

**COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE**  
**4<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER, 2001**

**SHELTERED HOUSING REVIEW**

**ANNEXE CONTENTS**

<b>ANNEXE A</b>	CONSULTATION SHELTERED HOUSING KEY FACTS ABOUT EXISTING ARRANGEMENTS
<b>ANNEXE B</b>	TIMETABLE OF CONSULTATION/INFORMATION PROVISION
<b>ANNEXE C</b>	KEY POINTS FROM FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS WITH STAFF, TENANTS AND STAKEHOLDERS
<b>ANNEXE D</b>	KEY POINTS FROM AREA SHELTERED HOUSING MEETINGS
<b>ANNEXE E</b>	APPRAISAL OF MODELS
<b>ANNEXE F</b>	IN ATTACHED EXEMPT REPORT
<b>ANNEXE G</b>	REPORT OF CHAIR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES SHELTERED HOUSING REVIEW TENANT/WARDEN CONSULTATION
<b>ANNEXE H</b>	ALTERNATIVE MODELS FOR SERVICE PROVISION, INCLUDING OPTIONS PUT FORWARD AS PART OF THE CONSULTATION
<b>ANNEXE I</b>	PROPOSED STAFFING STRUCTURE
<b>ANNEXE J</b>	COMMUNITY WARDEN AREAS

# **ANNEXE A**

## **SHELTERED HOUSING**

### **KEY FACTS ABOUT EXISTING ARRANGEMENTS**

**SHELTERED HOUSING – KEY FACTS ABOUT EXISTING ARRANGEMENTS**

**Properties**

Total number of Council dwellings involved – 1166

13 schemes have community rooms

6 schemes have guest bedrooms

9 schemes have utility rooms/laundry rooms

**Staffing**

Posts	Establishment	Currently in Post
SH Mgr	1	1
Warden/Controller	1	1
Mobile Warden	3	2 plus 2 temporary
Relief Warden	1	1
Resid/Assistant Wardens	18	15
Control Room Operators	5	3 plus 2 temporary
Handymen	2	1
Cleaners	5	5

**Visits**

Number of units	Type of Scheme	Visits per Week
533	Non residential warden schemes	2
204	Resident warden schemes where the warden also covers other schemes	3-4
255	Resident Warden schemes where the resident warden only covers their schemes	5

# **ANNEXE B**

## **TIMETABLE OF CONSULTATION/INFORMATION PROVISION**

Timetable of Consultation/ Information ProvisionStaff

Date	Action	Comment
22.2.2001	Letter to SH staff following Urg Cmtee report on Interim Challenge	
27.3.2001	Letter to SH staff prior to April H&E report	Gave background to report and invited to staff meeting on 6 April
6.4.2001	Copy of H&E report distributed to staff and meeting with SH staff to explained decisions of April H&E, plus offer of further meetings if staff required them re this report	Attended by Mgt, Personnel, Unison and Vice Chair
10.5.2001	Staff Focus Group	
14.5.2001	Meeting with all Hsg Div staff about possible implications of SH review to wider structure of Division	
12.6.2001	Letter plus draft press release to staff in advance of publication of BVI Report	
9.7.2001	Sec 188 Notice and Consultation packs issued to all affected staff (SH, A&L, SP)	
10.7.2001	Staff meeting (SH, A&L, SP)	Attended by Mgt, Personnel, Unison
2.8.2001	SH staff meeting with Chair CS	

Tenants

Date	Action	Comment
Before 5.4.2001	Discussion with TACT on proposed methods for consulting/informing tenants of changes	TACT's suggestions incorporated in consultation strategy
26.4.2001	Tenants Focus Group	Held at Pear Tree Court
30.4.2001	Tenants Focus Group	Held at Unity Close
21.5.2001	Area SH Tenants Meeting	
22.5.2001	Area SH Tenants Meeting	
23.5.2001	Area SH Tenants Meeting	
29.5.2001	Area SH Tenants Meeting	
30.5.2001	Area SH Tenants Meeting	
31.5.2001	Area SH Tenants Meeting	
10.7.2001	Newsheet hand delivered to tenants	
12.7.2001	Letter and consultation pack to TACT	
26.7.2001	Newsheet hand delivered to tenants	
2.8.2001	Meeting with TACT	
13.8.2001	Area SH Tenants meeting with members	
14.8.2001	Area SH Tenants meeting with members	

Date	Action	Comment
15.8.2001	Area SH Tenants meeting with members	
16.8.2001	Area SH Tenants meeting with members	
20.8.2001	Area SH Tenants meeting with members	
23.8.2001	Area SH Tenants meeting with members	

### Stakeholders

Date	Action	Comment
Late Feb/early March	Work with Centre for Sheltered Housing Studies to identify service vision, parameters of service, future options for how service could be delivered	
19.3.2001	Meeting with Chair and Vice Chairs H&E to inform work on service vision, parameters of service, future options for service delivery to shape and inform policy report to April H&E and future work	
6.4.2001	Progress report to BVI following decisions of H&E cmtee	
26.4.2001	Stakeholder Focus Group	
25.5.2001	Service Mapping/joint working meeting with local SS, health, CVS	
11.6.2001	Meeting with Chair CS to finalise proposals and report to Mgt Team	Final structure proposals subject to completion of work by Finance staff
2.7.2001	Meeting with Chair CS to consider implications of work by Finance staff on structure and negotiations on payments for emergency out of hours service	
2.7.2001	Briefing of Leader	
10.7.2001	Letter and consultation pack to members	
9.7.2001	Press release on start of staffing structure consultation period	
11.7.2001	Letter and consultation pack to SS, Health, CVS, CSHS	
13.7.2001	Letter and consultation to senior management in SS, Supporting People Manager and PCG CE	
13.7.2001	Letter and consultation pack to BVI	

# **ANNEXE C**

**KEY POINTS FROM  
FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS  
WITH  
STAFF, TENANTS AND STAKEHOLDERS**

## Annexe C

### Key Points from Focus Group Meetings with Staff, Tenants and Stakeholders

- Residents should feel safe and secure
- A warden should be available 24 hours a day
- Concerns raised over mixing the young with the elderly
- Residents should have privacy and suitable accommodation
- Residents lack awareness of what Sheltered Housing services are provided
- The need for someone to deal with prescriptions
- Residents should be able to make independent choices as to the level of service they wish to receive and be able to change this according to their needs
- The majority wish wardens to visit twice a week and to receive some contact at the weekend
- Wardens visits should be at a time that suits the resident
- Central Control Unit should contact residents according to their needs or when the warden is absent
- The high importance of a 24 hours, 365 days a year emergency contact point
- Social activities should be opened up to the wider community and organised centrally with resident involvement
- The need for a team approach by Housing and partners in order to deliver a united service to Sheltered Housing residents



# **ANNEXE D**

## **KEY POINTS FROM AREA SHELTERED HOUSING MEETINGS**

## Annexe D

### Key Points From Area Sheltered Housing Meetings

- Residents would like to keep resident wardens
- Definite need for collection of prescriptions - Some chemists already deliver prescriptions
- Serious concern over mixing elderly with young
- Want choice on service level
- Agree to open up common rooms/areas to other residents
- Residents want visit rather than call
- Residents want help and personal visit when signing up for tenancies
- Need for residents to have representative to speak on their behalf
- Residents haven't got the emergency number for Granville Court
- Need for the person visiting residents to be a regular caller so that they can get to know each resident, not one-off caller, i.e. mobile wardens.
- Need for week end visits
- Request for someone to listen (volunteer service) for those who are lonely and housebound
- Sheltered accommodation is badly set out for disabled people, i.e. those with wheelchairs
- A need for follow up meetings to feedback findings to residents.
- Residents want to be informed in future by newsletter delivered by wardens.
- The need for some kind of handbook, which explains to tenants what service, they should receive.

# **ANNEXE E**

## **APPRAISAL OF MODELS**

### Appraisal of Models

The following models of direct provision of the “warden” element of the SH service have been identified and appraised:-

#### **a) Resident Warden Service**

This model would have Resident Wardens responsible for and living in SH schemes with service tenancies. A Warden could be based at each SH schemes or at specific schemes, with a responsibility for more than one scheme. Resident Wardens would deal with visits, administration and emergencies on their own schemes. Staff would be employed on a standard 37 hour per week contract with emergency response being provided outside these times through the CCU. Cover during holidays and sickness would be provided by MWs.

Advantages:-

- initially the least disruptive option for staff and residents where resident schemes already operate
- offers greater opportunities for SH to be a “home for life” as the scheme manager can ensure care and support needs are identified at an early stage
- scheme can be a focus for the wider community in terms of social and community activities

Disadvantages:-

- less flexible option in terms of staff or changing use of existing scheme building as future needs change
- does not address wider SP issues
- limits the number of older people who can receive services outside of SH schemes
- tenants may perceive that RW based on site is available for emergency response at all times, thus creating dependency
- will require new resident wardens to be provided to schemes and availability of service tenancies and consequential loss of SH for residents and rent income
- costs of equipping new Wardens accommodation with communication equipment
- less flexibility for dealing with emergency out of hours service which would require delivery through mobile wardens or overtime payments
- would require MW or other means to provide cover for holidays and sickness
- does not readily address issue of wide span of management control

#### **b) Mobile Service**

This model would have a Team of Mobile Wardens who visit residents in SH schemes and Lifeline users in accordance with need and who respond to emergency situations. The MWs would be employed on a standard 37 hour per week contract with emergency response being provided outside these times through the CCU.

#### Advantages:-

- enables a greater number of older people to receive a “sheltered “ type service in their homes in the wider community
- reduces the inequalities between tenants in SH and those outside SH
- reflects SP principles and offers opportunity to develop service as part of SP
- provides an opportunity to generate income by extending service to older people o/s SH
- releases wardens accommodation for reletting and reduces costs of service tenancies
- allows service users greater choice over the level of service they receive a menu of services can be provided from which users choose the level of service required to meet needs at the time
- gives flexibility to change use of existing scheme buildings in the future

#### Disadvantages:-

- less helpful for the very frail elderly so would depend on good support being available from SS and health
- less likely that social and communal activities will take place in SH without scheme based staff unless other mechanisms in place for this provision
- will require Residential Wardens to give up their service tenancies and be rehoused
- doesn't readily address issue of span of management control
- service users may perceive this as a major change of service where their resident wardens are removed
- costs of removing/changing communication equipment to MWs
- staff would all require driving licences

#### c) **Flexible Area Based Service with a Combination of Residential and Community Staff**

This model would be area based with an Urban and Rural Team of staff dealing with service delivery to SH schemes tenants and to Lifeline users.

Each Team would provide services to customers based on needs. Service delivery in the area teams would be co-ordinated by the SH Teamleader.

Each team would have an operational base in their area where team briefings, planning and supervision/support meetings could be held and where SH staff can meet and work with other service providers. The base would be equipped with IT to allow effective communication with CCU and the Civic Centre.

Residential Sheltered Housing staff could be based at some schemes so that a higher level of support can be provided to frail residents and to support the development of intermediate care and partnerships with SS and Health. Residential staff would be the prime contact and focus for service delivery for residents on their schemes but would also work a part of the wider team to deliver services based on needs to other service users.

Other staff would live in their own homes.

### Advantages:-

- provides basis to provide services based on need
- enables a greater number of older people to receive a “sheltered “ type service in their homes in the wider community
- reduces the inequalities between tenants in SH and those outside
- reflects SP principles
- makes better use of Central Control equipment which has greater capacity than currently used
- provides an opportunity to generate income by extending service to older people o/s SH
- allows service users greater choice over the level of service they receive- a menu of services can be provided from which users choose the level of service required to meet needs at the time
- addresses issue of span of management control
- opportunity to build area based services with wider access to community activities
- flexibility to respond to service needs and to cover holidays and sickness absence
- offers longer term opportunity for carers to be employed by SDDC at Residential Schemes in partnership with SS and supervised by the scheme manager so that flexible care services can be delivered to schemes where there are large numbers of residents who are particularly frail
- releases wardens accommodation for reletting and reduces costs of service tenancies
- provides career development opportunities for staff
- gives flexibility to change use of existing scheme buildings in the future
- provides operational base in community for Teams to work from
- provides means for effective communication and supervision/support of dispersed workforce
- concentrates tenants with greatest needs in specific schemes

### Disadvantages:-

- frail elderly may have more limited choice of accommodation
- will necessitate most staff being redeployed/substantially changed JDS etc
- will require Residential Wardens to give up their service tenancies and be rehoused
- staff would all need driving licences.
- increased mileage costs
- money need to set up and equip area offices with IT
- costs of removing/changing communication equipment

All models would necessitate substantial staff changes in terms of redeployment and possibly redundancy or early retirement.

# **ANNEXE F**

**THIS REPORT WILL BE PRESENTED  
IN THE EXEMPT SECTION OF THE MEETING**

# **ANNEXE G**

**REPORT OF  
CHAIR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES**

**SHELTERED HOUSING REVIEW  
TENANT/WARDEN CONSULTATION**



## REPORT OF CHAIR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

### SHELTERED HOUSING REVIEW - TENANT/WARDEN CONSULTATION

1. Meetings were held with tenants and staff as follows:-
  - 2.8.01 - Meeting with Wardens
  - 13.8.01 - Meeting with tenants, Willington
  - 14.8.01 - Meeting with tenants, Granville Court
  - 15.8.01 - Meeting with tenants, Kendricks Close, Hartshorne
  - 16.8.01 - Meeting with tenants, Melbourne
  - 20.8.01 - Meeting with tenants, Linton
  - 23.8.01 - Meeting with tenants, Unity Close
2. Notes of the meetings are attached.
3. The keys points from these are:-
  - a) Tenants worries about their warden's job security
  - b) Security of properties - external entry systems; external lighting, poor state of locks
  - c) Practicalities of wardens carrying keys around
  - d) Tenants who suffer from blackouts/heart problems - what would happen if they collapsed
  - e) Concerns about communication with Central Control - speed of response, attitude of operators, effectiveness of equipment
  - f) Tenants with resident wardens do not want to lose them
  - g) How Central Control will deal with no response from tenants to their calls
  - h) Most staff accept that there must be change, that all staff should be on equal pay and do the same amount of work, working to the same job description
  - i) Concerns about the consultation process - some residents had difficulty getting to meetings; perception from newsheet that decisions already made
  - j) The Warden Manager should be involved in allocations of Sheltered Housing
  - k) Recognition of the work of the wardens
  - l) Tenants talked about the different levels of service they currently get
  - m) Concerns about current delivery of service by mobile wardens
  - n) Concern about loss of TV licence concessions

- o) Tenants concerned about the training wardens would receive, i.e. first aid, fire precautions
- p) Concerns over collection of medication from Doctors' surgeries
- q) Tenants want to be notified when a decision is made
- r) Tenants wanted to see the same warden regularly
- s) Tenants worries about having to call out a warden from a distance in an emergency
- t) Tenants concerns about young people being housed in sheltered schemes
- u) Tenants were unclear on how much they paid for the Sheltered Housing service
- v) Tenants concerns about whether it is physically possible for 10 wardens to cover all properties
- w) Concerns about how cleaning of communal areas will be done
- x) Tenants recognised need for more partnership working



**Councillor R.W. Southern**  
**Chair of Community Services Committee**  
**South Derbyshire District Council**



# South Derbyshire District Council

Councillor R.W. Southern,  
Chair of Community Services Committee,  
194 Regent Street,  
Church Gresley,  
Swadlincote,  
Derbyshire.  
DE11 9PQ

J.M. Eatough  
Legal & Members' Services Manager

Civic Offices, Civic Way,  
Swadlincote, Derbyshire DE11 0AH

Please ask for Paul Spencer  
Tel: (01283) 221000 Ext. 5722  
DDI (01283) 595722  
Fax (01283) 595802  
Minicom: (01283) 228149  
DX 23912 Swadlincote  
E.mail: civic.offices@south-derbys.gov.uk

Our Ref: PDS/KW/CA/5  
Your Ref:

Date: 17th August 2001

Dear Councillor Southern,

**SHELTERED HOUSING BEST VALUE REVIEW – CONSULTATION MEETING  
WITH WARDENS**

I enclose a copy of the notes of the consultation meeting held with Wardens on 2nd August 2001 for your information.

Yours sincerely,

J.M. Eatough  
Legal & Members' Services Manager

Enc.

SHELTERED HOUSING BEST VALUE REVIEW

CONSULTATION MEETING WITH WARDENS

2nd August 2001

PRESENT:-

District Council Representatives

Councillors Southern (Chair) and Councillors Dunn, Rose, Mrs. Mead, Routledge, Mrs. Rose, Taylor, Stone and Bell.  
B. Nicholls, P. Spencer and P. Harvey.

Unison Representative

B. Jones.

Wardens

S. Whiddett, E. Mortimer, K. McMorrugh, A. Winnal, I Fleming, S. Hubbard, K. Sharpe, E. Rode, S. Biwott, B. Taylor, A. Davies, E. Ward, J. Anslow, J. Wrathall, H. Orme, V. Biggadike, M. Taylor, J. Goodall and Mr. Ward.

APOLOGY

An apology was received from Mr. E. Mackie (Warden).

SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED AND PROPOSALS SUBMITTED

Following introductions the Chair explained the purpose of this consultation meeting as part of the Best Value Review of Sheltered Housing. He confirmed that outline notes would be taken to provide a summary of the main topics discussed and that separate meetings would be held for tenants as part of the ongoing consultation. He then opened the meeting for the views of Wardens.

It was felt that the current proposal was not sustainable in that eight people could not provide adequate cover for the 1,166 properties in sheltered housing. There was concern at the recent press coverage of this sensitive issue. There was a perception that Resident Wardens should not be removed as they provided vital service on-site to respond to tenants' needs.

The Chair spoke about the current subsidy arrangements for sheltered housing. He explained that the arrangements would be reviewed in 2003 and it was anticipated that such subsidy would not continue. He also felt

that units on sheltered housing schemes were sometimes allocated inappropriately to those in lesser need.

It was questioned whether the current proposal for a mix of resident and mobile wardens would work. In response, it was suggested that rather than eight wardens there be twelve positions and that this be funded by deleting the proposed manager position at Grade Principal Officer 4. It was felt that only one – not two relief warden positions were required and that the additional monies be used to provide cover through part-time positions.

An alternative proposal document was circulated for Members consideration. The Chair read extracts of this document as it had not been circulated previously. It suggested a need for nine resident wardens and eleven part-time assistant wardens. Details were reported of the proposal including initiatives for a monthly newsletter to inform all residents of activities throughout each sheltered housing scheme. A copy of the proposal document is appended to these notes for information.

There followed a general discussion on the merits of the proposal document submitted and that prepared by a number of wardens which Unison was to submit for the views of management on 6th August 2001. There was a consensus that some resident wardens needed to be retained.

A Member reiterated that managers would need to decide how the service was managed and the financial constraints imposed by Government would dictate the level of service provided. Praise was voiced for the work undertaken by wardens, but there was recognition that the quality of service varied in different sheltered housing schemes. There was a wish to improve the overall quality of service provided and to offer a uniform level of service throughout the District. It was noted that some of the roles performed by resident wardens currently should be undertaken by other agencies and as part of this review those additional services should be discontinued. A warden commented that she saw her role as caring for the tenants and it would be difficult to provide a lesser service.

There was a discussion on the charges levied for the warden service which had traditionally been added to the rent and often resulted in tenants

There was a discussion on the charges levied for the warden service which had traditionally been added to the rent and often resulted in tenants receiving housing benefit. A review of the rent structure would shortly be undertaken. Some tenants also received the benefit of a concessionary television licence which could be lost with the removal of resident wardens. It was understood that a number of residents had organised petitions to retain their resident warden.

The Chair of the Council's Overview Committee was invited to submit his comments and he explained a wish to look at the financial aspects. He expressed a view that the service might not need to be self-financing and funds could be allocated from the General Fund as part of the consideration of overall priorities.

Wardens felt that should the current proposals not be pursued, the Council should seek to determine this matter at an early date. The Chair stated that Members would not make a hasty decision and reiterated that the service provided to tenants was his primary concern. Wardens felt management should have been present at the meeting to appreciate the strength of their feeling, but the Chair confirmed that he had specifically excluded management so that wardens could express their views freely.

Further consideration was given to the proposal made by management and a number of the earlier points were reiterated. It was felt that a representative from the Warden Service should be involved in the future allocation of properties on sheltered housing schemes. The Chair thanked those present for their attendance and brought the meeting to a close.

R.W. SOUTHERN

CHAIR

The Meeting terminated at 3.10 p.m.

NOTES OF CONSOCIATION  
MEETING RE SHELTERED  
HOUSING

20/08/01 LINTON V.H.

CHAIR B. SOUTHERN

VCHAIR M. LAURO

CLERK JOHN STONE

30-40 Residents

No officers

Chair, Southern Read out statement re - comments about individual officers, ..

Resident Patrick Cross praised present service.:

Resident queried cost of clearing up after travellers.

- question re. will rents be reduced

Chair pointed out subsidy to sheltered housing & that costs were to be broken down - all warden are to do equal work

10 wardens throughout Loderlys -

question is that enough wardens? Chair explained loss of

subsidy in 2003.

Resident from Wallon. said their warden only asked if they are all right, no real service. Chair explained that the intention was that residents will always see the same warden:

average 116 to a warden & 3 visits per week, - explained relief warden scheme.

More comments from Linton residents that they wanted to retain what they have. Chair said Sue would remain in Linton, in her bungalow, but would not be able to offer the same services as in the past. - The chair praised the efforts of wardens who had often provided services above and beyond their job description.

Chair stated that Community transport must start to offer transport to central community facilities.

In answer to a question Chair stated that members would make the decision, and a good manager must be appointed to run the service.

A number of concerns were expressed about warden accommodation being lost & what disciplinary actions would be taken about staff making unilateral decisions. Chair explained actions taken following issue of unauthorised letter.

More concerns expressed re pipe systems in accommodation being out of date & worried about having to rely on that system more in the future.

Ques. what will happen to assistant wardens. will they be kept on?

Chair explained that number of units per warden could depend upon geographical spread, i.e. exortons in the rural areas would probably have less to cover. He also explained qualification for reduced price T.V. licences.

Ques re-job description, chair explained all wardens will have same job description. new locks are to be fitted & warden will be able to access with one key. concerned resident re. loss of master key & security of residents.

Chair stressed that the council would do their best to provide a good equal service but we could not continue as we are.

If the new scheme does not work as well as expected we will re-visit the matter & try to improve.

Ques re 1st aid, chair explained that all wardens will be asked to train in 1st aid & fire training.



## SHELTERED HOUSING PROPOSAL PLAN.

### Sheltered housing to be separated from the housing authority.

To gain maximum government grants. To be renamed South Derbyshire District Sheltered housing.

Properties to be rented or leased from housing department, at the current basic rent.

To include maintenance and grass cutting, and other maintenance services already in existence.

### STAFF PLANNING.

The staff required will consist of the following:-

1 manager, 9 resident wardens, 11 part time assistant wardens. Control room staff, 2 members of staff to work a double rota system, of 48 hours week 1, 36 hours week 2, Night shift will include a third assistant on a callout support system.

### PROPOSED AREA'S

Area 1 Ticknall and Melborne. 113 Dwellings 1 resident warden, and 1 part time assistant.

Area 2 Overseal, Netherseal, Lullington, Coton in the Elms, Walton on Trent, Linton, and Castle Gresley. 176 dwellings 1 resident warden and 2 part time assistant wardens.

Area 3 Church Gresley, 126 dwellings, 1 resident warden and 2 part time assistant wardens.

Area 4 Etwall, Hatton, Hilton, Willington and Repton. 187 dwellings 1 resident warden and 2 part time assistant wardens.

Area 5 Hartshorne, and Woodville. 95 dwellings 1 resident warden and 1 part time assistant warden.

Area 6 Swadlincote. 238 dwelling 1 resident warden and 3 part time assistant wardens.

Area 7 Upper Midway, and Newhall 150 dwellings 2 resident wardens.

Area 8 Shardlow, Aston and Weston. 60 dwellings 1 resident warden.

## Proposal Plan For Sheltered Housing.

This package has been put together to try and help the recent concern in the running of sheltered housing.

As we know there has been recent reports made into the current running of sheltered housing, and also the new proposals that are being looked into at present, that have not been taken to well by residents, resident's families and friends and not to mention the resident wardens them selves. So we have been asked to put an alternative plan together to give an insight to how sheltered housing could be run, and still be cost effective, and still maintain resident warden care.

This plan may not have all the sheltered housing needs with in it, but we have tried to cover as much of the sheltered housing specifications as we know of.

The plan includes a format for resident wardens where all sheltered housing schemes have been designated into areas as to where each area has at least a resident warden, and the larger schemes would have the assistance of a part time warden. Also a rough wardens guide to what their descriptions are their duties involve, this should be followed by all wardens, therefore all sheltered housing schemes receive the same level of care and assistant throughout. There is an estimated income and expenditure plan to give a rough guide to how the plans are feasible.

We thank you for taking the time to look at our proposals and we hope they prove helpful. We are not whiz kids, but have used common sense to help to provide a acceptable level of care to the elderly and disabled.

Again thank you.

Wardens and assistants to be more flexible in their approach to work, I.E out of hours calls, and to receive proper training, Working to a higher standard, set out to a wardens work objective. Resident wardens to all be paid at the same rate of pay, all assistant wardens to receive the same rate of pay, in proportion to the resident wardens.

Housing manager to visit each scheme on a monthly basis, to check on progress and standards in each scheme, to ensure correct levels of service and equality's in all schemes.

A monthly news letter to inform ALL RESIDENTS. of all activities through out each and every sheltered housing scheme.

Sheltered housing applicants to be assessed more stringently on application by the management I.E sheltered housing staff.

## SHELTERED HOUSING.

POST. Resident Warden.

### PURPOSE.

To provide day to day support and care to the elderly and other persons with a special need who live within sheltered housing accommodation, or who are linked to central control by means of a piper lifeline.

### RESPONSIBLE.

To Sheltered Housing Manager.

### LIAISON WITH.

Other members of sheltered housing, other departments within the council, tenants, Community Social Services and other Voluntary agencies.

### DUTIES.

1. Under the Directives of Sheltered Housing Manager to provide a supportive and caring environment for the elderly and other persons in the community with a special need living in Sheltered Housing or linked to central control by means of a piper lifeline system.
2. To ensure that the following requirements, in case of the elderly and other persons in Sheltered Housing and with special needs are met.
  - I. To be alert to the degree of ill health and dependence of each resident and to take appropriate action whether direct or indirect in nature.
  - II. To summon a Doctor or any other services that may be required.
  - III. To give general assistance in the case of accident or illness until help can be obtained through Doctors, local services and/or relatives.
  - IV. To maintain a record of Doctors and nearest relatives, emergency telephones of health and Social Services to ensure that the above needs are efficiently met.
  - V. To collect prescriptions for residents who are unable to make their own arrangements and who have no relatives available. To accompany such residents where necessary to hospital out patients departments, opticians,

dentists etc., IF NO OTHER ESCORT ARE AVAILABLE. The prior consent of the Sheltered housing Manager must be obtained in these cases.

VI. To keep a logbook or weekly report book in which all such incidents are recorded.

VII. To be responsible for a first aid box and to ensure that it is regularly stocked up.

VIII. Make applications for concessionary television licences as necessary.

IX. To adequately secure all residents keys in safekeeping.

3. To notify central control of deaths, unforeseen absences of residents and the circumstances of such absences and of cases where it is felt that the resident is no longer capable of looking after him/herself with minimum supervision.

4. To be aware of health and safety issues within the scheme, and to other employees.

