



St. Helens Council

Adult Social Care and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel

Empowering those who live in Retirement Villages

July 2013

Task Group

Councillor(s)

Anthony Burns – Chairman

Andy Bowden

Joe De'Asha

Jimmy Jackson

Allan Jones

Linda Maloney

Brenda Smith - Healthwatch

Table of Contents

Page

Chairman's Foreword	2
Introduction and Terms of Reference	3
Method of Investigation	3
Background	4
Findings	5 - 12
Conclusions	13 - 15
Appendix	16 - 18
Recommendations	19 - 21

Chairman's Foreword and Acknowledgements



Councillor: Anthony Burns Chairman of the Scrutiny Task Group

Promoting and supporting independent living amongst older people in St Helens is a key priority for the Borough. Retirement Villages have a key role in helping to achieve this overall aim by providing a mix of care, support and social activities for older people.

The evidence from residents and staff shows that our Retirement Villages remain very popular, with a list of people waiting for places.

As a result of demographic changes which are nationally and locally acknowledged, the demand for housing provision aimed at older people with some element of care is expected to grow in future years. This has resource implications for the Council in trying to best meet the needs of older people.

It is clear from the evidence presented that older people are not a homogeneous group. Therefore, there will continue to be people who can live independently into older age without needing much assistance in their own home well into later life, while others may need help and support to retain their independence at a much earlier stage. This presents both challenges and opportunities when developing future services for the Council.

The Task Group particularly welcomed the range of positive initiatives, such as the work of the Activity Coordinators to introduce a full and inclusive programme for each scheme and the broad range of low level preventative support services aimed at helping older people to maintain their independence for as long as possible. These will hopefully reduce potentially more costly interventions in the future.

I would like thank my colleagues and all witnesses for sharing their knowledge and experience which have helped to inform the findings of this review, and particular thanks to Sam Murray, Housing Strategy and Development Manager and David Harrison-Howard, Supporting People Service Inclusion Officer for their invaluable support and guidance throughout the review process.

1.0 Introduction and Terms of Reference

- 1.1 During the process of agreeing the Scrutiny Work Programme for 2012/2013 the Council's Adult Social Care and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel agreed to look at empowering those people who live in Retirement Villages.
- 1.2 The aim of the review was to investigate what provisions and services are available to people living in the four Retirement Villages within St.Helens.

The terms of the review were as follows:

- To identify the location and provision of Retirement Villages in the St.Helens borough.
- To establish the facilities / activities provided by the Retirement Villages.
- To review the provision of onsite management.
- To obtain the views and thoughts of the residents of the Retirement Villages located in St.Helens.

2.0 Method of the Investigation

- 2.1
 - We undertook desktop research to find out information about our and other Local Authorities Retirement Village provision.
 - We meet with Council Officers to obtain background information.
 - We obtained the publicity brochures from the four Retirement Villages in the borough.
 - We visited each of the settings to consult with the residents and obtain their views.
 - We issued questionnaires to the Retirement Village residents to obtain their opinions.
 - We invited the Activities Coordinators and Management of the Retirement Villages to meet with the Task & Finish Group.
 - We enlisted the assistance of Samantha Murray – Housing Strategy and Policy Development Manager, St.Helens Council and David Harrison-Howard - Supporting People Service Inclusion Officer.

3.0 Background

- 3.1 Nationally for the first time, people aged 65 and over now out number those under 18 and people aged over 80 are the fastest growing age group. Housing requirements need to reflect the ageing populations needs.
- 3.2 Retirement Villages are a relatively new type of housing option for people aged 55 and over, but are growing in popularity in the UK. They offer a variety of housing types and an extended range of facilities for older people.
- 3.3 These are generally designed as larger developments with 100 or more properties being served, however sometimes older schemes are re-modelled. The larger schemes offer a range of social, sport and leisure facilities to suit all requirements, there are also various catering facilities onsite. The size of the developments means that a wide selection of facilities can be offered, however these can vary significantly between providers.
- 3.4 Properties are available to buy outright, part ownership or to rent (this can vary from scheme to scheme) and as they are a fairly new concept and often are new builds they are therefore designed and built to modern standards, for example offering modern conveniences, e.g. visual intercom in each property.
- 3.5 Individuals care needs are assessed prior to moving in and if needs are identified, there is an on site care provider at the scheme. Reassessment and flexibility in the service model means that as an individuals needs may change, the service can meet those needs. This prevents admission into residential care and enables residents to live as independently as they can within their own home environment.
- 3.6 Living in a Retirement Village enables people to live independent lives but with the reassurance that in the future if their care needs increase all the additional care and support can be provide by the onsite teams. Whilst living in a Retirement Village may be comparatively more expensive than living independently in the community, some of these costs are due to the communal facilities that are provided.
- 3.7 Social and leisure facilities onsite can vary, they include communal rooms, laundry rooms, restaurants, cafes, a pub maybe on the larger sites, shops, gyms and even a hairdressers. Various leisure activities are provided, indoors and outdoors, and range from arts and crafts, dancing, sporting events and day trips out. These are mainly arranged by the onsite management teams but in some cases are arranged by the residents themselves.
- 3.8 These activities enable residents to mix socially with each other and make new friendships. Obviously it is entirely up to each individual resident how involved with the village community they wish to be.

4.0 Findings

- 4.1 St.Helens has four Retirement Villages or Extra Care Facilities;
- Heald Farm Court (Earlestown) – opened in 2009 with 152 properties, which are divided into 50% rented, 25% shared ownership and 25% privately owned. Operated by Helena Partnerships.
 - Heyeswood (Haydock) – opened in 2009 with 92 properties, which are split equally into privately owned, shared ownership and rented. Operated by Your Housing Group, formally known as Arena Housing.
 - Parr Mount Court (Fingerpost) – refurbished in 2008 with 96 flats, which are all rented. Operated by Helena Partnerships.
 - Reeve Court (Rainhill) – opened in 2005 with 206 properties, which are split 50/50 into privately owned and rented. Operated by Your Housing Group, formally known as Arena Housing.
- 4.2 The Council contracts with all four service providers for the provision of both social care (funded by Adult Social Care & Health) and housing support (funded by the Supporting People programme). All residents are assessed prior to moving in, to establish their care and support needs. Individuals who require support are either eligible for subsidy from ASCH / Supporting People or may self fund the provision they require. All residents receive housing support, however only a proportion of residents in each service will require social care services.
- 4.3 The four schemes are aimed at over 55's and all provide onsite care and support facilities. Priority for rented accommodation is given to people who already live in St.Helens although people who have an existing or former association with the town (i.e. family live here) will also be considered.
- 4.4 Each Retirement Village varies with the type of accommodation and leisure facilities being offered. Reeve Court is the largest 'Retirement Village' on a large site with a wide variety of shops and a restaurant and bar onsite. While Parr Mount Court is a smaller setting with limited facilities as this was a remodelled service, previously in operation as a sheltered housing scheme.
- 4.5 Activity Coordinators**
- 4.6 The Task & Finish group invited the Activities Coordinators from each scheme to meet with them to discuss what they offer the residents in the form of social and leisure activities. It was clear from the discussions that a great variety of activities are provided for the residents and that residents are consulted on what they would like to do.
- 4.7 Activities provided include:
- Bingo, arts and crafts, IT classes, keep fit classes (for all levels), dancing classes, movie nights, discussion groups, challenge days and themed events in the restaurants.

- Mobile shops that visit on a regular basis including fruit & vegetable and sweets.
- Day trips are organised to places such as Whitby, Windermere, Anfield Football ground and steam train events.
- There are also genealogy classes that operate at Reeve Court and classes where residents can make a DVD of their photographs operated at Heald Farm Court.

Not all these events take place at all the villages and this is just a small example of the activities on offer.

4.8 The Activities Coordinators assured the Task & Finish group that the residents are frequently asked and consulted on what activities they would like to be offered and to make any new suggestions. If an activity or event is not successful it is not automatically stopped, the Activities Coordinators will review which residents are taking part. It is not always the aim to ensure a large number of residents attend the activities, sometimes the smaller specialist events attract a smaller number of residents that may not normally attend other social events.

4.9 During the discussions with the Activities Coordinators it was apparent that the various schemes do not communicate with each other with regards to what trips they are organising. If there are spare seats on coaches then these currently go unfilled. There was an early recommendation from the Task & Finish group that schemes communicate with each other, and we are pleased to report that each scheme now informs each other about forthcoming trips and activities.

4.10 Site Visits

4.11 The Task & Finish group visited all four schemes to meet with a small number of the residents to talk to them about living there and their views on what facilities were provided and how their needs were catered for. It was evident that overall, residents were generally happy living at the schemes albeit that there were a number of residents who highlighted a variety of issues. These can be seen in more detail further on in the report.

4.12 Heald Farm Court

4.13 Some of the key points discussed included opening times of the Bistro. Residents commented that they would like to see longer and more varied opening times. It was felt there was a lack of communication between the staff and residents believed that establishing a Residents Association could help. Concerns were expressed in respect of the transparency and use of levies. Residents also stated that they would like to see the Police Community Support Officers visiting the scheme.

4.14 Heyeswood

4.15 Residents expressed their dissatisfaction with the length of time it took to fix general repairs to the building and again would like to see the Bistro opening for more varied hours. There is an active Residents Association at this scheme however they would also like to see the Police Community Support Officers visiting the schemes on a regular basis. It was felt that there was an ever increasing number of 'rules & regulations' being established, mostly with

regards to health & safety which were limiting the residents to what they can organise socially. There was overall satisfaction from the residents with the quality of their apartments, but dissatisfaction with the communal areas / facilities and the response of management to a range of issues on site.



Heyeswood

4.16 Parr Mount Court

4.17 The feedback from residents at Parr Mount Court was very positive, with satisfaction expressed on all elements of the service provided. Residents discussed how they enjoyed the activities that were on offer and felt that the Bistro meals offered good value. Residents are able to bring their own food / takeaways into the scheme when the Bistro is shut. Whilst there is not a Residents Association in place, the residents spoken to felt that there was no requirement for one.

4.18 Reeve Court

4.19 The residents at Reeve Court also highlighted the increase and change in rules and regulations especially with regards to health & safety. Again it was felt that this was limiting their opportunities for social arrangements with regards to catering. An active Residents Association has been operating for many years and 'street' meetings are also held on a regular basis, however a few residents stated that matters were always ongoing and never finalised.

4.20 Residents mentioned that some general cleaning duties such as the rubbish chutes were not being fully completed. They also stated that on a weekend they felt a bit isolated due to the lack of public transport. On the whole the residents enjoy living at Reeve Court and felt the shops and restaurant facilities were very good, but were concerned about the perception from the outside that it was a 'Nursing Home' rather than a Retirement Village.

4.21 All the schemes agreed that it would be beneficial for Ward Councillors to visit on a regular basis to share community information and to answer any questions the residents may have.



Reeve Court

4.22 Questionnaires

4.23 Questionnaires are a good way to source information that might not be said in a direct meeting. Questionnaires were sent to Heald Farm Court, Heyeswood and Reeve Court. We did not send questionnaires to Parr Mount Court as this had recently been undertaken by the Council's Housing Section less than 12 months ago, so we used these results to build our conclusions along with the other completed questionnaires. Each resident received the same questionnaire and could fill it in anonymously, if they required assistance to complete this, members of our Housing Team were happy to help.

4.24 Once the responses had been received the results were collated and analysed in conjunction with the Housing Strategy and Policy Development Manager and the Supporting People Service Inclusion Officer.

4.25 A total of 542 questionnaires were sent to residents (including Parr Mount Court), the response rates were as follows:

- Heald Farm Court - 152 sent, 47 returned
- Heyeswood – 92 sent, 35 returned
- Parr Mount Court – 92 sent, 18 returned
- Reeve Court – 206 sent, 81 returned

4.26 Key responses from the questionnaires

4.27 Table to show response rates to some of the key questions asked:-

Sample of questions	Heald Farm Court		Heyeswood		Parr Mount Court		Reeve Court	
	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
<i>Do you think that you getting value for money for the services that you pay for (i.e. lunch clubs, care)?</i>								

Yes	25	41.7	31	70.5	10	55.6	63	60.0
No	13	21.7	2	4.5	1	5.6	7	6.7
Do not know	10	16.7	8	18.2	4	22.2	19	18.1
Total	48	80.1	41	93.2	15	83.4	89	84.8
<i>Do you take part in events and activities at your scheme?</i>								
Yes	33	55.0	29	65.9	6	33.3	67	63.8
No	23	38.3	11	25.0	11	61.1	31	29.5
Total	56	93.3	40	90.9	17	94.4	98	93.3
<i>Do you think that the activities offer value for money?</i>								
Yes	25	41.7	24	54.5	6	33.3	66	62.9
No	12	20.0	2	4.5	2	11.1	1	1.0
Do not know	15	25.0	7	15.9	6	33.3	27	25.7
Total	52	86.7	33	74.9	14	77.7	94	89.6
<i>Do you know who to complain to or how to make a complaint?</i>								
Yes	53	88.3	38	86.4	15	83.3	90	85.7
No	4	6.7	1	2.3	0	0.0	2	1.9
Not sure	0	0.0	1	2.3	2	11.1	10	9.5
Total	57	95.0	40	91.0	17	94.4	102	97.1
<i>Do you feel that your complaints are listened to and acted upon?</i>								
Yes	28	46.7	29	65.9	6	33.3	62	59.0
No	14	23.3	5	11.4	4	22.2	10	9.5
Not sure	8	13.3	5	11.4	6	33.3	20	19.0
Total	50	83.3	39	88.7	16	88.8	92	87.5
<i>Do the staff respect your rights to have/lead a private life?</i>								
Always	47	78.3	37	84.1	N/A	N/A	80	76.2
Often	8	13.3	4	9.1	N/A	N/A	18	17.1
Sometimes	0	1.9	0	0	N/A	N/A	2	1.9
Never	2	3.3	0	0	N/A	N/A	0	0
Total	57	96.8	41	93.2	N/A	N/A	100	95.2

4.28 Summary of Questionnaires

4.29 Heald Farm Court

- 4.30 Questionnaires were sent to 152 residents, with 47 completed and returned – a response rate of 31%. 91% of residents at Heald Farm Court were either very or quite satisfied with the quality of their apartment, however 18% of residents stated some concerns with safety and security. Three quarters of residents felt that their friends and family were made to feel welcome when they visited the service and 86% of residents were happy (very or quite happy) living in their neighbourhood.
- 4.31 Over half of the residents said that they were kept informed of changes – the other 45% were unsure about this. 91% of residents feel that the staff respect their right to a private life. 88% of residents know how to make a complaint, with 55% having confidence that the staff would be able to deal with any issues.
- 4.32 In relation to care, 83% of those who receive care said that they were very satisfied. 20% of all the residents felt that living in the scheme had not had a positive impact on their health / wellbeing. Over half of the residents stated that they took part in activities at the scheme, but 26% said that they were not

happy with the range of activities on offer. Only 23% of residents stated that they took place in activities in the wider area.

- 4.33 Only 65% of residents felt that they had made a positive choice in moving into the scheme.
- 4.34 The findings of the questionnaire for Heald Farm Court are less positive than the outcomes of the face to face meeting with residents, where overall there was a positive perception of the service.



Heald Farm Court

4.35 Heyeswood

- 4.36 All 92 residents at Heyeswood received a questionnaire, with 35 being completed and returned – a response rate of 38%. Almost all (97%) of residents were satisfied with their apartments and the communal areas. Almost all residents (95%) stated that their family and friends were made to feel welcome when visiting the service. All of the respondents were either very happy or quite happy with their neighbourhood. All respondents felt that the staff team respected their right to a private life. 86% of residents felt that the staff kept them informed of any changes.
- 4.37 79% of residents felt that the scheme had a positive impact on their health / wellbeing, with 31% of the respondents stating that they were receiving care.
- 4.38 65% of residents take part in activities at the service and 75% are happy with the range of activities on offer. 63% of residents do not take part in activities outside of the scheme. 86% of residents know how to make a complaint with 72% believing that the staff know how to deal with any problems. 70% of residents feel that they are getting value for money at the service.
- 4.39 Overall, 75% of residents felt that they had made a positive choice by moving into Heyeswood.
- 4.40 The findings of the questionnaire for Heyeswood are more positive than the outcomes of the face to face meeting with residents at the scheme. As

reported above, residents at the meeting raised a number of issues, however these have not emerged in the findings of the questionnaire.

4.41 Parr Mount Court

- 4.42 Questionnaires were sent out to all 92 residents at Parr Mount Court, only 18 were returned, giving a response rate of 20%. One of the main findings was that 38.9% of residents that returned questionnaires reported that they are either quite dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the safety and security of the building. 22.2% of residents that returned questionnaires reported that they are quite dissatisfied with the grounds around the building. A third of residents reported that they are not informed of changes to the service. 55.5% of residents that returned questionnaires reported that they either do not feel that their complaints are not listened to and acted upon or did not know.
- 4.43 33.3% of residents that returned questionnaires reported that they do not feel that living at Parr Mount Court have had a positive effect on their health and well-being. 22% of residents reported that they were not happy with the range of activities on offer, with 44% of respondents either unsure or not happy with the value for money of activities on offer.
- 4.44 38.9% of residents that returned questionnaires reported that they either do not feel that they have made a positive choice by moving into Parr Mount Court or were unsure.
- 4.45 These findings again are opposite to the findings of the Task Group members who visited Parr Mount Court and were pleased to hear positive feedback from the residents living at this service.



Parr Mount Court

4.46 Reeve Court

- 4.47 Questionnaires were sent to all 206 properties at Reeve Court with 81 forms completed and returned – a response rate of 39%. All of the residents reported that they were satisfied with their property, with 86% reporting that their visitors are made to feel welcome at the scheme.

- 4.48 76% of the residents are either very or quite satisfied with the support they receive and 77% of residents stated that they were kept informed of any changes at the scheme. 76% of residents felt that staff respected their right to a private life all of the time and 79% of residents felt that staff always encouraged them to make decisions about their own lives.
- 4.49 18% of residents stated that they were receiving care. 63% stated that they took part in the activities and 81% were happy with the range of activities on offer. 30% of residents took part in activities outside of the scheme.
- 4.50 18% of residents did not know if they were getting value for money at the scheme but 87% of residents know how to make a complaint and 64% feel that the staff would be able to deal with any problems.
- 4.51 84% of residents felt that they had made a positive choice by moving into Reeve Court.
- 4.52 The findings of the Reeve Court questionnaire are consistent with the findings of the face to face meeting with residents.
- 4.53 It is evident from the results of the questionnaires that a high majority of residents enjoy living at the schemes and feel that they have made a positive choice by moving there. Residents felt that staff respect their right to a private life and in between half to three quarters of residents who responded stated that they took part in the activities on offer and were happy with the of activities.

A full analysis of the questionnaires can be found at appendix A.

- 4.54 The Council's Housing Team have carefully analysed these results and have corresponded with the various schemes to discuss all the key issues. As the result the Management Team at Heald Farm Court is now in the process of establishing a Residents Association.
- 4.55 One of the main issues that emerged from the questionnaires was that a significant proportion of residents at the scheme were unaware that they were in receipt of housing support. High numbers of residents in all of the schemes stated that they did not receive any one to one support or have a copy of a support plan. The Supporting People team have carried out visits over recent years to all of the schemes and verified that the Support Planning process is taking place and therefore will work with providers and residents to address this issue.

5.0 Conclusions

5.1 Each of the four schemes in St.Helens vary from one another. From size and number of occupants, to facilities on offer, percentage of privately owned and rented accommodation, involvement with the local communities and different managerial styles, rules and consultation processes.

5.2 Residents were keen to stress that they liked the concept of a Retirement Village and generally were happy living at the schemes. There was clear satisfaction with their apartments in all of the schemes, but varying levels of satisfaction with the wider facilities at the schemes. All meetings ended on a positive note.

5.3 Activities

5.4 There was a mixed response to the range and frequency of activities and events held at the four schemes – ranging from satisfaction at Parr Mount Court and Reeve Court whilst there was some dissatisfaction at Heyeswood.

5.5 Reeve Court arranges a wide variety of activities that are held on site on a daily basis. These activities range from arts and crafts, dancing, IT lessons to themed meal nights in the restaurant, trips to places outside the borough are also undertaken. This was reflected at the other schemes but on a smaller scale and it was evident that residents enjoy the activities on offer.

5.6 It was brought to our attention that at Heyeswood, activities were predominantly aimed at the less mobile residents and include exercise classes which were sedentary. Some residents felt they would enjoy more energetic activity classes.

5.7 We have identified the following key points, which are summarised below.

5.8 Health and Safety (especially at Your Housing Group Schemes)

5.9 A major concern raised by both sets of residents in the schemes owned by Your Housing Group was the view that there was an over-emphasis on 'health and safety'. It was believed that this was an excuse to prevent residents from carrying out activities, especially social activities and events at which food was provided.

5.10 Residents provided numerous examples of how they had felt that 'health and safety' was provided by management as a reason for not permitting them to order in food, cater for each other or provide buffets to share. Residents at Heyeswood were particularly concerned as these rules had an impact on them being able to socialise together and had meant that they had stopped some activities that they had previously enjoyed. The schemes owned by Helena did not report any similar issues relating to health and safety restrictions and therefore the comparison was notable.

5.11 Rules & Lack of Consultation

5.12 In some of the schemes there was a perception that new rules were being imposed and that consultation did not take place. Residents at Reeve Court

gave the example that management had told them that the corridors needed to be 'sterile' and that they would have to reduce ornaments, etc outside their properties.

- 5.13 Earlier discussions with management had indicated that residents had been consulted on this matter, however the perception remained that management were 'making up rules' to suit their own agenda. In some schemes this had developed into a sense of frustration about 'being told what to do'.
- 5.14 Residents in all schemes felt like the scheme was their home and therefore they expected the autonomy to make and take decisions of their own. Whilst the Task and Finish group recognises that there is a need for structure and rules within a scheme, there is an underlying issue about how rules are implemented.
- 5.15 Concerns of Owner Occupiers – value of properties (void properties), sinking fund, amenities charges**
- 5.16 Owner occupiers who attended the consultations noted that they were concerned regarding some of the charges levied such as the Sinking Funds – there is a need for greater clarity on these charges, both at the point of moving in, and also throughout the residents time at the scheme.
- 5.17 There were some concerns at schemes regarding the leasehold agreements and some residents expressed concerns that they had not really understood the implications of these agreements at first.
- 5.18 As mentioned above, a common theme was concern regarding the reality of lease agreements, including the financial costs of living at the schemes and their understanding of what all the charges are for.
- 5.19 Scrutiny of financial charges and transparency from providers**
- 5.20 At all the schemes, with the exception of Parr Mount Court, the issue of money and transparency was raised. Residents wanted to know what their money is being spent on, the cost of various things and want accessible information so that they can scrutinise expenditure.
- 5.21 Perception of the services from outside the area / links to wider community**
- 5.22 Some residents were concerned about the 'outside' perception of their property as a nursing / residential home as most residents were keen to stress that they did not want to live in a nursing / care environment. However, the consultation events did not find any evidence of isolation from the wider community. Residents at Heyeswood appeared very engaged with Haydock and there was a strong sense of community at Parr Mount Court, with residents moving in from the local area.
- 5.23 Lack of Residents Associations (Helena Schemes)**
- 5.24 At Heald Farm Court, residents expressed frustration that they were not encouraged to have their own residents association. Both Arena Schemes had active associations. Parr Mount Court residents that we met stated that they did not need a residents association.

5.25 Repairs – differing experiences in schemes

5.26 The experience of repairs varied from high levels of dissatisfaction at Heyeswood to general satisfaction at Reeve to no issues raised at Parr Mount Court. These issues ranged from general lighting maintenance to leaking water pipes in individual homes.

5.27 Location – some comments scheme specific (Reeve Court and transport)

5.28 Of all the schemes, it would appear that some of the residents at Reeve Court felt that the bus service was preventing them from going out more, especially over the weekend period and evenings. When planning and building future schemes it would be beneficial to ensure that transport links are investigated to ensure that residents will not feel isolated from neighbouring communities.

5.29 Parr Mount Court – ‘clear difference of opinion in this scheme to the others’

5.30 There was a stark difference in opinion from the residents at Parr Mount Court, residents here were very happy with the accommodation, activities on offer and the catering provided by the Bistro.

5.31 Key Quotes from residents:

“We were told that this was independent living, I did not want to buy into an old peoples home”

“Increased bureaucracy and common sense has flown out of the window”

“They are making rules up as they go along”.

“I have lived here two years and it’s been the best two years of my life”.

“We are treated very well here” “There is nothing that they haven’t thought of”.

5.32 It was evident that prior to the Activities Coordinators meeting with the Task & Finish group that they did not communicate with each other with regards to the organisation of trips. Following this meeting contact details were shared amongst the Activities Coordinators and details of forthcoming trips and events are being communicated between the schemes to ensure all residents can be included and that the residents obtain value for money. Therefore if there are any spare places on trips they can be filled by residents from other schemes.

Appendix A

Key Findings from Extra Care Questionnaires

Heald Farm Court

- 47 questionnaires completed from a potential 152 – return rate of 31%
- 50% of respondents were renting their home.
- 91% were either very or quite satisfied with the quality of their apartment.
- 18.4% of residents were either quite or very dissatisfied with safety and security
- 75% of residents stated that their friends / family were made to feel welcome at the service.
- 86% of residents were either very happy or quite happy with their neighbourhood.
- 10% of residents were dissatisfied with the community alarm service.
- 58.3% of residents state that they do not receive any one-to-one support from staff.
- 21% of residents felt that they were not receiving enough support, with a further 20% not sure.
- 55% of residents felt that they were kept informed of changes, the other 45% either did not or were unsure.
- 40% of residents have a copy of their support plan.
- 91% of residents feel that the staff respect their right to have a private life.
- 20% of residents felt that living in the extra care scheme had not had a positive affect on their health / wellbeing.
- For those residents receiving care, 83% state that they are very satisfied.
- 55% of residents stated that they took part in the activities at the scheme.
- 26% of residents were not happy with the range of activities delivered.
- 41% of residents believe that activities offer value for money.
- 23% of residents take part in activities in the wider community.
- 88% of residents know how to make a complaint – with 55% of residents believing that staff know how to deal with their problems.
- 60% of residents feel that they have made a positive choice by moving into extra care.

Heyeswood

- 35 questionnaires were returned from 92 – a return rate of 38%
- 45% of respondents were renting their home, with a further 45% shared owners.
- 97% of residents were either very or quite satisfied with their apartments.
- All respondents were either very or quite satisfied with the communal areas.
- 95% of residents who responded stated that their family / visitors were made to feel welcome at the scheme.
- All respondents were either very or quite happy with their neighbourhood.
- 36% of residents were not receiving any one-to-one visits
- 86% of residents felt that they were kept informed of changes.
- 70% of residents have a copy of their support plan

- All respondents felt that the staff either always or often respected their right to a private life
- 79% of residents felt that living in the extra care service had a positive impact on their health / wellbeing
- 31% of residents received care at the scheme.
- 79% of the residents felt that they were encouraged to make decisions about their life
- 70% of residents feel that they are getting value for money at the service
- 65% of residents take part in activities and 75% are happy with the range of activities.
- 63% of residents do not take part in activities in the wider community.
- 86% of residents know how to make a complaint, with 72% stating that the staff team know how to deal with any problems.
- 75% of residents feel that they have made a positive choice moving into Heyeswood.

Parr Mount Court

- 18 questionnaires were returned from 92 – a return rate of 20%
- 22.2% of residents that returned questionnaires reported that they are quite dissatisfied with the grounds around the building.
- 38.9% of residents that returned questionnaires reported that they are either quite dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the safety and security of the building.
- 22.3% of residents that returned questionnaires reported that they are either quite dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the repairs service on offer.
- 33.3% of residents that returned questionnaires reported that they never receive one-to-one support from a member of staff.
- 33.4% of residents that returned questionnaires reported that they are either not informed of improvement to the service or were not sure if they were.
- 39.6% of residents that returned questionnaires reported that they either do not have a support plan or were not sure if they do.
- 55.6% of residents that returned questionnaires reported that their support plan is not discussed with them or were unsure if it was.
- 33.3% of residents that returned questionnaires reported that they do not feel that living at Parr Mount Court have had a positive effect on their health and well-being.
- 18.2% of residents that are in receipt of care report that they don't find the staff helpful with their personal care.
- 18.2% of residents that are in receipt of care report that they don't find the staff helpful when taking medication
- 36.4% of residents that are in receipt of care reported that they either don't find the staff helpful in preparing meals or helping them to the bistro or they do not know.
- 22.2% of residents that returned questionnaires reported that they are not happy with the range of activities organised.
- 16.7% of residents that returned questionnaires reported that they are not consulted on the activities that are offered.
- 44.4% of residents that returned questionnaires reported that they either do not think that the activities offer value for money or did not know.
- 55.5% of residents that returned questionnaires reported that they either do not feel that their complaints are not listened to and acted upon or did

- not know.
- 50.0% of residents that returned questionnaires reported that they either do not feel that staff are able to deal with their problems or were unsure.
- 38.9% of residents that returned questionnaires reported that they either do not feel that they have made a positive choice by moving into Parr Mount Court or were unsure.

Reeve Court

- 81 residents responded to the questionnaire from 206 – a response rate of 39%
- 45% of respondents rented their property, 23% owned their property outright.
- All of the residents were either very or quite satisfied with their apartment / property.
- 86% of residents felt that their friends / relatives were welcomed at the scheme.
- 76% of residents are either very or quite satisfied with the support they receive.
- 44% of all residents did not receive any one-to-one visits.
- 77% of residents felt that they were kept informed of any changes at the scheme.
- 76% of residents felt that staff respected their right to a private life all of the time and 79% of residents felt that staff always encouraged them to make decisions about their own lives.
- 79% of residents felt that they had made a positive choice by moving into extra care.
- 18% of residents confirmed that they were receiving care.
- 18% of respondents did not know if they were getting value for money.
- 63% of residents stated that they took part in activities.
- 81% of residents were happy with the range of activities
- 30% of residents take part in activities in the outside area
- 87% of residents know how to make a complaint and 64% feel that staff are able to deal with their problems.
- 84% of residents feel that they have made a positive choice by moving to Reeve Court.

6.0 Recommendations

1. That clarity be sought over the extent of the Health & Safety regulations in place at each scheme.
2. That residents be consulted when a proposed change or new rule / regulation is put in place.
3. That detailed breakdowns of how service charges and sinking funds are utilised are made available to residents.
4. That consideration be given to establishing a Residents Association at Heald Farm Court.
5. That consideration with regards to transport routes be given at the planning stages for any future Retirement Villages / schemes to ensure residents have full access to local transport systems.
6. That consideration be given to ensuring that activity events are organised to ensure all levels of mobility / fitness are included.
7. That schemes continue to share amongst themselves activity / trips, to ensure that residents obtain value for money and a wide range of trip options.
8. That the Supporting People Team review the results from the questionnaires and follow up any issues arising.
9. That Ward Councillors visit the Retirement Villages on a regular basis.
10. That the Council continues to work in close partnership with the providers to ensure best service.

Empowering those who live in Retirement Villages

Rec No	Recommendation	Responsible Officer	Agreed Action and Date of Implementation
1	That clarity be sought over the extent of the Health & Safety regulations in place at each scheme.		
2	That residents be consulted when a proposed change or new rule / regulation is put in place.		
3	That detailed breakdowns of how service charges and sinking funds are utilised are made available to residents.		
4	That consideration be given to establishing a Residents Association at Heald Farm Court.		
5	That consideration with regards to transport routes be given at the planning stages for any future Retirement Villages / schemes to ensure residents have full access to local transport systems.		
6	That consideration be given to ensuring that activity events are organised to ensure all levels of mobility / fitness are included.		
7	That schemes continue to share amongst themselves activity / trips, to ensure that residents obtain value for money and a wide range of trip options.		

Empowering those who live in Retirement Villages

8	That the Supporting People Team review the results from the questionnaires and follow up any issues arising.		
9	That Ward Councillors visit the Retirement Villages on a regular basis.		
10	That the Council continues to work in close partnership with the providers to ensure best service.		