common room.

**Recent major works**

The former control room and wardens office on the first floor have now been converted back into bedsits.

The former deputy warden flat is now let as a sheltered unit

**Works required under Decent Homes**

- Scheme re-wire
- New heating
- Kitchens
- Bathrooms

Estimated cost: £300,000

The items listed above are currently programmed within the Decent Homes works. Please note however that funding for these works is subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following there Audit Commission inspection in early 2010. Even if 2 Stars are awarded, it has been announced by Central Government that funding will not be available until 2011.

**Quality of accommodation**

**Positive**

*Community atmosphere*

One of the first impressions you get when walking through the scheme is the excellent community atmosphere. Despite possible shortfalls, residents clearly enjoying living at the scheme. There is a thriving social scene, with regular events and trips organised. The communal lounge is in the centre of the scheme rather than positioned by the main entrance, this might be a contributing factor?

*Location*

The scheme is located in the centre of Loughborough and therefore residents have access to excellent local facilities and public transport links.
Negative

Layout

The scheme is like a rabbit warren with numerous corridors leading to different bedsits, communal rooms and bathrooms. There is no continuity throughout the scheme.

Bedsit facilities

The majority of units are bedsits with no private bathroom which as already stated, is the most difficult to let property type throughout the sheltered stock.

Decoration

The décor is generally dated and poor, carpets within the communal areas are in need of replacing.

Surface trunked cable runs throughout the scheme adding to the visual confusion.

Location

Fielding Court residents have previously expressed concern about security in the area. Problems with anti-social behaviour have been reported.

Access

There is no passenger lift access to upper floor accommodation within the front of the old block.

External appearance

Externally the scheme appears uninviting with its red brick façade and hard landscaping though this is partly down to the town centre location.

Repairs cost

Over the last five years Fielding Court has had the highest average repairs cost out of all Sheltered Housing schemes.
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Scheme options

**Option 1 - Bedsit adaptation**

The main cause of voids within the scheme is the bedsit accommodation. Through re-configuration of the kitchen and toilet room it is possible to create a self contained unit through installation of a bath/shower room. This applies to the majority of bedsits within the old block.

**Option 2 – Bedsit conversion**

A number of bedsits have sufficient space to offer potential for conversion into a 1 bedroom flat. This would mean however that the now permanent bedroom within the bedsit would have no natural light. Bedrooms would benefit from borrowed light only through the use of opaque glazing in the partition wall.

Flats entrances are recessed within corridor walls. As an alternative entrance doors could be bought forward to run flush with the corridor walls. This would allow the space behind to be utilised within the flat.

**Option 3 – Lift installation**

Currently passenger lift access is not available to the front upper floor of the old block.

Providing lift access to this floor would make upper floor units a more attractive proposition in terms of accommodation increasing levels of demand for the scheme overall.

Lift installation is potentially possible using the space behind the stairwell on the ground floor up through into the bathroom on the floor above.

**Option 4 – Conversion of Fielding Court into an Extra Care scheme**

Extra Care is a form of housing designed for older people whose needs dictate a requirement for housing with care.

The essential components of an extra care scheme are 24 hour on site care, the provision of meals and the provision of services to residents with a defined need. In terms of the built environment, essentially an Extra Care housing scheme comprises specially designed or adapted self-contained units.

Subject to further investigation, Fielding Court has potential for conversion into an Extra Care scheme.

Its town centre location means staff are within walking distance of transport links. The scheme already contains a tea kitchen, lounge/social activities area, specialised bathroom, laundry facilities and office. An conservatory added onto the communal room could function as a dining room, the bin store has potential for conversion into
a buggy room. The large corridor ends and guest rooms have potential for conversion into staff quarters. A void unit could be converted into a catering kitchen.

It might be possible to link further in with social services and use some of the bedsits as respite facilities for people coming out of hospital for example. This would further promote Fielding Court as providing permanent accommodation.

When considering this proposal, it is important to take into account that the existing dwellings may not provide sufficient space standards. For example, it is recommended that within the bedroom there is sufficient space to accommodate a hoist or a carer on each side of the bed. Kitchens should have storage space suitable for wheelchair users. There is also concern whether the existing car park is large enough to cope with an Extra Care scheme and the additional number of staff and visitors?

If Option 4 is to be considered, significant further investigation is required into whether the site and location really is suitable, are the flats actually capable to remodelling to suit the client group? Are the facilities capable of expansion? What is the estimated remodelling cost?

There are also concerns over the actual level of demand for Extra Care accommodation in the borough, for example Connaught House, an Extra Care scheme in Loughborough run by Places for People is almost half empty.

**Option 5 – Demolition of the ‘old block’ and re-build**

Conversion of bedsit units or re-designation of the accommodation will not change the fact the Fielding Court is a poorly laid out and dated sheltered housing scheme.

‘Starting again’ by way of demolition of the older block and re-build may be a more sensible approach. This could either be done via sale of the site to another provider for redevelopment or the Council could develop the site itself with assistance from the HCA.

Either approach would present the opportunity to design and build a purpose built accommodation scheme for the elderly that meets the needs and aspirations of tenants today and in the future.

Demolition of the old Fielding Court block and development of new purpose built accommodation will significantly reduce average maintenance spend for the scheme.

There is a large car park area adjacent to Fielding Court that is owned by the Council. The majority of the car park is used by Fielding Court residents and visitors; the remainder is leased to a neighbouring business.

An option for redevelopment is the construction of a new accommodation block within the adjoining car park area. Residents could then remain in their existing accommodation whilst works on-going and transfer permanently to the new block.
once works complete. The old block could then be demolished to provide a replacement parking area.

It is important to consider however that Fielding Court is already very popular with residents. Significant expenditure and serious tenant upheaval might not be a wise investment in a scheme that at the current time doesn’t actually have a serious void problem. Nevertheless there are no guarantees that this trend will continue.

**Recommended option**

**Option 5 – Demolition and re-build**

There are uncertainties around whether Fielding Court would really be suitable as an Extra Care scheme. Conversion and adaptation of bedsits would not change the existing rabbit warren layout of the scheme. Whilst there is currently a reasonable level of demand for the scheme and not a serious void problem, there are no guarantees that this trend will continue as older people aspirations for accommodation change still.

It is therefore felt that the most appropriate option for further investigation is demolition of Fielding Court and redevelopment of the site as more suitable older persons accommodation.

**Recommended option – cost estimate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New build development – 40x 1 bedroom flats for the elderly with communal facilities</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of old block and laying of car park</td>
<td>£2,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.13 **Martin Court, Anstey**

**Total units:** 51

**Unit mix:**
- 46x bedsits
- 5x 1 bedroom flats
- 1x 2 bedroom flat

**Current voids:** 11

**% of scheme void:** 21.57

**Warden:** Mobile

**Priority ranking:** 6

Scheme location

Martin Court is situated on Latimer Street in Anstey close to all town centre shops and amenities.

Anstey is considered the gateway to Charnwood. It is located a few miles to the north of Leicester the other side of the A46 trunk road. It has excellent transport links to Loughborough, Leicester and the M1 motorway.

Surrounding land use

A Council owned scheme for the elderly known as the Latimer Street flats abuts Martin Court to the north. Light industrial units are adjacent to the main entrance of the scheme. Residential dwellings surround the remainder of the scheme.

The various shops and amenities of Anstey town centre are situated to the north east of Martin Court.

Site layout

The accommodation at Martin Court is split into two blocks. Block A was erected in 1971 providing four 1 bedroom flats, 23 bedsits and a 2 bedroom former wardens flat. Block A also includes a common room, post room, laundry and staff office. Bedsits within block A have a toilet room only, bathroom facilities are shared.

Block B was added in 1978 providing a further 22 bedsits. Access to block B is via a covered walkway also referred to as the ‘catwalk’ or ‘runway’. Access is also available via Park Road to the rear of the scheme. A small number of bedsits within block B have now had self contained bathrooms installed. Block B also contains a guest room and small reading areas.
There are no lifts within Martin Court, however stair lifts run throughout the scheme providing access to upper floor accommodation.

The main access to Martin Court is via Latimer Street. A scheme car park fronts the development. Access is also available via Park Road to the rear of the scheme along with an additional small parking area. Soft landscaping surrounds both blocks with a resident’s amenity area adjacent to the covered walkway.

Recent major works

The majority of units within block A had new kitchen and bathrooms installed under the Decent Homes contract in 2006/2007.

In Block B new central heating was installed within bedsits in 2002. 10 out of the 24 bedsits in block B had new bathroom installed between 2003 and 2007. Only 4 units have had new kitchens installed throughout the same time period.

Works required under Decent Homes

- Scheme re-wire
- New heating
- Kitchens
- Bathrooms

Estimated cost: £240,000

The electrical upgrade costs are currently programmed within the Decent Homes works. Please note however that funding for these works is subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following there Audit Commission inspection in early 2010. Even if 2 Stars are awarded, it has been announced by Central Government that funding will not be available until 2011.

Quality of accommodation

Positive

Location

The scheme is in an excellent location, within walking distance of Anstey town centre shops and regular public transport links to Loughborough and Leicester.

Communal area

The internal communal areas are light, well maintained and welcoming. Communal facilities are well used and are also accessed by Latimer Court residents. As a result the scheme has a thriving social scene.
The scheme sits in pleasant grounds with ample parking at the main entrance.

Communally, Martin Court provides a much nicer living environment than some of the sheltered schemes above it in terms of priority.

Negative

Bedsit accommodation

Martin Court’s major downfall is that the scheme is made up almost entirely of bedsits. The majority of bedsits include a toilet only, bath and shower facilities are shared.

Bedsits within block A offer limited scope for the installation of a self contained bathroom. The kitchen window prevents full extension of the WC area to accommodate a shower tray. Altering the window position will affect the external appearance of the building. Re-siting the kitchen within the lounge area would encroach too much into the living area.

In addition to the common room there are a number of communal sitting areas which appear scarcely used.

Scheme layout

The layout of the accommodation over two different blocks causes a division amongst residents. Many of the residents in block B are not as mobile as they used to be and find it difficult to access the scheme events that take place in the common room in block A. This creates a ‘them and us’ environment within the scheme.

Void levels

Martin Court currently has 13 empty properties, a number of which have been void for over 2 years in anticipation of possible future scheme improvements. This number of long term voids is itself having a negative impact on the scheme.

Many elderly residents look for accommodation that provides a social environment with lots of other people living close by. With an increasing number of voids that are not being let, Martin Court is failing to provide this.
Martin Court – Site layout
Scheme options

**Option 1 - Bedsit conversion**

Within block A, the majority of bedsits are either in pairs or adjacent to communal facilities. A programme of works converting two bedsits into a one bedroom flat or a bedsit and adjacent sitting/bathroom into the same would reduce significantly the number of hard to let units throughout the scheme.

Within block B, the layout is similar however a number of bedsits are in rows of three. This would enable a programme of works converting three bedsits into two adjacent 1 bedroom flats. Converting ‘three into two’ would reduce the total number of units lost within the scheme.

The current number of voids means that sufficient units are available to use as decant properties. Where works are affecting occupied bedsits, residents will need to be moved into temporary accommodation until works complete.

**Option 2 – New build development**

Block B contains the greatest number of voids throughout the scheme. An approach that would reduce significantly the number of hard to let bedsits in Martin Court and offer replacement in the form of more appropriate units would be to demolish block B completely and re-develop this area of the site.

Block B is currently clearly separated from block A, the loss of block B would therefore not have a detrimental affect on the remainder of accommodation. Access to the rear of the site is possible via Park Road.

Due to the existing layout of block B, it might be possible stagger closure of the accommodation, i.e. the block is split into three thirds by level changes. Access to block B will be maintained via the walkway enabling closure of the first section of the block from Park Road.

Subject to further investigation it appears that the land left available following demolition could accommodate a small development of bungalow units.

There are two possible routes to delivery.

1) Sale or gift of land to a partner Housing Association for development in partnership with Charnwood Borough Council. The Housing Association would retain ownership and management, with nomination rights being granted to the Council.

Any proceeds from the sale of the land could be used to fund improvements / conversion works to block A. Alternatively, works could be carried out by the Housing Association in lieu of ‘free land’.
2) Local Authorities are now able to bid for grant direct from the Homes and Communities Agency to once again build ‘Council Housing’. In brief, the Authority must provide free land, funding for development can be raised through HCA grant and prudential borrowing.

This approach would enable the Council to retain ownership and management of the units and would benefit from the rental income.

Referring to both approaches, the existing voids in block A could be used as decant units for residents affected by the demolition of block B. Compensation for the upheaval of moving into temporary accommodation could be the offer of accommodation in one of the new bungalow units.

Communal facilities within Block A could continue to be used by all residents.

**Recommended option**

**Option 1 - Bedsit conversion**

**and**

**Option 2 – New build development**

In terms of accommodation, block A is more popular than block B. The demolition of block B would remove a proportion of hard to let bedsits from the scheme and would provide developable land suitable for bungalow accommodation.

With a significant and increasing number of voids in block B now would be a good time to give serious consideration to these proposals. The decanting of residents to enable a programme of redevelopment will be made easier with fewer numbers to deal with.

Further potential of this option is that an sale of land could be used to fund or part fund bedsit conversion works within block A.

If Martin Court were to provide accommodation in the form of 1 bedroom flats and bungalows, the scheme would be significantly more sustainable in terms of long term demand.
**Recommended option – cost estimate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheme re-wire, new heating, kitchens and bathrooms – Decent Homes</td>
<td>£240k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition cost – block B only</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbuild development – 2 options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24x 1 bedroom flats (no communal facilities)</td>
<td>£1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6x 2 bedroom bungalows</td>
<td>£462,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following the Audit Commission inspection in early 2010, a proportion of the £240,000 listed above is to address units within block B. Demolition of block B will mean a proportion of this sum can be used to finance the cost of the new build works, i.e. newly created flats/bungalows will still require new kitchens and bathrooms.
6.14 **Beresford Court, Shepshed**

**Total units:** 35

**Unit mix:**
- 4x bedsits
- 31x 1 bedroom flats

**Current voids:** 3

**% of scheme void:** 8.57

**Warden:** Mobile

**Priority ranking:** 7

---

**Scheme location**

Beresford Court is situated on The Lant in Shepshed a short distance from town centre amenities.

Shepshed is located approximately 3 miles to the west of Loughborough just off junction 23 of the M1 motorway.

**Surrounding land use**

The surrounding land use is entirely residential. There is a large garden area either side of Beresford Court which are under private ownership.

**Site layout**

The accommodation at Beresford Court is situated over two blocks, A and B. Both blocks are over 2 storeys and have individual entrances. The majority of units are 1 bedroom flats with a small number of bedsits. The former wardens flat attached to block B now forms part of the accommodation, provides a 2 bedroom unit and has been fully adapted for disabled use.

In terms of communal facilities, block A contains a common room, kitchen and laundry room. There is also a staff office and post delivery room. Block B contains only a communal kitchen and laundry, there is no lounge area.

There are stair lifts within both blocks providing access to upper floor accommodation.

Externally there is a small parking court at the front of the scheme. There are communal garden areas running alongside block B and to the west of block A.
Recent major works

The scheme formally comprised majority bedsits. Within the last 10 years, the majority of bedsits have been converted into 1 bedroom flats. It was not viable to convert the remaining 4 bedsits.

A small number of units had new windows fitted in 2007 and new bathrooms installed between 2002 and 2009. The majority of new bathrooms were installed in 1994.

A small number of units have also recently been fitted with level access showers.

A gazebo has recently been erected within the garden area; this was funded through a tenants bid.

A former reading room has now been converted into a storage room for mobility scooters.

Works required under Decent Homes

- Scheme re-wire
- New heating

Estimated cost: £130,000

The items listed above are currently programmed within the Decent Homes works. Please note however that funding for these works is subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following there Audit Commission inspection in early 2010. Even if 2 Stars are awarded, it has been announced by Central Government that funding will not be available until 2011.

Quality of accommodation

Positive

Recent conversions

Through the recent conversion works, the majority of hard to let bedsits have been converted into 1 bedroom flats.

Scheme environment

Apart from the remaining bedsits, Beresford Court offers fairly standard sheltered accommodation. The Court is attractive and well maintained. The scheme appears more like a private sheltered housing development rather than Local Authority owned stock. The Warden Services Manager advised that residents enjoy living in Martin Court, the scheme offers a pleasant environment to live in.
**Negative**

**Scheme layout**

Block B is clearly separated from block A, with the majority of communal facilities being found in block A. This creates a 'them and us' attitude within the scheme, with some block B residents finding access to the other block difficult.

**Access**

The communal lounge within block A can be accessed via a stair lift, however the positioning of the lift is inappropriate and presents a trip hazard within the lounge.

Access to block B is far from ideal. A set of steep steps only provide access to the main entrance. For level access, residents need to use the side entrance which means negotiating a form of ‘race track’ along the side of the scheme.

Access to some of the flats internally is also an issue, for example the approach to flats 5 – 8 is via a small set of steps with no lift provision.

**Provision for mobility scooters**

There are no suitable storage areas within the scheme for mobility scooters, at present scooters are ‘abandoned’ throughout the scheme in the lounge and stairwells. This takes up valuable space and presents a potential hazard. Scooters being used within the scheme have also left some damage to walls.

**Bedsit facilities**

The four remain bedsits do not have self contained bath/shower rooms, only communal facilities are available.

**Guestroom**

The residents of Beresford Court have recently petitioned for a guestroom. The only guest room serving the sheltered schemes in Shepshed is located on Longcliffe Road. This is on the other side of Shepshed and is not practical for guests visiting Beresford Court.
Please note: The floor plan attached represents the original scheme layout. A floor plan following recent bedsit conversion works is not available.
### Scheme options

#### Option 1 – Improving access

To improve access to block B, the possibility of installing a ramped entrance needs to be investigated.

Within block B, there is space to install a proper passenger lift rather than stair lift within the front stairwell. However, this may be an expensive option when essentially there is already a lift in place.

The steps leading to the fire exit to the rear of block A could be ramped to provide level access to the rear of the block.

#### Option 2 – Provision of mobility scooter storage

To deal with the current situation of mobility scooters currently being abandoned throughout the scheme, within block A the store room next to the staff office or the store rooms at the far end of the scheme have potential for conversion into scooter storage rooms.

Within block B the laundry room has direct level access from the outside. There is potential to convert store room 1 into the laundry room, the existing laundry room could then be converted into a scooter storage room.

#### Option 3 – Bedsit conversions

Within the existing bedsits there is scope to enlarge the toilet area to create a shower room. A bedsit with a self contained shower room is more attractive to a potential occupier than one with communal facilities only.

Two of the bedsits on the ground and first floor are situated next to communal bathrooms. This offers potential to utilise the space occupied by the bathroom to convert the bedsit into a 1 bedroom flat. There is a further bathroom available within the same area to serve the remaining two bedsits on each floor.

An alternative conversion option would be to knock through each bedsit into adjoining flat to create four large 2 bedroom flats. The loss of rental income from the four bedsits would be compensated to a degree from the increased rent on four 2 bedroom flats.
**Option 4 – Provision of guest room**

Unit 17 is a bedsit and has been empty for over 4 years. If other conversion works were not to go ahead, this dwelling could be converted into a guest room. This would reduce a hard to let void from the Housing Revenue Account and provide a much sought after guest room within the scheme.

If shower rooms were installed within bedsits, there would be no requirement for communal bathrooms. Redundant bathroom areas could therefore be converted into a guest room.

**Option 5 – Creation of additional accommodation**

Beresford Court is served by a mobile warden; the office is only therefore used part time. The office, store and delivery room occupies the same area as a flat and therefore has the potential to be converted into a further unit of accommodation.

**Option 6 – Demolition and redevelopment**

The two blocks at Beresford Court occupy a large area of land. Demolition of the existing scheme would leave a sizeable site for the development of a modern purpose built scheme possibly as Extra Care or bungalow accommodation.

As with Martin Court, the Council could consider disposal of the site to another provider for development or bidding for NAHP grant direct to fund development.

It is important to highlight that as of November 2008, Beresford Court only had 3 voids out of a total of 35 dwellings. Progressing this option would mean having to decant or transfer almost an entire scheme of residents.
Recommended option

Option 1 – Improving access
and
Option 2 – Provision of mobility scooter storage
and
Option 3 – Bedsit conversion
and
Option 4 – Provision of guest room

It is recommended that a number of options that will assist in improving the sustainability of Beresford Court are investigated further.

The positioning of the last four bedsits does not offer significant potential for conversion into flats. Tackling the remaining four bedsits by installing self contained shower / bathrooms will help address the remaining hard to let units.

Residents have long petitioned for a guest room, converting one of the four bedsits will address this demand. This combined with other scheme improvements including the provision of mobility scooter storage and improving the access to block B will help to ensure future demand for accommodation at Beresford Court.

Recommended option – cost estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheme re-wire and new heating</td>
<td>£130k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion of last 4 bedsits into 2x 1 bedroom flats</td>
<td>£62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved ramped access into block B</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of scooter storage within block A store room</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation of block B laundry into store room opposite side of the corridor Conversion of (previous) laundry into scooter storage room</td>
<td>£5,000 £10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion of unit 17 into guestroom facility</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following the Audit Commission inspection in early 2010, a proportion of the £130,000 listed above can be used to finance the cost of conversion works, i.e. newly created flats will still require heating and wiring.
6.15 Sorrel Court, Mountsorrel

Total units: 33

Unit mix:
- 22x bedsits
- 8x 1 bedroom flats
- 3x 2 bedroom flats

Current voids: 1
% of scheme void: 3.0

Warden: Mobile

Priority ranking: 8

Location

Sorrel Court is located on the corner of The Green and Leicester Road in Mountsorrel. The scheme is situated just to the north of the town centre a short walk from shops and local amenities.

Surrounding land use

Surrounding land use is mainly residential. There is a Council owned scheme to the south of Sorrel Court. This development is known as Chestnut Court and although is designated as accommodation for the elderly, is not classed as a sheltered scheme.

Site layout

The accommodation at Sorrel Court is situated in a single block over 2 storeys. The block runs along The Green and then turns a slight south following Leicester Road. The scheme fronts both roads with the common room in a corner position providing views out to Leicester Road.

In terms of unit types, the scheme comprises a mixture of accommodation. The majority of units remain bedsits, however there a number of 1 and 2 bedroom flats.

As with the other sheltered developments, the scheme also includes a communal lounge, kitchen and laundry, a post room and a staff office. There are also communal sitting areas on both floors where the block turns the corner of The Green / Leicester Road.

Externally there is a small landscaped amenity area and car park to the rear of the scheme.
Recent major works

In 2006/2007 a programme of converting adjoining bedsits into flats went ahead. A total of six 1 bedroom flats and three 2 bedroom flats were created out of a number of bedsits. The project came of a halt when it was decided that on any future works the fire wall in-between flats must be extended through the loft area. Cost implications proved prohibitive to the works programme.

Works required under Decent Homes

- Scheme re-wire
- New heating
- Kitchens
- Bathrooms

Estimated cost: £120,000

The items listed above are currently programmed within the Decent Homes works. Please note however that funding for these works is subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following there Audit Commission inspection in early 2010. Even if 2 Stars are awarded, it has been announced by Central Government that funding will not be available until 2011.

Quality of accommodation

Positive

Location

Arguably, out of all Council owned sheltered schemes Sorrel Court is the best located. It sits within easy walking distance of the town centre, Mountsorrel itself is possibly one of the best served villages within Charnwood in terms of local amenities.

Community

There is reportedly a thriving social scene within the Court with weekly meals booked in the local pub and regular trips and events arranged by residents.

Environment

The scheme is in good condition and has a nice feel when walking into the main entrance and through corridors. The communal areas are well used; there are two sitting areas on each floor with floor to ceiling windows providing views down Leicester Road into Mount Sorrel. These are extremely popular with residents.
Recent conversion works

The recent conversion works have been successful and the newly created flats are highly sought after.

Negative

Access

The scheme does not have a lift, however stair lifts have been fitted providing access to upper floor accommodation.

The scheme has number of level changes throughout which can make movement through Sorrel Court difficult for some residents. Stair lifts are fitted to accommodate for all level changes, however when presented with slight level change, residents prefer to struggle with the steps rather than use the stair lift which they view as cumbersome and complicated.

The communal laundry is situated at the far end of a lower floor corridor. Consequently some residents have difficulties in accessing this facility.

Bedsit facilities

Whilst a number of units have now been converted into flats, a large number of hard to let bedsits remain with shared facilities.

Parking

Car parking for the scheme is limited with space being shared with the adjoining Chestnut Court.
Sorrel Court - Overhead
Please note: The floor plan attached represents the original scheme layout. A floor plan following recent bedsit conversion works is not available.
Scheme options

**Option 1 – Continuation of bedsit conversions**

Only a small proportion of the scheme was converted into flats before works came to a halt. Bedsits are hard to let, to overcome this problem the obvious option would be to convert the remaining bedsits where possible. Compartmentalisation of stairwells and corridors has already happened as part of the original works, however a number of adjoining bedsits remain that could be converted into self contained one bedroom flats.

Elderly people living on their own in 2 and 3 bedroom houses have fed back that they would love to live in Sorrel Court but not in a bedsit. Converting bedsits into 1 and 2 bedroom flats may therefore assist in freeing up under occupied family accommodation within the borough.

Scheme costs however would need to take into account the extension of firewalls into loft space, this proved prohibitive to expansion of the original works programme.

**Option 2 – Provision of mobility scooter storage**

As with other schemes, there is limited space to store mobility scooters which results in them being abandoned throughout the development. A safer option would be to provide proper storage space.

The store room to the rear of the scheme adjacent to the bin store has direct access from the outside and has potential for conversion into a proper storage room for mobility scooters.

**Option 3 – Provision of additional car parking**

The car park could be reconfigured making use of the adjoining landscaped area to provide spaces for an additional number of vehicles.

Sorrel Court falls within a conservation area; this must be taken into account when considering any possible modifications to the scheme.

The whole site is really too small to offer any potential for alternative use.
Recommended option

Option 1 – Continuation of bedsit conversions

Sorrel Court is in an excellent location and demand for accommodation is relatively high in comparison to other sheltered schemes. The previous bedsit conversion works proved successful, the units are sought after and existing residents are very happy in their homes.

The layout of the remaining bedsits presents potential for further future conversion works. It is felt that expanding on the original works programme will ensure the schemes long term sustainability by providing 1 bedroom flats in what is already a popular development.

Future conversion works will need to take into account the additional cost of extending firewalls into the ceiling voids, this proved prohibitive to expansion of the original works programme.

Recommended option – cost estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheme re-wire, heating, kitchens, bathrooms – Decent Homes</td>
<td>£120k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion costs – remaining 22 bedsits into a number of 1 bedroom flats</td>
<td>£465,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following the Audit Commission inspection in early 2010, a proportion of the £120,000 listed above can be used to finance the cost of conversion works, i.e. newly created flats will still require kitchens and bathrooms.
6.16 *St Michaels Court, Thurmaston*

**Total units:** 22  
**Unit mix:**  
21x bedsits  
1x 1 bedroom flats  

**Current voids:** 3  
**% of scheme void:** 13.64  
**Warden:** Resident  
**Priority ranking:** 9

---

**Location**

St Michaels Court is located on Melton Road in Thurmaston. Melton Road is the main road running through Thurmaston and provides a number of local shops and amenities. Thurmaston is on the northern edge of Leicester with the city centre being approximately 3 miles away.

**Surrounding land use**

Surrounding land use is mixed. Melton Road abuts the scheme to the west, private residential units adjoin the scheme to the north. A Leicestershire County Council owned sheltered housing scheme known as Hadrian House sits to the east of the scheme and St Michaels church sits to the south.

**Site layout**

St Michaels Court is one of the smaller sheltered schemes with the accommodation being located in a single block over two storeys. Apart from the 2 bedroom warden’s flats, the scheme comprises all bedsits.

All bedists are situated off a single corridor running in a straight line through the scheme. Bedsits have access to communal bath / shower rooms only.

In terms of communal facilities the scheme provides a communal lounge, laundry, post room and upper floor sitting area. There is also a staff office and guest room.

Externally there is a small parking area along with a landscaped area and drying area.

**Recent major works**

New fire doors have recently been fitted within communal areas.
**Works required under Decent Homes**

- Scheme re-wire
- New heating
- Kitchens
- Bathrooms

Estimated cost: £200,000

The items listed above are currently programmed within the Decent Homes works. Please note however that funding for these works is subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following their Audit Commission inspection in early 2010. Even if 2 Stars are awarded, it has been announced by Central Government that funding will not be available until 2011.

**Quality of accommodation**

**Negative**

**Form of accommodation**

Little money has been spent on both communal areas and the bedsits themselves, so whilst in reasonable condition the scheme is dated and in need of modernisation.

The scheme is made up entirely of hard to let bedsits so whilst updating communal areas would improve the scheme, it is unlikely to make any difference to the popularity of the accommodation itself.
Scheme options

**Option 1 – Bedsit conversions**

Due to the positioning and layout of St Michaels Court, really the only option for possible future major improvements is conversion of existing bedsits into flats.

Whilst the layout of kitchens within bedsits could be improved marginally, there is no adaptability within the bedsits themselves for retrospective installation of bath/shower rooms. Kitchens within existing units will not meet the Decent Homes standard.

Due to the size of the existing scheme, any conversion works will need to where possible convert three bedsits into two flats. If bedsits are converted on the basis of two into one throughout, the scheme may become so small that insufficient rental income is generated for it to operate.

In some instances it will be possible to incorporate adjoining spaces to create an additional or larger flat, for example the communal bathroom area adjacent to unit 8. Unit 21 could be knocked through into the adjoining guest room and store to create a 1 bedroom flat. The wardens flat along with unit 22 could be used to create two 1 bedroom flats. The ‘dead’ space at the end of each corridor could also be incorporated into conversion works.

Scheme costs would need to take into account the extension of firewalls into loft space, this proved prohibitive to conversion works at other sheltered housing developments.

Due to the size of the scheme, it maybe necessary to decant the majority of existing tenants and carry out all of the works in a single phase. Adopting a piecemeal approach where existing voids are used as decant units may create too much disturbance for residents.

**Option 2 – Provision of mobility scooter storage**

As with other schemes, there is limited space to store mobility scooters which results in them being abandoned throughout the development. A safer option would be to provide proper storage space.

The post room has direct access from the outside and has potential for conversion into a proper storage room for mobility scooters.

Following a survey conducted within all sheltered housing schemes, St Michaels Court residents were alone in confirming they would be happy to see their post room removed. The alternative option proposed was fitting letter boxes within flat doors. However, following further investigation it was established this would contravene with fire door regulations.
As an alternative to the post room and letter boxes, there is space to fit post boxes under the stairwell.

**Option 3 – Lift installation**

The warden’s office on the ground floor and the sitting area directly above on the first floor provide potential for future lift installation.

**Option 4 – Linking in with local Extra Care accommodation**

Prior to the announcement that the sale of six county council care homes had collapsed, proposals were discussed that would link St Michaels Court with the neighbouring County Council owned Hadrian House.

Hadrian House was one of the six cares homes that were due to be sold. Proposals by the buyer were to create a brand new 40 unit Extra Care scheme on the site of Hadrian House.

The new scheme at Hadrian House could have been used to provide decant accommodation whilst works were on-going at St Michaels Court. This would provide a more satisfactory form of decant or permanent accommodation for residents.

It will be important to monitor the situation surrounding the sale of the six County owned care schemes closely. If the County do try and sell them again, it would be next years at the earliest before any sale could be agreed.

**Option 5 – Demolition and re-build**

Converting existing bedsits into flats may reduce the total unit number within the development to a level where it is not viable for the scheme to continue to operate.

Due to the age of St Michaels Court, even with conversion works and scheme improvements, long term demand for the accommodation may remain a problem.

Subject to further investigation, demolishing the scheme would leave land suitable for the potential development of more appropriate accommodation. This could be either in the form of a purpose build apartment block for the elderly or bungalow units. Due to location, the site would also be very suitable for general needs accommodation.

As with other new build options, the Council needs to examine whether it would be more appropriate to develop the site itself or transfer land to another provider for development.
St Michaels Court comprises almost entirely hard to let bedsit accommodation. The layout of the development offers excellent potential for conversion of bedsits into 1 bedroom flats. The scheme is in a good location with the supply and demand for sheltered accommodation within Thurmaston currently considered as ‘in balance’.

With this in mind, it is considered that the most appropriate option for further investigation is option 1, a programme of bedsit conversions.

However, if following further investigation it is established that a fully converted scheme with a reduced total number of units is unviable from a management perspective, option 5 will require further consideration.

Subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following the Audit Commission inspection in early 2010, a proportion of the £200,000 listed above can be used to finance the cost of conversion works, i.e. newly created flats will still require kitchens and bathrooms.
6.17 St Peters Court, Syston

Total units: 30
Unit mix: 29x bedsits 1x 1 bedroom flats

Current voids: 7
% of scheme void: 23.33
Warden: Resident
Priority ranking: 10 (joint)

Location

St Peters Court is located off Melton Road in Syston. Syston is a thriving town with a good number of shops and local amenities. Syston town centre is a short walk from the scheme.

Syston is located to the north east of Leicester and can be found the other side of Thurmaston.

Surrounding land use

Surrounding land use is entirely residential.

Site layout

The accommodation at St Peters Court is located in a large single block over 2 storeys. Apart from the 2 bedroom wardens flat, the scheme comprises entirely bedsits. Bedsits have access to shared facilities only.

The block is really broken down into three corridors in approximately the shape of a lower case n.

The scheme includes a large communal lounge along with a kitchen, laundry and post room. There are a number of quiet rooms and store rooms throughout for use by tenants. There is also a guest room.

Externally, there is a small parking area and extensive landscaped grounds.

Recent major works

In 2001 the scheme had new windows installed
Works required under Decent Homes

- Scheme re-wire
- New heating
- Kitchens

Estimated cost: £200,000

The items listed above are currently programmed within the Decent Homes works. Please note however that funding for these works is subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following there Audit Commission inspection in early 2010. Even if 2 Stars are awarded, it has been announced by Central Government that funding will not be available until 2011.

Quality of accommodation

Positive

Community atmosphere

The scheme sits in extensive landscaped grounds, whilst this area appears barely used by residents, the green open space provides a pleasant environment to live in.

The communal lounge and kitchen are large and well used. In fact there is a good social function throughout the scheme will facilities also being used by the Syston community, the scheme is really ‘part and parcel’ of the village.

Negative

Dated accommodation

However, little money has been spent on both communal areas and the bedsits themselves, so whilst in reasonable condition the scheme is dated and in need of modernisation.

The scheme is made up entirely of hard to let bedsits so whilst updating communal areas would improve the scheme, it is unlikely to make any difference to the popularity of the accommodation itself.

Maintenance

The positioning of the boiler in the loft space means that access is almost impossible for maintenance. The current boiler is old and requires servicing or possible replacement. Tenants report problems and possible faults each winter, due to the reluctance to spend money on the scheme, boiler problems are set to continue.
Provision for mobility scooters

As with other schemes, limited storage facilities have lead to mobility scooters increasingly being abandoned throughout the scheme.

Parking

The level of parking available is insufficient for a scheme of this size.
Scheme options

**Option 1 – New build development**

St Peters Court sits on a large plot of Council owned land. The landscaped grounds around the scheme occupy an area larger than the accommodation block itself. With this in mind there are different options available for redevelopment or part redevelopment of the site.

a) Development on existing land available and conversion of existing accommodation.

There is sufficient land available for the development of more appropriate accommodation at St Peters Court such as a small development of bungalows. The land could be transferred or gifted to a partner Housing Association for development; the Housing Association would retain and manage the units with nomination rights being granted to the Council.

As part of the deal, the Housing Association could also carry out conversion works to the existing accommodation at St Peters Court looking at a programme of converting adjoining bedsits and communal areas into 1 bedroom flats.

An alternative approach would be for the Authority to bid for HCA grant direct and carry out its own development work. Ownership and management would therefore be retained and the Council would benefit from the rental income.

b) Re-development of St Peters Court

A dated sheltered housing scheme with or without conversion works is not necessarily the best use of a large area of land at St Peters Court, also taking into account future maintenance liability of the existing scheme.

A further option is the complete demolition of St Peters Court. This would leave a large area of land for re-development.

Again, the land could be transferred to a Housing Association for development or the Council could bid for grant direct and build itself.

A new development could take the form of a purpose built Extra Care scheme comprising both apartments and bungalows offering a variety of tenure types.

To limit disturbance to existing residents, subject to design it might be possible to build on the land currently available, transfer tenants into the new accommodation, then demolish and re-build on the current St Peters Court approximate footprint.

Before new build options are progressed, further consultation is required with Charnwood Borough Councils planning department.
Option 2 – Conversion of existing accommodation only

As already mentioned above, the current layout of the scheme means conversion of adjoining bedsits and communal areas into one bedroom flats is possible.

Installation of bath/shower rooms within existing bedsits is not possible. As it stands, bedsits will not meet the Decent Homes standard.

Conversion works could also include some specific scheme improvements such as installation of a lift through the wardens office although this would also mean utilising part of the wardens flat on the first floor. The post room is an ideal location and size for conversion into a mobility scooter storage room.

Due to the potential of the entire site, it does need to be questioned however whether conversion of the existing scheme would be making best use of the land.

Recommended option

Option 1A – Development on existing land and conversion of existing accommodation

In terms of further investigation, it is felt that with the amount of ‘spare’ land available, the opportunity for new build development of more appropriate accommodation is too good to not give further consideration.

The atmosphere within the existing development is excellent and the scheme forms part of the wider Syston community with communal facilities being well used by many non-residents.

With this existing popularity, it is recommended that further investigation is also given to converting existing accommodation into flats alongside new build development work. Conversion works will need to include more general scheme improvements such as re-decoration of communal areas and provision of mobility scooter storage. Simply converting bedsits will not turn the scheme completely around.

It could be that in lieu of free land, the selected housing provider will also carry out appropriate conversion works to existing accommodation, alternatively proceeds raised from a land sale could be used to fund conversion works?

Providing 1 and 2 bedroom flats in place of bedsits and new build bungalows alongside would assist greatly in ensuring the long term demand for sheltered accommodation on this site.
### Recommended option – cost estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheme re-wire, heating, kitchens – Decent Homes</td>
<td>£120k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New build development costs – additional ‘wing’ of accommodation providing 20x 1 bedroom flats</td>
<td>£1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion costs affecting St Peters Court – conversion of 29 bedsits into a number of 1 bedroom flats</td>
<td>£620,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following the Audit Commission inspection in early 2010, a proportion of the £120,000 listed above can be used to finance the cost of conversion works, i.e. newly created flats will still require kitchens and bathrooms.
6.18 Arnold Smith House, Shepshed

Total units: 23

Unit mix: 10x bedsits
            13x 1 bedroom flats

Current voids: 1
% of scheme void: 4.35

Warden: Resident

Priority ranking: 10 (joint)

Location

Arnold Smith House is located on Bridge Street in Shepshed close to town centre shops and amenities.

Shepshed is located approximately 3 miles to the west of Loughborough just off junction 23 of the M1 motorway.

Surrounding land use

Surrounding land use is entirely residential. There is a block of accommodation neighbouring Arnold Smith House that formally fell within the scheme. This part of the development is now owned and managed by Nottingham Community Housing Association.

Site layout

The accommodation at Arnold Smith House is located in a single block over 2 storeys. Entrance is through the side end of the building into a hall area. The accommodation follows the corridor up through the scheme before turning a right angle and continuing until the corridor end.

The block comprises an almost even mix of bedsits and 1 bedroom flats. Communal facilities include a common room, kitchen, laundry, sitting room and post room. There is also a staff office on site. All bedsits have self contained shower rooms.

Externally there is a reasonably sized car park serving the accommodation. The car park is shared with tenants and staff of the neighbouring Housing Association accommodation. Pleasant landscaped grounds surround Arnold Smith House, a gazebo for tenants use has recently been erected at the front of the scheme. There is also an external drying area and some undercover storage for mobility scooters.
Recent major works

Within the last 10 years a number of bedsits have been converted into 1 bedroom flats. A number of units had new bath/shower rooms installed in 2003.

Works required under Decent Homes

All works relating to Decent Homes have been completed. There is no projected spend for the next 5 years.

Quality of accommodation

Positive

Recent modernisation works

Arnold Smith house has recently undergone a degree of modernisation with a number of hard to let bedsits converted into 1 bedroom flats and new bath/shower rooms installed within remaining bedsits. This has proved successful, void levels at the scheme are not as severe as previously listed sheltered developments.

Environment

Both internally and externally, the scheme is well maintained and provides a pleasant environment to live in.

Negative

Guest room provision and access

Other than the remaining bedsits, the main drawbacks of the scheme are the shortage of a guest room and access to bedsits 9 – 12. There is short set of steps leading to these units with no lift fitted.

Communal facilities

The recently erected gazebo funded through a tenant bid is now used almost exclusively as a smoking shelter. External drying areas are not used at all and now appear unsightly and are really a waste of space.

The communal grounds themselves are sloped and uneven, as a result actual use by residents is limited.

Neighbouring tenants

There have previously been complaints from Arnold Smith House residents about the Housing Association tenants in the neighbouring Nottingham Community Housing scheme. It is not clear exactly what the complaints have been about.
Arnold Smith House – Floor plan

*Please note:* The floor plan attached represents the original scheme layout. A floor plan following recent bedsit conversion works is not available.
**Scheme options**

**Option 1 – Bedsit conversions**

There is still scope to convert the majority of the remaining bedsits into one bedroom flats. Most of the remaining bedsits are located on the ground floor and subject to location have potential for conversion both three bedsits into two flats and two bedsits into one flat.

A continuation of conversion works would remove almost all of the hard to let bedsits from what is already a relatively popular development.

**Option 2 – Provision of guestroom**

A guest room could be accommodated within the area currently occupied by the store and large WC on the ground floor adjacent to the main entrance.

Alternatively a guest room could be accommodated within a long term void bedsit.

**Option 3 – Creation of additional unit of accommodation**

The space currently occupied by the large WC, store room, post room and office adjacent to the main entrance could be converted to create an additional 1 bedroom flat. The existing warden is due to retire shortly and it is envisaged will be replaced by a mobile warden, this option may therefore become more appropriate.

**Option 4 – Arnold Smith House extension**

Subject to further investigation, the land to the rear of the north-east corner of the accommodation block could accommodate additional development. It is envisaged this would take the form of an extension to the existing block with access being through the bathroom and cleaners cupboard on the ground floor in-between flats 6 and 7, alternatively it may be necessary to utilise one of the bedsit units to create more appropriate access arrangements.

It is anticipated the land identified would be able to accommodate a two storey block of eight 1 bedroom flats, with four units being situated on each floor.

As the extension would be physically attached to the existing block, it would be a more suitable arrangement if the Council were to carry out any development work so that ownership and management could be retained.
Recommended option

Option 1 – Bedsit conversions

The scheme layout still offers potential to convert the majority of remaining bedsits into 1 bedroom flats. In comparison with some other sheltered housing developments the existing scheme is relatively popular. Whilst all bedsits do have self contained bath/shower rooms there is no guarantee that a demand for these units will continue to exist.

Converting the remaining bedsits into more appropriate and sustainable 1 bedroom flats should ensure a longer term demand for accommodation at Arnold Smith House.

Recommended option – cost estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversion costs – remaining 10 bedsits into a number of 1 bedroom flats</td>
<td>£186,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.19 Riversdale Court, Birstall

Total units: 24

Unit mix: 16x bedsits
8x 1 bedroom flats

Current voids: 4
% of scheme void: 16.67

Warden: Mobile

Priority ranking: 12

Location

Riversdale Court is located on Riversdale Close adjacent to the River Soar in Birstall. The nearest local amenities are in Birstall town centre a short distance to the north west of the scheme.

Birstall is located on the southern edge of Charnwood on the City of Leicester border.

Surrounding land use

Surrounding land use is predominantly residential. The White Horse PH neighbours Riversdale Court to the south. The River Soar and subsequent fields are to the east of the scheme.

Site layout

The accommodation at Riversdale Court is located in a single two storey L shaped block. Units comprise a mix of majority bedsits and a small number of 1 bedroom flats. Bedsits have access to communal bath / shower rooms only.

The accommodation includes a communal common room, post room and laundry. A guest room is located on the first floor. There is also a wardens office adjacent to the main entrance.

Externally the scheme is bordered on each side by a narrow strip of landscaping. A staggered terrace area using the gradient of the land sits in front of the common room dropping part way down to the river. Limited parking is available adjacent to the main entrance and at the far end of the scheme.
Recent major works

Riversdale Court had new windows installed in 2004. 3 units benefited from new bath/shower rooms in 2004, a further 3 units had new kitchens installed also in 2004. Between 1998 and 2000 gas wet heating systems were installed throughout the scheme.

Works required under Decent Homes

- Scheme re-wire
- New heating
- Kitchens

Estimated cost: £120,000

The items listed above are currently programmed within the Decent Homes works. Please note however that funding for these works is subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following there Audit Commission inspection in early 2010. Even if 2 Stars are awarded, it has been announced by Central Government that funding will not be available until 2011.

Quality of accommodation

Positive

Location

The scheme is in a very pleasant water side location, with the communal room, outdoor terrace and a number of bedsits and flats offering views across the River Soar and lakes and fields beyond.

The scheme does not suffer from the void levels experienced in some of the sheltered schemes previously listed. It is suggested that the location of Riversdale Court and the environment it provides to live in compensates for the fact that the majority of accommodation comprises bedsits, i.e. in other locations, the accommodation block at Riversdale Court would experience a high level of voids, however in this location offers for bedsits are accepted by waiting list applicants.

Communal areas

The communal areas are in excellent condition and have recently been redecorated including the fitting of new curtains and installation of new light fittings.

Proximity to amenities

Riversdale Court is within easy walking distance of the local shops and amenities in Birstall town centre.
Negative

*Provision for mobility scooters*

There is limited space for mobility scooter storage will leads to buggy’s being abandoned throughout the scheme.

*Internal access*

Access to the communal lounge is via a steep set of steps with no lift provision. This limits the use of the facility for some residents.
## Scheme options

### Option 1 – Bedsit conversions

Due to the layout of accommodation, the potential for converting bedsits into 1 bedroom flats is limited. A number of existing flats are adjacent to bedsits meaning that a full programme of converting ‘two into one’ is not possible.

However, there are four ‘pairs’ of bedsits, conversion of these units would remove a total of eight hard to let bedsits from the scheme and be replaced by four more appropriate flats. There are also possibly 3 occasions where bedsits are adjacent to store rooms or communal bath rooms. With the overall number of units decreasing following conversion works, numbers using communal facilities will also drop. This will open up the possibility of incorporating adjacent communal spaces into bedsits to create large 1 bedroom flats.

Due to the size of Riversdale Court, reducing the overall number of units through a programme of converting bedsits may leave the scheme financially unviable. Management costs will remain relatively constant compared to a reduced rental income.

### Option 2 – Provision of lift access to common room

There are two storerooms next to each other, one accessed from the common room, the other accessed from the corridor. This layout offers potential for installation of a lift platform in the place of both cupboards taking into account the level change between the corridor and common room. A full passenger list would not be required, more of a platform lift for single person.

### Option 3 – Provision of buggy storage

As with other schemes, there is limited space to store mobility scooters which results in them being abandoned throughout the development. A safer option would be to provide proper storage space.

The post room has direct access from the outside and has potential for conversion into a proper storage room for mobility scooters.

### Option 4 – Sale of site

Riversdale Court is in an excellent location situated on the bank of the River Soar with views over the countryside beyond.

Birstall is a desirable area to live offering excellent local facilities and good links to Leicester.

Albeit in a rising housing market, the site occupied by Riversdale Court is likely to be an attractive proposition for market development. It might be worth valuing the site as sale of this asset may provide a significant capital return for the Council.
Recommended option

Option 1 – Bedsit conversions
and
Option 2 – Provision of lift access to common room

Whilst Riversdale Court does not suffer from the void levels experienced in some of the sheltered schemes previously listed, the scheme still offers the majority of accommodation in the form of bedsits. Whilst in an excellent location that in part compensates for the poor unit type, there is no guarantee that as more purpose built accommodation for the elderly gets developed, levels of demand will continue to exist.

Whilst, due to the layout of the existing scheme it is not possible to convert all units into flats, it is possible to address the issue in part. It is recommended that in order to maintain the existing level of demand for Riversdale Court, the conversion of bedsits into flats where possible within the scheme is given further consideration.

Having no lift access whatsoever to the communal lounge seriously impedes some residents from using this important facility and may be a reason for refusal in terms of an offer of accommodation within the scheme.

Providing lift access to the communal lounge may be a cost effective means of improving existing resident satisfaction with Riversdale Court and increasing levels of demands amongst potential tenants.

Recommended option – cost estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheme re-wire, heating, kitchens – Decent Homes</td>
<td>£120k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion costs – 16 bedsits into a number of 1 bedroom flats</td>
<td>£341,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of ‘Terry Lift’ to provide more appropriate access to communal lounge</td>
<td>£6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion of store room into buggy storage facility</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following the Audit Commission inspection in early 2010, a proportion of the £120,000 listed above can be used to finance the cost of conversion works, i.e. newly created flats will still require kitchens and bathrooms.
6.20 Durham Road, Loughborough

Total units: 29

Unit mix: 25x 1 bedroom bungalows 4x 2 bedroom bungalows

Current voids: 0
% of scheme void: 0

Warden: Resident

Priority ranking: 13

Location

Durham Road is located off Derby Road on the north side of Loughborough. The scheme is situated approximately one mile from Loughborough town centre. Regular buses running along Derby Road provide convenient access to town centre shops and amenities.

The scheme is approximately 2 miles from the Charnwood Borough Council offices on Southfields Road.

Surrounding land use

Surrounding land use is predominantly residential comprising majority Council and Housing Association owned housing. Derby Road and Warwick Way border the scheme to the north. A public house is situated to the west of the scheme.

Site layout

The accommodation at Durham Road comprises entirely bungalows. Bungalows are built in small rows of terraces generally surrounding roughly squared landscaped areas with all units facing into each other.

The scheme includes a communal room and staff office over the footprint of one of the bungalow units. There are a number of communal drying areas. Parking is available in a communal car park adjacent to the scheme to west.

Recent major works

All units had new windows fitted in 2002. The majority of units had new bath and shower rooms installed between 2001 and 2008. Many of the units have experienced some adaptation, including level access entry and level access shower facilities.
Between 2004 and 2008 a small number of units had new central heating systems installed. In 2007/2008 a small number of units had new kitchens installed.

**Works required under Decent Homes**

- Central heating
- Kitchens
- Bathrooms

Estimated cost: £140,000

The items listed above are currently programmed within the Decent Homes works. Please note however that funding for these works is subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following their Audit Commission inspection in early 2010. Even if 2 Stars are awarded, it has been announced by Central Government that funding will not be available until 2011.

**Quality of accommodation**

**Negative**

*Anti-social behaviour*

The accommodation at Durham road sits in a large housing estate. There have been some complaints from residents about anti-social behaviour regarding local children playing football in the drying areas and open space within the scheme.

*Landscaping*

Roots from mature trees are protruding through footpaths within the scheme causing a trip hazard for residents. The same trees are also blocking out light from residents bungalows.

**Positive**

*Type of accommodation*

The sheltered accommodation at Durham Road is highly sought after. Bungalows both internally and externally are well maintained. Turnover of residents is minimal compared to other sheltered housing schemes. There are high numbers of applicants on the Housing Register waiting for available accommodation at Durham Road. There is a good community spirit within the scheme and to a degree the surrounding area.
Durham Road – Overhead

Durham Road – Site plan
Scheme options

**Option 1 – Durham Road extension**

Due to the popularity of the scheme, as present there is little requirement to implement major improvements and alterations. Vacant space within the existing development does however offer some potential for expansion.

The warden’s office and common room could be converted back into a bungalow to create an extra unit of accommodation.

Some of the drying areas are un-used and locked up. The drying area adjacent to plots 61 and 69 is large enough to accommodate a new build bungalow.

The area of open space at the far end of the Durham Road scheme, the opposite end to the car park is also large enough to accommodate an additional bungalow.

These additional units would assist in meeting some of the un-met demand for accommodation at Durham Road. Development work could be progressed by the Council by bidding for HCA grant direct. Alternatively, the land could be transferred to a Housing Association for development. This approach may be limited bearing in mind we are talking about just two single plots in the middle of an existing Council owned scheme.

**Option 2 – Re-designating scheme to Central Alarm System (CAS)**

The Central Alarm System is where units are fitted with a pull cord linked to a central ‘call centre’. A warden will still visit all residents once a week. People in CAS accommodation are generally not as high need in terms of support as those in sheltered accommodation.

Durham Road is only a sheltered scheme because through conversion of one of the bungalows, the scheme meets the essential requirement of having a communal lounge.

Due to the independent nature of the bungalow accommodation it may be considered appropriate to convert the scheme back to a CAS.

The lounge could therefore be converted back into a bungalow providing a further unit of accommodation.
Recommended option

**Option 1 – Durham Road extension and Re-designation under the Central Alarm System**

The development of additional sheltered bungalows at Durham Road would assist in meeting some of the un-met demand for this accommodation type in this area.

Further investigation is required into whether it would be more appropriate for the Council to carry out development work or to appoint another provider.

With no communal facilities and as the units do not 'share a roof' it is recommended that bungalows are re-designated under the Central Alarm System.

**Recommended option – cost estimate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New central heating, kitchens and bathrooms – Decent Homes</td>
<td>£140k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New build development costs – 2x 1 bedroom bungalows</td>
<td>£154,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion of communal room and staff office back into 1 bedroom bungalow</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.21 St Pauls Court, Syston

Total units: 24
Unit mix: 24x 1 bedroom flat

Current voids: 0
% of scheme void: 0
Warden: Mobile
Priority ranking: 14

Location

St Pauls Court is located off Chapel Street in Syston. Chapel Street is a short distance from Melton Road which is the main road running through the centre of Syston and is home to the majority of town centre shops and amenities.

Surrounding land use

Surrounding land use is mixed. A social club, community centre and light industrial units abut the scheme to the east. A park sits to the south of St Pauls Court, a public house to the west and further residential buildings lie to the north.

Site layout

The accommodation at St Pauls Court comprises entirely 1 bedroom flats. The majority of flats are located in a single court looking into communal gardens. All flats are situated in pairs over two storey blocks, with each benefiting from their own direct entrance rather than via a communal corridor. There is a further block of 2 flats (plots 17 and 19) situated apart from the central court to the north of the site. This separate accommodation block is a Grade II listed building.

The centre of the court contains pleasant landscaped grounds. Residents in fact take huge pride in the grounds and garden areas have recently won awards. There is a very small car park adjacent to the main entrance.

In terms of layout, St Pauls Court does not represent a typical Charnwood Borough Council sheltered housing scheme.

Recent major works

New windows were installed throughout the scheme in 2001. Within the last 10 years the majority of bedsits have been fitted with new bath / shower rooms. A
number of units have been adapted, including provision of level access entry and level access shower.

**Works required under Decent Homes**

- Heating
- Kitchens
- Bathrooms

Estimated cost: £140,000

The items listed above are currently programmed within the Decent Homes works. Please note however that funding for these works is subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following there Audit Commission inspection in early 2010. Even if 2 Stars are awarded, it has been announced by Central Government that funding will not be available until 2011.

**Quality of accommodation**

*Positive*

*Location*

St Pauls Court provides entirely 1 bedroom flats, there are no bedsits to speak of. The scheme is in an excellent location being sat within pleasant and private landscaped grounds but only a short walk from town centre amenities.

*Type of accommodation*

St Pauls Court offers a relatively modern form of sheltered accommodation. Voids levels at St Pauls Court are minimal compared to other sheltered schemes listed. There are a large number of applicants on the Housing Register who have expressed an interest in accommodation at St Pauls Court.
St Pauls Court – Overhead
St Pauls Court – Site plan
Scheme options

Due to the demand for accommodation at St Pauls Court, it is felt that investment in scheme improvements should not be a priority. Major improvements are not required in order to improve the scheme sustainability in terms of lettings.

However, one option for possible further consideration is:

**Option 1 – Re-designating scheme to Central Alarm System (CAS)**

The Central Alarm System is where units are fitted with a pull cord linked to a central ‘call centre’. A warden will still visit all residents once a week. People in CAS accommodation are generally not as high need in terms of support as those in sheltered accommodation.

Due to the independent nature of the accommodation it may be considered appropriate to convert the scheme back to a CAS.

If the scheme is re-designated the communal areas could be converted into a bungalow unit. Kitchens within the existing flats are large enough to accommodate a washing machine. This would free up the space occupied by the communal laundry and reduce the scheme running costs for the Council.

**Recommended option (Decent Homes works only) – cost estimate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New central heating, kitchens and bathrooms – Decent Homes</td>
<td>£140k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.22 Grays Court, Barrow upon Soar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total units:</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit mix:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17x 1 bedroom flat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x 1 bedroom bungalow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7x 2 bedroom bungalow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current voids:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of scheme void:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warden:</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority ranking:</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location**

Grays Court is located on North Street in Barrow upon Soar. The accommodation is accessed both via North Street and Bryan Close. Town centre amenities are situated on the High Street in Barrow a short walk from Grays Court.

Barrow upon Soar is located to the south east of Loughborough in the centre of the borough.

**Surrounding land use**

Surrounding land use is predominantly residential. A light industrial premises sits to the east of the scheme.

**Site layout**

The accommodation at Grays Court is divided over two areas. At the front of the scheme is a three storey apartment block comprising entirely of 1 bedroom flats. The block includes a communal lounge, kitchen and laundry. A passenger lift provides access to upper floor accommodation.

Parking for the apartment block is adjacent, accessed from North Street. To the rear there is a small amount of external amenity space.

Beyond the block of apartments and accessed via Bryan Close is a new development of 10 bungalows, three 1 bedroom units and seven 2 bedroom units. The majority of bungalows form a U shape around a square landscaped court. There is a further pair of bungalows to the south of the court. Limited parking is available within the curtilage of the dwellings, the remainder in communal parking courts. Only the two separate bungalows have private enclosed rear gardens.
Recent major works

In 2005 a Housing Association was appointed by the Council to demolish part of the accommodation at Grays Court and re-develop as bungalows. These are the bungalows now evident to the rear of the apartment block. As part of the deal, the Housing Association was also appointed to convert the remaining accommodation into seventeen 1 bedroom flats. All these units are located within the apartment block fronting the scheme.

Refurbishment works included new windows, bath/shower rooms, kitchens and central heating. The majority of units were also adapted to elderly person’s requirements.

Refurbishment and development work was part funding through the Charnwood Borough Council Enabling Grant and Housing Corporation Social Housing Grant.

Works required under Decent Homes

All works relating to Decent Homes have been completed. There is no projected spend for the next 5 years.

Quality of accommodation

Negative

Current parking provision is insufficient for a scheme of this size.

Positive

Recent conversion works

The redevelopment of Grays Court has meant that this is really the only sheltered scheme in the borough to provide accommodation comparable to new build schemes for the elderly being constructed by some private developers.

There are no bedsits within the scheme, all flats have been modernised with new kitchens, bathrooms and central heating. Communal areas are naturally well lit and offer a pleasant modern interior.

Bungalows

The bungalows to the rear of the scheme offer a highly sought after unit type.
Negative

Scheme layout

The only negative consequence of redevelopment work is the Housing Association partner has retained ownership and management of the bungalows, although the Council still has nomination rights. This has created a 'them and us' divide within the scheme between Housing Association and Council tenants.
**Scheme options**

The redevelopment of Grays Court has removed all hard to let properties from the scheme and replaced with highly sought after modern 1 bedroom flats and 1 and 2 bedroom bungalows. Voids levels at Grays Court are minimal compared to other sheltered schemes listed.

In light of previous expenditure committed and the success of recent redevelopment work, it is felt that investment in major scheme improvements is not required at Grays Court.
7.0 Scheme wide options

There are a number of options that are relevant to all Council owned sheltered housing schemes. Rather than considering them in relation to a specific scheme, these options have potential to influence demand for sheltered units across the borough.

**Option 1 – Better marketing**

A significant number of Council owned sheltered schemes are in excellent locations, surrounded by areas of mature landscaping but close to local amenities and public transport links.

Better marketing of the available units in these schemes may encourage elderly people who wouldn’t normally consider Council owned sheltered housing to apply for accommodation. This would assist in increasing the number of applicants on the Councils Housing Register for sheltered accommodation meaning that when voids arise it will reduce the time taken to re-let the property.

Marketing can take various forms, some suggestions include:

- Adverts in the property section of the paper showing units available for rent with details of how to apply
- The use of internet sites such a ‘Right Move to advertise vacant properties available for rent
- Many sheltered schemes are situated in prominent positions adjacent to the main routes into some of Charnwood’s larger settlements. The use of ‘Accommodation to let boards’ may generate increased levels of interest
- Word of mouth is often one of the best means of advertising. Discussing with current residents the need for new tenants to occupy existing voids to ensure the schemes long term sustainability may help to generate further interest locally
- When potential residents are presented with an empty flat that has been vacant for over six months with no carpets down, curtains fitted and walls that could really do with decorating, it is likely to confirm any fears they may have had about living in a Council owned sheltered scheme. The use of a show flat may assist in allaying some of those fears. A show flat will demonstrate the level of furniture a unit can accommodate and what it can look like once lived in. It may be possible to negotiate with furniture providers deals for chairs, table and beds, etc to be provided at no cost on the understanding that it will be displayed within the show unit.
Option 2 – Variation of tenure types

Currently within Charnwood the only option available to prospective occupiers is to rent a unit within a sheltered scheme at an affordable level.

Expanding the range of tenure options available to prospective occupiers may increase demand for Council accommodation. Elderly people are often looking to downsize or move into sheltered accommodation due to support needs. The sale of their existing property may have left them with a level of equity that they would prefer to invest in their next property. This will mean they have a future legacy for their family.

Possible schemes worth further investigation include:

**Leasehold schemes for the Elderly (LSE)** involves the prospective occupier buying a proportion (e.g. 70%) of the equity of the property, the remaining portion being owned by the Council. When the property is sold, the seller receives the same percentage of market value.

**Shared Ownership** would involve the Council offering the option to prospective occupiers of buying a proportion of the value of the property (it can be between 5% and 95%) and paying rent on the remainder. The share of the equity can be increased through ‘staircasing’. A service charge will normally have to be paid in addition to the rent. The rent element may be eligible for Housing Benefit.

**Life interest plans.** This is a less common model. It offers an arrangement where the purchaser buys the right to live in a retirement property for the rest of their life. The purchase price is well below the normal market price and once the occupier leaves the property, it reverts back to the Council. Life Interest Plans are generally available to people over 65. If a couple occupy the dwelling, the property carries onto the surviving partner.

Option 3 – Review of the allocation process

The fundamental problem with the Councils Sheltered schemes is the design, layout, condition and age of the accommodation on offer. However, the process of allocating empty properties is also key in ensuring void units are turned over as quickly possible to minimise void rent loss. Investing significant sums of money in improving sheltered accommodation would have a greater benefit if the process of allocating new properties as efficient and effective as possible. Some suggested areas for possible further investigation are:

**Allocation officers visiting all Sheltered Housing schemes** so they are familiar with exactly what the accommodation has to offer. Due to the high level of voids in some schemes it is possible to have a pre-defined opinion of what the accommodation is like without actually seeing it. Even before any improvement works some of the Council owned schemes have a lot of selling points. Allocation
Officers being able to discuss these with prospective occupiers may encourage further offer acceptances.

**Warden Services overseeing the allocation of sheltered accommodation.**
The Warden Services department are the most knowledgeable in terms of what sheltered housing stock the Council has to offer. They also work every day with elderly people and are well experienced in dealing with specific requirements and people’s individual needs. They may be in a better position to assess the suitability of accommodation for potential occupiers and work more closely with existing residents to promote the scheme within the local community.

**Option 4 – Improvements to the main entrance**

An observation that is consistent throughout the majority of sheltered housing stock is the general poor condition of the main entrance to the schemes.

The main entrance doors are dated and fairly unattractive. External walls surrounding the main entrance are often finished in concrete render and painted grey or in a lighter colour that has now turned grey.

The approach to a scheme is often dominated with hard landscaping. Scheme signage is dated and does not present a good advert for the development.

Once through the main doors internal decoration is too often dated. Carpets are worn and lighting harsh.

Improving the main entrance to each scheme will assist in improving the overall appearance of the development. This could be done by installing new entrance doors and signage, re-decorating both internally and externally around the main entrance, fitting more up to date lighting schemes within the main entrance, laying new thicker pile carpets and hanging new curtains again within the main entrance would give potential occupiers a much better first impression. When viewing their unit they would be in a much more positive frame of mind and therefore more likely to accept the offer of accommodation.

**Option 5 – Layout of communal lounge**

This is a very minor proposal, however it could again affect peoples overall impression of the scheme.

Chairs and tables within the communal lounge are often laid out in a very formal manor, for example in two long rows along either side of the room. This can make the scheme appear even more institutional that it already feels.

Placing tables with chairs in small groups may help the room and scheme feel slightly less regimented and more welcoming for potential occupiers.
8.0 Extra Care Housing

The conversion or re-development of existing Council owned Sheltered Housing schemes into Extra Care accommodation has been proposed on a number of occasions throughout the option review.

This section of the report provides further detail on Extra Care as a model

8.1 The County’s perspective

Using existing sheltered accommodation to convert to Extra Care is being explored as part of the strategic review of older peoples services.

8.2 Charnwood provision

There is currently only one Extra Care housing scheme within the Borough. The scheme is managed by Places for People Housing Association and is located off Victoria Road in Loughborough. (need to confirm this paragraph)

8.3 What is Extra Care Housing?

What are the essential features of Extra Care Housing?

- Self – contained – own front door
- Extra communal facilities (more than traditional Sheltered Housing)
- Accessible accommodation/SMART technology
- Availability of flexible personal care and support from on-site team
- A restaurant or meals service
- Emphasis on independence

Key issues

- ‘Separate’ versus ‘integrated’ models of management/support
- Potential for joint commissioning
- Supporting People through Area Based Grant
- Who controls nominations?
- Split between housing management care and support (and costs)
- Viability of care service
- Viability of additional services e.g. restaurant, leisure facilities
- Managing diversity – age and care needs as well as ethnicity
- Leasehold and shared ownership

Re-modelling issues

- Location
- Thorough survey at the outset
- Tensions of introducing frail residents
• Re-furbished or re-modelled? Is it value for money?
• What standards are achievable – Design, accessibility?
• Loss of revenue with fewer units?
• Residents should not remain on site during works? Is there land for a new wing?
• Political sensitivities
• Viable size on completion
• Reliable assessment of cost

8.4 Potential provision

Fielding Court in Loughborough and Dudley Court in Sileby have both been identified has having potential for the conversion into Extra Care Housing. This would provide the borough with a good geographical spread of Extra Care accommodation with one scheme being provide in the north of the District and the other in the south.
9.0 Sheltered Scheme Investment Options

9.1 Summary

The three specific aims of the Sheltered Housing review were to:

- Highlight investment requirements to ensure existing social housing stock continues to meet the needs of older people
- Inform investment decisions in new housing provision or services
- Promote choices of accommodation for older people

Sheltered scheme visits and inspections enabled the Council to identify the major shortfalls of each development and highlight possible options for scheme improvements.

All scheme finding and resulting development options were discussed with representatives from the Councils ALMO, Charnwood Neighbourhood Housing.

This section of the report provides a summary of the most appropriate investment options for each Sheltered Housing scheme. It is intended that this information is used to inform future investment decisions relating to Sheltered Housing. These decisions are required to ensure the Councils stock continues to meet the needs of older people in the borough and promote choices of accommodation for older people.

It is important to highlight that at this stage these options have been highlighted for further investigation only. Although costs have been provided, these are indicative only and are intended to provide the reader with some estimated guidance on what sort of costs might be involved. Further investigation on each option individually will enable ‘firm’ costs to be established and full appraisals undertaken.

The table below provides a summary of costs attributable to the preferred scheme improvement options as detailed within the scheme inspection sheets. Costs have been split between those identified under Decent Homes and those that will not be eligible for Decent Homes funding. In some instances Decent Homes costs apply to the whole scheme, however a scheme option maybe to demolish a proportion of the scheme and redevelop. In these instances, a proportion of the Decent Homes funding can therefore be used to part fund newbuild or conversion works. It is important to reiterate however that funding for works under Decent Homes is subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following the Audit Commission inspection in early 2010. Even if 2 Starts are awarded it has been announced by central government that funding will not be available until 2011.

The schemes are set out in order of scores awarded following site inspections starting with schemes achieving the lowest (worst) scores first. The table also includes each schemes void performance status, ‘red’ being schemes that perform poorly in relation to void levels on all accounts, ‘amber’ being schemes where performance is mixed and ‘green’ where performance is good.
### 9.2 Scheme options cost summary table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Void performance</th>
<th>Scheme appraisal score (ranking(^1))</th>
<th>Scheme improvements - Decent Homes</th>
<th>Preferred Scheme options – non Decent Homes(^2)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babington Court</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>20/40 (1st joint)</td>
<td>Upgrade of electrical supply + re-wire £90,000</td>
<td>Demolition and re-development £1,700,000</td>
<td>Decent Homes works would not apply to scheme if site re-developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michaels Court</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>21/40 (2(^{nd}) joint)</td>
<td>New kitchens, bathroom, heating and re-wire £200,000</td>
<td>Conversion of bedsits into flats £434,000</td>
<td>Decent homes costs can be used to offset conversion costs. Scheme might become financially unviable if converted due to reduced number of units – further investigation therefore required into demolition and re-build</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Scheme with the lowest score is given the lowest ranking, e.g. scheme ranked 1\(^{st}\) is the worst performing development in terms of the scheme inspection.

\(^2\) Funding for works under Decent Homes is subject to CNH being awarded a 2 Star rating following there Audit Commission inspection in early 2010. Even if 2 Stars are awarded, it has been announced by Central Government that funding will not be available until 2011.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>Work Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Peters Court</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>21/40</td>
<td>New kitchens, heating and re-wire</td>
<td>£120,000</td>
<td>£620,000 + New build development £1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2nd)</td>
<td>Conversion of bedsits into flats</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decent Homes funding can part offset cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longcliffe Road</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>22/40</td>
<td>Upgrade of electrical supply + re-wire</td>
<td>£125,000</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3rd)</td>
<td>Conversion of communal area back into bungalow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riversdale Court</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>22/40</td>
<td>New kitchens, heating and re-wire</td>
<td>£120,000</td>
<td>£357,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3rd)</td>
<td>Conversion of bedsits into flats</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decent Homes funding can part offset cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ Installation of lift into lounge area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ Creation of buggy storage facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beresford Court</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>22/40 (3rd joint)</td>
<td>New heating and re-wire&lt;br&gt;£130,000</td>
<td>Conversion of remaining bedsits&lt;br&gt;Block B improved access&lt;br&gt;Scooter storage&lt;br&gt;Guest room&lt;br&gt;£100,000</td>
<td>Decent Homes funding can part offset conversion works cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Court</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>23/40 (4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>New kitchens, bathrooms, windows, heating and re-wire&lt;br&gt;£300,000</td>
<td>Bedsit conversions&lt;br&gt;Scooter storage&lt;br&gt;Through floor lift&lt;br&gt;£350,000</td>
<td>A sale of available land at Dudley Court would part finance scheme improvements&lt;br&gt;Decent Homes funding can part offset conversion works cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Smith House</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>24/40 (5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; joint)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Bedsit conversions&lt;br&gt;£186,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aingarth</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>24/40 (5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; joint)</td>
<td>New kitchens, heating and re-wire&lt;br&gt;£162,000</td>
<td>Communal courtyard – re-landscaping&lt;br&gt;£4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fielding Court</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>25/40 (6\textsuperscript{th} joint)</td>
<td>New kitchens, bathrooms, heating and re-wire</td>
<td>Demolition and scheme re-development</td>
<td>£300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£3,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If scheme options were to progress, money allocated under Decent Homes can be used to part finance new-build.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sorrel Court</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>25/40 (6\textsuperscript{th} joint)</th>
<th>New kitchens, bathrooms, heating and re-wire</th>
<th>Remaining bedsit conversions</th>
<th>£120,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£465,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decent Homes funding can part offset conversion works cost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Durham Road</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>25/40 (6\textsuperscript{th} joint)</th>
<th>New kitchens, bathrooms and heating</th>
<th>New build development (x2 bungalow units)</th>
<th>£140,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£154,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Martin Court</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>30/40 (7\textsuperscript{th} joint)</th>
<th>New kitchens, bathrooms, heating and re-wire</th>
<th>Block A only – bedsit conversions</th>
<th>£240,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Block B only – demolition and re-development
£1,500,000

If scheme options were to progress – works required under Decent Homes would apply to block A only. Decent Homes money can be used to part finance new build works.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St Pauls Court</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>30/40 (7th joint)</th>
<th>New kitchens, bathrooms and heating</th>
<th>£140,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grays Court</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>34/40 (8th)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.3 Conclusion

It is important to highlight that at this stage these options have been identified for further investigation only. Although costs have been identified, these are purely indicative. Further investigation on each option individually will enable accurate costs to be established and full appraisals undertaken. Further consultation will take place with residents once the Council is in a more informed position on the specific realistic scheme options. No resources in terms of funding have yet been formally identified.

As can be seen in the table above estimated costs to address each scheme vary widely.

There are a number of lower cost options that can increase demand in the short term such as installing lifts or creating a scooter storage facility, however will not necessarily ensure that housing stock meets the needs of older people in the long term.

Because of the inherent problem of minimal low demand for bedsits in the future the preferred options for the long term involve conversion or redevelopment works. This is because the inherent problem with most of the Councils Sheltered Housing development is the accommodation available, bedsits form the majority of units throughout the Councils stock. Whilst significantly more expensive, converting schemes into and developing more appropriate accommodation is therefore a better option if the Council is serious about ensuring the long term sustainability of its Sheltered Housing schemes.

The total cost to address all schemes, setting aside the works required under Decent Homes stands at just under £12,000,000, clearly the availability of resources will play a part on the programming of works and potential timeframes.

Sheltered Housing schemes that were ranked as poorer performing following site visits do not necessarily generate the highest costs for scheme improvements. The type and layout of scheme has a major impact on the options proposed. For example, following the site inspections Martin Court was considered one of the better performing schemes in terms of the scheme location, access and environment. However, the scheme layout provides excellent opportunity for site redevelopment. Whilst this is considered the best option for addressing the long term sustainability of Martin Court it is also one of the most expensive.

The approach of assessing each scheme in terms of voids, location, suitability, access and so on is intended to provide some justification behind future spending. It is not intended to provide a pre-defined priority list for future expenditure.
9.4 The way forward

The Sheltered Scheme Review is a supporting document of the Councils Asset Management Strategy, approved at Cabinet on 29th October 2009.

The Review highlights the potential investment required to ensure the Councils existing social housing stock continues to meet the needs of older people. Each scheme option has been identified in consultation with Charnwood Neighbourhood Housing and at this stage is for further investigation only.

It is intended that the information contained in this review will be used by the Council to make a decision on which Sheltered scheme improvement options to target for further investigation.

Further investigation on each option individually will enable accurate costs to be established and full appraisals and viability assessments undertaken. Detailed proposals will then need to be taken to the Councils Cabinet for approval.

Further consultation will take place with residents once the Council is in a more informed position on specific realistic scheme options. No resources in terms of funding have yet been formally identified.

9.5 Action Plan

In order to add further clarity to the way forward, the table below summarises the actions recommended for further investigation for each sheltered housing scheme. The recommended options do not include works required under Decent Homes as detailed within each scheme inspection summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Option recommended for further investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babington Court</td>
<td>Scheme demolition and site redevelopement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michaels Court</td>
<td>Conversion of bedsits into flats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| St Peters Court | Conversion of bedsits into flats                                                +
|                | New build development on available land within site                               |
| Longcliffe Road | Re-designation of flat blocks to general needs accommodation                        +
|                | Conversion of communal area back into a bungalow unit                            |
| Riverside Court | Conversion of bedsits into flats                                                +
|                | Installation of lift into lounge area                                            +
<p>|                | Creation of mobility scooter storage facility                                      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beresford Court</td>
<td>Conversion of remaining bedsits into flats + Improved access into Block B + Creation of mobility scooter storage facility + Convert void bedsit into a guestroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Court</td>
<td>Conversion of bedsits into flats + Creation of mobility scooter storage facility + Installation of through floor lift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Smith House</td>
<td>Conversion of bedsits into flats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aingarth</td>
<td>Communal courtyard re-landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fielding Court</td>
<td>Scheme demolition and site re-development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorrel Court</td>
<td>Remaining bedsit conversions into flats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Road</td>
<td>New build development (x2 bungalows) on drying area and area of open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Court</td>
<td>Block A – Bedsit conversions into flats + Block B – Site demolition and re-development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Pauls Court</td>
<td>Decent Homes works only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Court</td>
<td>No further action required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.6 Current Sheltered Scheme void levels

All voids data for the initial desktop investigation into Sheltered Scheme void levels was recorded on 3rd November 2008. It was felt that data should not be updated over the timeframe it took to compile the report to maintain a level of consistency in terms of figures used. Data is now over a year old; this next section therefore provides a summary of current void levels with figures extracted on 16th November 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme name</th>
<th>Total units</th>
<th>Nov 2008 – Total voids</th>
<th>Nov 2008 - % of scheme void</th>
<th>Nov 2009 – Total voids</th>
<th>Nov 2009 - % of scheme void</th>
<th>Void level difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aingarth</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.92</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Smith House</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babington Court</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beresford Court</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Court</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Road</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fielding Court</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Court</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longcliffe Road</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Court</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riversdale</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall void levels have increase by a total of 8 from 53 out of a total of 460 units to 61. The relative increases and decreases for each scheme are better shown in the chart below. There are 3 schemes that have experienced a significant increase in void levels, these being Fielding Court, Sorrel Court and St Michaels Court. Riversdale Court and St Peters Court have experienced the largest decrease in void numbers.

This data does indicate that void levels within the Councils Sheltered Housing schemes are increasing. This trend places greater significance on implementing some
of the recommendations within this report to ensure the long term sustainability of the Councils Sheltered Housing stock.
Appendix A – Overall scheme performance

The table below illustrates in which quartile each sheltered housing scheme sits under each performance indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total voids</th>
<th>Quarter 1</th>
<th>Quarter 2</th>
<th>Quarter 3</th>
<th>Quarter 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durham Road</td>
<td>St Michaels Court</td>
<td>Riversdale Court</td>
<td>Babington Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Court</td>
<td>Fielding Court</td>
<td>Aingarth Albert Prom</td>
<td>St Peters Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorrel Court</td>
<td>Longcliffe Road</td>
<td>Dudley Court</td>
<td>Martin Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Pauls Court</td>
<td>Beresford Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Smith House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voids as a %</th>
<th>Quarter 1</th>
<th>Quarter 2</th>
<th>Quarter 3</th>
<th>Quarter 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durham Road</td>
<td>Beresford Court</td>
<td>Aingarth Albert Prom</td>
<td>Babington Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Court</td>
<td>Fielding Court</td>
<td>Dudley Court</td>
<td>Riversdale Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorrel Court</td>
<td>Longcliffe Road</td>
<td>St Michaels Court</td>
<td>St Peters Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Pauls Court</td>
<td>Arnold Smith House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Smith House</td>
<td>Martin Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current void length</th>
<th>Quarter 1</th>
<th>Quarter 2</th>
<th>Quarter 3</th>
<th>Quarter 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durham Road</td>
<td>Riversdale Court</td>
<td>St Peters Court</td>
<td>Babington Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Court</td>
<td>Aingarth Albert Prom</td>
<td>St Michaels Court</td>
<td>Martin Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorrel Court</td>
<td>Longcliffe Road</td>
<td>Fielding Court</td>
<td>Dudley Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Pauls Court</td>
<td>Arnold Smith House</td>
<td>Beresford Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quarter one represents the lowest data range collected for all 3 indicators, for example schemes with the fewest number of total voids will be within quarter 1 for that indicator. Schemes within quarter 1 could therefore be classed as the best performing.

Quarter 4 represents the highest set of data collected, for example schemes with the highest percentage of units void will be in quarter 4 for that category. Schemes within quarter 4 could therefore be classed as the worst performing.
Appendix B – Waiting list data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Babington Court</th>
<th>No. voids</th>
<th>No. waiting list</th>
<th>Waiting list applicants per void</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedsit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1BF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riversdale Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedsit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peters Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedsit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1BF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedsit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aingarth Albert Prom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedsit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1BF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedsit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michaels Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedsit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beresford Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1BF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fielding Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedsit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1BF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longcliffe Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1BF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Smith House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedsit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1BF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1BF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above lists each sheltered housing scheme highlighted in terms of relative priority, i.e. green, amber and red. The second column lists the total number of voids within each scheme. The third and fourth column illustrate the total number of applicants on the Housing Register who have expressed an interest in living in the selected unit type and location and how this relates as an average number of applicants per current void. Where in the fourth column the average number of applicants per void has dropped below 10, the figure has been highlighted in blue.
# Appendix C – Sheltered housing scoring toolkit (completed example)

**Sheltered Housing Scoring Toolkit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Details</th>
<th>Arnold Smith House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Shepshed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedsits</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bed flat</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed flat</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) **Demand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are these figures acceptable in comparison to the other sheltered schemes under review and the wider voids general needs performance?</th>
<th>Yes, definitely</th>
<th>Yes, just about</th>
<th>No, not really</th>
<th>No, definitely not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of voids</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voids as a % of total unit number</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of current void (days)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people on the waiting for bedsits</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people on the waiting list for flats</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total A = 1
Total B = 4
Total C = 0
Total D = 0

2) **Comments**

3) **Are the services provided appropriate currently?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing related support (mobile and resident cover)</th>
<th>The services provided are highly adequate / appropriate</th>
<th>The services provided are mostly adequate / appropriate</th>
<th>The services provided are only partly adequate / appropriate</th>
<th>The services provided are highly inappropriate / inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total A = 0
Total B = 2
Total C = 0
Total D = 0

4) **Are the services currently delivered likely to be appropriate to the needs of future tenants?**
Subject to Supporting People provision, will the housing related support currently provided be appropriate or inappropriate for the needs of most tenants in 5 years time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Appropriate</th>
<th>Mostly Appropriate</th>
<th>Mostly Inappropriate</th>
<th>Highly Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will the physical nature of the accommodation currently provided be appropriate or inappropriate for the needs of most tenants in 5 years time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Appropriate</th>
<th>Mostly Appropriate</th>
<th>Mostly Inappropriate</th>
<th>Highly Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total A = 0**

**Total B = 2**

**Total C = 0**

**Total D = 0**

Comments

Is the scheme suited to the service provided?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully Met</th>
<th>Almost Met</th>
<th>Partially Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of flats or bedsits</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal communal space e.g. communal lounge, dining room, etc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility space for tenants e.g. laundry, guest room etc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and design features for people with a disability e.g. level access, lifts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security e.g. alarm call system, CCTV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy efficiency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (near local facilities, safety of local area)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to other services e.g. GP, transport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds / Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for scheme based and visiting staff e.g. office, consultation room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total A = 7**

**Total B = 2**

**Total C = 0**

**Total D = 1**

Comments

No guest room, no CCTV, required scooter storage, no consultation room, no dining room

Current and projected costs

What has been the average maintenance cost (inc. responsive repairs, voids, cyclical and planned) per unit for the last 5 years?

- £892.61
- Average annual cost £20,530.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, definitely</th>
<th>Yes, just about</th>
<th>No, not really</th>
<th>No, definitely not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are maintenance costs for the property acceptable?

- 0
- 0
- 0
- 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have there been any major scheme improvements over the last 5 years? If yes, what is the estimated average cost per unit?</td>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>£104.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, just about</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, not really</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, definitely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual spend</td>
<td>£2,400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are these costs reasonable taking into account the age of the scheme and comparable general needs accommodation?</td>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, just about</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, not really</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, definitely</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the estimated average cost per unit to meet the Decent Homes Standard by 2012?</td>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, just about</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, not really</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, definitely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are these costs reasonable taking into account the age of the scheme and comparable general needs accommodation?</td>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, just about</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, not really</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, definitely</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on current voids and rent levels, what is the total level of rent loss accrued as of 2nd December 2008?

£823.06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Top performing</th>
<th>Reasonable standard</th>
<th>Could perform better</th>
<th>Poor performing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How does the void rent loss level compare to the other sheltered housing schemes under review?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regards to each scheme location, does the supply of similar services outweigh current demand?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under supply</th>
<th>Supply and demand in balance</th>
<th>Moderate over supply</th>
<th>Severe over supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scheme Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points value</td>
<td>Points total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A = 4 points</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B = 3 points</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C = 2 points</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D = 1 point</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme total =</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under each heading, the toolkit asks the service provider to respond to each question in the form of selecting A, B, C or D. Responses under an A will indicate the scheme performs very well or meets the necessary requirements. At the other end of the scale, a response in the form of a D will indicate the scheme performs very poorly under that heading or does not meet the necessary requirements.

In order to summarise the results for each heading, scores under A, B, C or D are allocated the following points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question response</th>
<th>Points equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D – Scoring toolkit results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Are services provided appropriate currently?</th>
<th>Are the services delivered likely to be appropriate to the needs of future tenants?</th>
<th>Is the scheme suited to the service provided?</th>
<th>Are costs acceptable?</th>
<th>Void rent loss performance</th>
<th>Scheme location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Babington</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aingarth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Longcliffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aingarth</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fielding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Babington</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Babington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babington</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Longcliffe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Beresford</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sorrel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Aingarth</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Arnold Smith</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Beresford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fielding</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Arnold Smith</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dudley</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fielding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michaels</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Beresford</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fielding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aingarth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peters</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dudley</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Longcliffe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Arnold Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longcliffe</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sorrel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sorrel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dudley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beresford</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>St Peters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riversdale</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>St Michaels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorrel</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Grays</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>St Pauls</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>St Pauls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Smith</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>St Peters</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>St Peters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Riversdale</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Grays</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Pauls</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>St Michaels</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Riversdale</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Riversdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>St Pauls</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>St Michaels</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Grays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Maximum score available | 20 | 8 | 8 | 40 | 12 | 4 | 4 |
## Appendix E – Sheltered scheme void rent loss calculations

### Void rent loss calculated up to 3rd November 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Annual rent</th>
<th>Daily rent</th>
<th>Void rent loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aingarth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. bedsit voids days</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>£2,276.64</td>
<td>£6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 1BF void days</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>£2,733.60</td>
<td>£7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total void rent loss</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Arnold Smith</strong></th>
<th>Annual rent</th>
<th>Daily rent</th>
<th>Void rent loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. bedsit voids days</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>£1,925.76</td>
<td>£5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 1BF void days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£2,611.20</td>
<td>£7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total void rent loss</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Babington</strong></th>
<th>Annual rent</th>
<th>Daily rent</th>
<th>Void rent loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. bedsit voids days</td>
<td>3843</td>
<td>£1,925.76</td>
<td>£5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 1BF void days</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>£2,500.00</td>
<td>£6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total void rent loss</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Beresford</strong></th>
<th>Annual rent</th>
<th>Daily rent</th>
<th>Void rent loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. bedsit voids days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£1,820.16</td>
<td>£4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 1BF void days</td>
<td>1283</td>
<td>£2,400.00</td>
<td>£6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total void rent loss</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Dudley</strong></th>
<th>Annual rent</th>
<th>Daily rent</th>
<th>Void rent loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. bedsit voids days</td>
<td>3774</td>
<td>£1,925.76</td>
<td>£5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 1BF void days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£2,484.48</td>
<td>£6.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total void rent loss</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Durham</strong></th>
<th>Annual rent</th>
<th>Daily rent</th>
<th>Void rent loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. bedsit voids days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 1BF void days</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>£2,691.84</td>
<td>£7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total void rent loss</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>No. bedsit voids days</td>
<td>Annual rent</td>
<td>daily rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fielding</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>£2,083.68</td>
<td>£5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>£2,613.60</td>
<td>£7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total void rent loss</strong></td>
<td>£3,115.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£2,600.00</td>
<td>£7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total void rent loss</strong></td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longcliffe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£2,344.32</td>
<td>£6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>£2,351.52</td>
<td>£6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total void rent loss</strong></td>
<td>£914.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>11035</td>
<td>£1,873.44</td>
<td>£5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£2,364.48</td>
<td>£6.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total void rent loss</strong></td>
<td>£56,639.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riversdale</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>£2,047.20</td>
<td>£5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total void rent loss</strong></td>
<td>£4,329.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorrel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£1,925.76</td>
<td>£5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£2,250.00</td>
<td>£6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total void rent loss</strong></td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michaels</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>£1,925.76</td>
<td>£5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£2,351.52</td>
<td>£6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total void rent loss</strong></td>
<td>£4,146.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual rent</td>
<td>daily rent</td>
<td>void rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St Pauls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. bedsit voids days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 1BF void days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£2,469.12</td>
<td>£6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total void rent loss</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St Peters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. bedsit voids days</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>£1,925.76</td>
<td>£5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 1BF void days</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>£2,438.40</td>
<td>£6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total void rent loss</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total void rent loss**  **£124,865.23**
## Appendix F – Scoring toolkit results and ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Scheme score</th>
<th>Priority ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babington</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longcliffe</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aingarth</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fielding</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beresford</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorrel</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michaels</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peters</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riversdale</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Pauls</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix G - Scheme Appraisal (Martin Court completed example)

### Scheme Name: Martin Court, Anstey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>LOWER QUALITY</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>HIGHER QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority unit type</td>
<td>Bedsits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Flats and bungalows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixtures and fittings</td>
<td>Poor: Kitchen/bathroom fittings poor condition/inadequate/ &gt;20 yrs old</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Majority flats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Even mix between bedsits and flats</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Flats and bungalows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair: Reasonably modern kitchen and bathroom but &gt;10 yrs old, low quality/limited range etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kitchen and bathroom &lt;10 yrs old: reasonable layout but standard design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen/bathroom &lt;10 yrs old: reasonable layout but standard design</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen &lt; 10 years old, high level oven, sep. hob: space for WM/DW. Attractive level access shower with space for manoeuvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>Partial CH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Full wet system CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift access</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Full wet system, double glazing, good insulation etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Steep gradients, multiple steps, cramped internal layout</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully wheelchair accessible lift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range/quality of communal facilities</td>
<td>No communal facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Full wheelchair standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location with regard to shops and amenities</td>
<td>Isolated from local shops and services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Full range of communal facilities e.g. communal lounge, catering kitchen, assisted bathroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport links</td>
<td>No public transport nodes within 500m</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent range of shops and amenities within 100m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External environment</td>
<td>Low quality, potentially unsafe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent service within 100m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decent Homes status (referring to the majority of units)</td>
<td>Non Decent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non Decent in 3 or 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Decent in 3 or 5 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Non Decent in 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Decent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Decent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total scheme score:** 30/40