

Please ask for: Tracie Rees
Direct Line: 0116 454 2301
E-mail: tracie.rees@leicester.gov.uk
Ref: TR/JLW



13 December 2018

Ms Sue Cowling
Chief Executive
Norton Housing and Support
107 Newport Street
Leicester LE3 9FU

Dear Sue

Re: Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission - 4th December 2018

Further to your e-mail dated 3rd December 2018, regarding Appendix E and the current ILS consultation. Your correspondence stated that you believed the paper to be inaccurate and a misrepresentation of the Norton Housing and Support and misleading. You also asked for several sections to be retracted.

At the above meeting, Cllr Cleaver (Chair) agreed that Alison Morley (Norton Housing and Support) could explain to the scrutiny commission why Norton Housing and Support believed that the information contained in the report was inaccurate and a misrepresentation. Following Alison's explanation, Cllr Cleaver also agreed that a response would be provided in writing by the Council addressing each of the following points.

- Reference to information gained from service user assessments carried out in January 2018, which we were told was not being used to inform the current proposals - paragraphs 4.6 and 4.10
- Reference to tenancy and licence agreements - paragraph 4.8
- Reference to additional charges for support by NH&S - paragraph 4.9
- Reference to charges to tenants not being payable under the new service - paragraph 4.9
- Reference to NH&S's lack of an alternative proposal - paragraph 4.9
- Reference to the costs of our Housing Benefit proposal and apparent reliance on additional charges - paragraph 4.9

4.6 To clarify: The assessments undertaken in March 2018 were driven by the last commissioning review. The purpose was to indicate the level of non-statutory need under the current contract, how long people had been resident at these services and whether there were opportunities to move on.

In relation to the current consultation, the assessments demonstrated the need for ongoing support for existing clients. If the assessments had not been used to inform the proposal, then it is likely that the proposal would have been to end the funding in its entirety. We do however note that these assessments indicate a lower level of need.

4.8 To clarify: Norton Housing and Support have asked us to make clear that they are the managing agent on behalf of two Registered Social Landlords (RSL) and as such the tenancy arrangement responsibility lies with the RSLs. As noted the RSLs at the time of the engagement indicated a willingness to review this if the proposal to consult was agreed. Regardless of who makes the decision relating to the type of tenancy, the City Council is concerned that the majority of tenants who have lived in the various schemes for a number of years have a licence agreement, which offers no security of tenure and is deemed to be unacceptable.

4.9 To clarify:

Sentence/line 1:

This states that one of Support Providers is supportive of the proposals.

To clarify: this should read that they are supportive of the approach to consult, as they understand the local authorities position, which may lead to the early termination of the contracts.

Sentence/line 2 and 3:

In the engagement period one of the providers (Norton Housing and Support) asked the Council to delay the start of the consultation in order that they could put forward an alternative proposal.

To clarify: The proposal put forward was to utilise housing benefit via the intensive housing management charge, which would operate in parallel to the proposal currently being consulted upon. This would mean two support services working with the same group of tenants leading to the duplication of efforts and potential conflict and confusion for tenants. This model was also specific to Norton House Schemes (as set out in your letter of the 3rd August 2018) only and not felt to be an alternative option.

Sentence/line 3:

This talks about a charge that places an additional payment of £60 per tenant towards the cost of support.

To clarify: this charge relates to ineligible housing benefit costs including food, a contribution towards the Healthy Living Co-ordinators post, non-communal gas and electricity, water, TV licence, management of ineligible services, social activities, trips and volunteers.

The paper goes on to say that if the new model is introduced the Council would look to end the additional payments from tenants, this would include the charge made for food, social activities, management of ineligible services and the cost of the Healthy Living Co-ordinator. The key aspect of the new model is to promote independence, which includes supporting/encouraging individuals to buy and cook their own food.

It is estimated that this will save each tenant in the region of £45.00 per week. However, it is accepted that tenants will still have to pay for some ineligible charges, such as a contribution towards the gas, electricity, water and TV licence.

To clarify: this is the Council's intention but will require discussion with the respective landlords where this charge is in place.

I hope this has clarified the Council's position and I believe the information presented in the scrutiny report was factual and it is certainly not our intention to misrepresent Norton Housing and Support.

Yours sincerely



Tracie Rees

Director – Adult Social Care and Commissioning
Social Care & Education