

## Kent Draft Supporting People Strategy 2010-2015 – Summary of Consultation Feedback

### 1. Vision

All responses received from stakeholders were in broad agreement with vision of the Programme for the next five years.

### 2. Strategic Objectives

Stakeholder	Feedback	SP Response
SMT (KASS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the objectives. KASS acknowledges that the SP programme is essentially preventative in nature. Prevention is a shared target among stakeholders and there could be more joint commissioning (including joint funding) of services</li> <li>• Appreciation about the strategy stressing the importance of HIAs as preventative tools. However, some concern about how a review might affect the in-house HIAs in Canterbury and Swale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strategic review of HIAs will be based on wide consultation with all stakeholders and any recommendations arising from the review will need to be agreed by all</li> </ul>
Commissioning Body (Dec 09)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad agreement that services should prioritise vulnerable Kent citizens</li> <li>• P.11, Obj.5 - The strategy objectives need to include publicity to maintain the Programme's profile and access to the Programme as well as recognising under 'partnership' the contribution other services make to outcomes</li> <li>• No mention of growth areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintaining the profile of the Programme added to strategic actions under objective 5, 'Partnership Working' and 'focus on outcomes' expanded</li> <li>• Growth areas mentioned on p.5, section has been expanded</li> </ul>
POC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objectives are good and should be endorsed</li> </ul>	
CFE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objectives are good but do not give much idea of commissioning information/outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The commissioning plan will give detailed commissioning/decommissioning information</li> </ul>
Service User Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with most objectives and that services should prioritise Kent citizens</li> <li>• P.11 Obj.7. p.48 - Concerns expressed about the appropriateness of personalised services for people at crisis point: panel does not support such services. Vulnerable people at crisis point cannot make decisions about service providers or personalised budgets</li> <li>• P.11, Obj.7 - Concern expressed about the vital importance of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SP acknowledges that personalised services for people at crisis point might not be appropriate-added qualification to Objective 7 to pilot being run in long term accommodation</li> <li>• Re access to opportunities, new contracts will include</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Feedback	SP Response
	<p>access to opportunities such as training and employment-some support workers do not have the knowledge to support service users in that</p>	<p>a clause about providers facilitating access to training etc and the Service User Involvement Officer will work with providers on making that a reality</p>
<p>Executive Board of Providers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.3 - Executive summary should make reference to move of SP into Communities Directorate</li> <li>• P.5 – Significant factors SP strategy must address should include rural/urban split and growth in older population</li> <li>• P.6 – Expand on partnership working and name partners</li> <li>• P.9, Obj.1 – redressing the balance between accommodation-based and floating support services: concern about moving service users in sheltered accommodation on to short term floating support</li>   <li>• P.9, Obj.1 – Delete 'Eradicate assumption of remaining in long term accommodation for life'</li> <li>• P.9, Obj.1 – Limiting floating support to one year will lead to increase in repeat referrals, more extension requests time intensive administrative burden on SP and providers</li>   <li>• P.10 Obj.2 – Add to last bullet point ...the vulnerable people of Kent of <i>all age groups</i>'</li> <li>• P.10, Obj.4 – Tendering all floating support cause disruption to services and creating an unstable environment for service providers, staff and service users. Alternative: SP to deal with providers individually to ensure they are getting best value for money, contracts extended or re- tendered on a cases by case basis which will allow providers to plan their business and give some security to their staff</li> <li>• P.10, Obj.3 –Not for SP to create concierge services to fund support as concierge services are a housing management function and covered through housing benefit</li>   <li>• P.10, Obj.4 - Concerns about strategically reviewing outreach service, has only been operating for 4 months in its current configuration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not considered appropriate</li>   <li>• Text amended to include additional bullet points</li>   <li>• Text amended to include partners</li> <li>• SP has no intention to implement such measures in existing sheltered accommodation – the strategic review of older persons' services agreed that any changes can only be implemented with the agreement of service users in such services</li> <li>• Strategic action has been amended to acknowledge that not all people in such services can move on.</li> <li>• Amended the action point to clarify that that maximum duration can still be up to two years (but based upon a review at one year and a case being made for extension.</li> <li>• Detailed amendment made</li>   <li>• SP will retender/review all floating support on the basis of strategic relevance.</li>   <li>• SP will require via contracts/specifications relevant providers to access housing benefit to deliver 24 hour services where there is a potential for significant or serious risk of harm to service users, e.g. young people at risk services.</li> <li>• SP will strategically review the outreach service 2010/11</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Feedback	SP Response
Providers	<p><u>Anchor Trust:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.9, Obj.1 - Contended that older people are likely to become less independent in time and more dependent on support, need long term supported accommodation</li> <li>• P.7 - Asked for clarity on 'focus for outcomes' about more institutional or less independent living options</li> </ul> <p><u>Porchlight:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.9, Obj.1 - Whilst reduction of floating support to one year will reduce dependency as well as reduce waiting lists and reduce costs, it will also affect effectiveness and quality of the programme: more acute issues in the future that could increase the need for more crisis services, more repeat referrals, and cycle of dependency. Maybe SP could change the eligibility criteria for floating support so it is focused on people who are most vulnerable and most in need</li> <li>• P.9, Obj.1 - Need clear and transparent system for requesting extensions and appealing decisions and for specific referral routes and mechanisms for service users who need on-going support</li> <li>• P.9, Obj.1 - Whilst all supported housing should aim for the goal of independence some people will need long term supported accommodation indefinitely. Need to specify which client groups are alluded to regarding 'redressing the balance between accommodation based and floating support services</li> <li>• P.10, Obj.2 - Remodelling accommodation to be self contained will lead to loss of bed spaces</li> <li>• P.10, Obj.3 - Concierge services for young people at risk are not appropriate, using Housing Benefit to fund concierge services will lead to increase in the overall rent payable by the service user, discourage young people from gaining employment (in contradiction with the outcomes of the strategy) and use of lower skilled, non-support staff having no expertise in dealing with vulnerable young people</li> <li>• P.10, Obj.4 - Retendering floating support not value for money and will cause disruption to services and creating an unstable environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SP acknowledges that not all people can move on from long term supported accommodation. The strategic action point has been amended</li> <li>• SP has added an example</li> <li>• Amended the action point to clarify that that maximum duration can still be up to two years (but based upon a review at one year and a case being made for extension</li> <li>• SP will work with providers to agree a protocol</li> <li>• SP acknowledges that not all people can move on from long term supported accommodation. The strategic action point has been amended</li> <li>• SP Has amended the action point to show that it alludes to future commissioning</li> <li>• SP has reconsidered and will negotiate with providers where appropriate to seek housing benefit to fund concierge services where the vulnerability of the client group dictates additional safety and security requirements.</li> <li>• SP will retender/review floating support on the basis of strategic relevance</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Feedback	SP Response
	<p>for service providers, staff and service users. Should only re-tender where services are of poor quality, not achieving the level of outcomes or are not delivering the service as they should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.10, Obj.4 - Concerns about strategically reviewing outreach service, has only been operating for 4 months in its current configuration.</li> <li>• P.12, Obj.7 - Expand on self directed support pilot to specify which client group and type of service this pilot would be directed at, when it would start and how it would be monitored</li> </ul> <p><u>West Kent Housing Association, Maidstone Housing Trust and Invicta Telecare:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.9, Obj.1 – Re. reduction of floating support, accept that one size does not fit all but should be up to professional judgment of support workers to agree earlier close</li> <li>• P.9, Obj.1 – redressing balance between accommodation based and floating support services not right for all client groups. Moving older people from current more long term floating support to short term support wrong, they are likely to become less independent as their needs increase. Propose a more flexible long term person centred approach that links in with accommodation but ensure the support is tailored to the individual</li> <li>• P.10, Obj.2 – Where remodelling of shared housing is concerned, SP must commit to working with providers</li> <li>• P.10, Obj.4 – Retendering floating support is not value for money, cause instability in market, impact of TUPE costs on services</li> <li>• P.7, p.11 Obj.7 – Channelling peer support through some client groups takes away choice and control to integrate into the community. For example, people with learning disabilities may want to choose a group outside their disability parameter</li> <li>• P.6 – Name partners under ‘partnership working’</li> <li>• P.7, ‘focus on outcomes’ to include reference to cross generational</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SP will strategically review the outreach service 2010/11</li> <li>• Point has been expanded to detail what client group and type of service is involved in the pilot</li> <li>• Maximum duration of floating support can still be up to two years (but based upon a review at one year and a case being made for extension).</li> <li>• SP will honour the agreed recommendations of the strategic review of older people’s services and has added a bullet point detailing this: there will be no change to category 2 sheltered accommodation unless agreed by service users. Category 1 accommodation is regarded as community alarm services only.</li> <li>• SP is committed to working with providers and has no intention to remodel existing shared housing wholesale. The text has been amended to acknowledge this</li> <li>• SP will retender/review floating support on the basis of strategic relevance</li> <li>• SP supports people having choice and participating in peer support will not be mandatory. It is an additional support people can choose</li> <li>• Partners named</li> <li>• SP supports these outcomes, for example through</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Feedback	SP Response
	<p>work and voluntary work as conduit to employment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.7 – Supporting people to live in their own accommodation for as long as possible is contradicted by the strategy’s lack of support for long term accommodation</li>   <li>• P.9, Obj.1 – Reducing floating support to one year’s duration will result in more repeat referrals. People need time to manage their transition to independence</li>   <li>• P.9, Obj.1 – Eradicating assumption that long term accommodation is for life contradicts the promoted outcome for people to live in their own homes for as long as possible</li> <li>• P.10 Obj.4 – Tendering all floating support will cause disruption to services and creating an unstable environment for service providers, staff and service users. TUPE implications. Only retender services graded QAF level D</li> <li>• P.10, Obj.3 - Further explanations for use of concierge services needed, especially where Housing Benefit in different districts make different decisions</li>   <li>• P.11, Obj.4 – Withdrawal of specialist floating support from older people may be viewed as discriminatory. Also mainstreaming support for teenage parents may be detrimental to meeting their very specific needs</li> </ul>	<p>HIAs providing apprenticeships to young people. Text amended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting people in their own accommodation does include sheltered accommodation. However, the Programme must balance this provision with the fact that the vast majority of older people live in other accommodation in the community and that their aspirations are changing</li> <li>• Maximum duration of floating support can still be up to two years (but based upon a review at one year and a case being made for extension). This will encourage support workers to focus on developing exit strategies in an appropriate timeframe rather than just providing support for 2 years because that is the guideline</li> <li>• SP acknowledges that not all people can move on from long term supported accommodation. The strategic action point has been amended</li> <li>• SP will retender/review floating support on the basis of strategic relevance</li>   <li>• SP has reconsidered and will negotiate with providers where appropriate to seek housing benefit to fund concierge services where the vulnerability of the client group dictates additional safety and security requirements.</li> <li>• SP will retain some specialist floating support services. However, in many districts floating support for the above client groups is already delivered, very successfully, through generic services. Floating support for teenage parents will be merged with floating support for young people at risk.</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Feedback	SP Response
	<p><u>Stonham:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.9, Obj.1 – Eradicating assumption that long term accommodation is for life, need to acknowledge that some people will not be able to move on to full independent living.</li> <li>• P. 9, Obj.1 – Limiting floating support to one year will reduce dependence but some people with learning disabilities or mental health problems may require on-going support from other agencies, need partnership working with statutory agencies</li> <li>• P.10, Obj.3 – Concerns about concierge services used in services for young people, Stonham experience has shown that replacing night time support staff with concierges does not work. Concierges lack skills</li> </ul> <p><u>Catch 22:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.9, Obj.1 – Concerns about limiting floating support to one year duration</li> <li>• P.10, Obj.4 – Uncertainty about which floating support will be reduced to 2 hours per week</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SP acknowledges that not all people can move on from long term supported accommodation. The strategic action point has been amended</li> <li>• SP will work with providers on a process to identify early indicators that on going support is required and how statutory agencies can be involved in partnership working</li> <li>• SP has reconsidered and will negotiate with providers where appropriate to seek housing benefit to fund concierge services where the vulnerability of the client group dictates additional safety and security requirements</li> <li>• Maximum duration of floating support can still be up to two years (but based upon a review at one year and a case being made for extension).</li> <li>• Generic floating support is delivered at 2 hours per service user per wee. This will also apply to floating support services that are to be mainstreamed.</li> </ul>
Districts/boroughs	<p>Dover, TMBC and Sevenoaks broadly agree the strategic objectives. <u>Sevenoaks noted that</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.6 – promoting independence and wellbeing includes giving people advice on how to address fuel poverty and improve the condition of their homes</li> <li>• P.11, Obj.4 – concern about withdrawing specialist floating support from teenage parents, client group aged 16-24 highest homeless acceptances</li> <li>• P.11, Obj.4, P.49 – Concern expressed about impact of proposed reduction in floating support</li> </ul> <p><u>Dover:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.9, Obj.1 – Extending floating support to over a year requires processes to be agreed. Reference to this should be made.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SP agrees that HIAs play a vital role in addressing these issues and thereby preventing further ill health</li> <li>• Floating support for the client group will be amalgamated with floating support for young people at risk.</li> <li>• SP is proposing to mainstream services for particular client groups. This does not mean reducing supply and is likely to result in more generic services.</li> <li>• SP will work with providers on the criteria for extension process. Reference to this will be made in</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Feedback	SP Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P.10.p.11, Obj.4 – Clarify which floating support services for older people are to be decommissioned</li> </ul> <p><u>Maidstone:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P.7 – Diversity should include groups such as lesbians, gays, and transgender P.6 – Rephrase second bullet point under ‘prevention’ to preventing ‘vulnerable people to feel...</li> <li>P.10, Obj.3 – Expand on joint funding of services and charging for handyperson services</li> <li>P.10, Obj.4 – Mainstreaming floating support for teenage parents might affect floating support for this client group currently delivered in lieu of accommodation based services</li> </ul> <p><u>Tunbridge Wells:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P.3 – executive summary makes no reference to need for older persons services</li> </ul>	<p>the Annual Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The delivery plan will detail this.</li> <li>Acknowledged and the paragraph has been amended The bullet point has been amended</li> <li>Expanded on joint commissioning. Charging for handyperson services will be examined through the strategic review of such services currently in progress</li> <li>SP has reconsidered and floating support for teenage parents will be amalgamated with floating support for young people at risk. Objective 4 amended accordingly. Any floating support commissioned to be delivered until accommodation based services become available will not change.</li> <li>The summary refers to new additional services for certain priority groups. This has been made clearer.</li> </ul>
Other stakeholders	<p><u>Mental Health Social Services:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P.9, Obj.1 - Concerns about limiting the number of maximum hours of support in accommodation based services, limiting duration of floating support and retendering of floating support services. Clarify reduced number of hours proposed. In some cases, cyclical nature of mental health problems results in repeat referrals. Proposed measures impact on KASS budgets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed maximum weekly number of support hours has been clarified as 10 (p.9, under objective 1). SP has clarified that floating support provision can be extended, on a case by case basis, to a maximum of two years</li> </ul>
KASS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P.8 - No reference to safeguarding</li> <li>P.6 – Recognise that overall the programme needs to shift to prevention and maximisation of independence. But introduction of any changes must be transparent and managed and agreed up with stakeholders</li> <li>P.9, Obj.1 – Concern about limiting floating support to one year duration. Many people with mental health problems and/or learning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference added</li> <li>Supporting People acknowledges that the Programme must work with stakeholders to introduce changes, Will set up a working group with KASS to agree and timetable changes</li> <li>Maximum duration of floating support can still be up to two years (but based upon a review at one year and a</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Feedback	SP Response
	<p>disabilities need long term support, costs must not be shunted to KASS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.9, Obj.1 – Reducing maximum hours of support ignores need of many vulnerable clients and is attempt at cost reduction.</li> <li>• P.9, Obj.1 – Preference for people with local connection in Kent may lead to demand for KASS services from people currently funded by SP but placed from outside of Kent.</li> <li>• P.9, Obj.2 – Only commissioning self contained accommodation will disadvantage some service users and limit choice</li> <li>•</li> <li>• P.10, Obj.3 – KASS should be included in deliberations on charging for handyperson/HIA services</li> <li>• P.10, Obj.4 – Mainstreaming some specialist services will have cost implications for KASS, services are delivered in-house</li> <li>• P.10,Obj.5 – Where is evidence that service user groups affected have been consulted</li> <li>•</li> <li>• P.11, Obj.6 – Not all people will be able to move on to independent living from accommodation based supported housing</li> </ul>	<p>case being made for extension). Need for early identification of ongoing support need and linking of individuals to support sources in the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SP Team carried out a task analysis that identified that currently funded 'support' includes non-housing related support. The Programme has to balance the need of 21 client groups.</li> <li>• SP has scoped the potential number of such individuals and has advised KASS: the numbers are very low.</li> <li>• However, there have been instances where shared accommodation has run with voids for a long time because it is more difficult to match tenants</li> <li>• Consultation will include representatives from KASS</li> <li>•</li> <li>• The client groups concerned are already provided with generic services where specialist ones are not available</li> <li>• The needs analysis Sept 09 as well as the development of the strategy incorporated service user consultation, not only direct but also consultation carried out as part of the strategic review of long and short term supported accommodation</li> <li>•</li> <li>• SP acknowledges that not all people can move on but challenges the assumption that long term supported housing is always for life.</li> </ul>



### 3. Commissioning Priorities and Strategic Actions

Stakeholder	Feedback	SP Response
SMT (KASS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.9, Obj.1 - Appreciation that budgets are under pressure and need to be tightened. However, proposed measures of reducing housing related support hours will exclusively affect groups that are traditional Social Services clients</li> <li>• P.10/11,Obj.4 - Retendering floating support and discontinuing specialist floating support for people with learning disabilities and HIV/Aids will affect in-house providers. Need a financial impact assessment for KASS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SP team has provided KASS with financial information about the likely impact of the proposed measures and will continue working with KASS during the implementation of the measures</li> </ul>
Commissioning Body (Dec 09)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.13/14 - Since SP requested additional funding for floating support for those fleeing domestic abuse, this should be mentioned under the highest priority groups</li> <li>• Need to use the right change management techniques</li> <li>• Concern expressed re potential decommissioning of extra care provision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SP team acknowledges that this recently identified need had not been included in the strategy-domestic abuse added to priorities</li> <li>• Change management measures to be incorporated in Annual Plan</li> <li>• Assurance given that there will be no decommissioning of extra care services-the measures proposed are about funding extra care services at the same level as sheltered accommodation</li> </ul>
POC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries re. impact of strategy on districts in area of HIAs and currently unused savings</li> <li>• Some elected members expressed concerns about future of warden controlled sheltered accommodation but others took the view that older people's aspirations are changing and that they may not want to live in such accommodation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SP has match funding objective with Health and LHAs to show commitment to joint commissioning-need to secure handyperson funding, some districts may want to withdraw from funding and in most areas PCTs do not contribute directly to funding</li> <li>• Re savings-future programme funding is uncertain, If CLG apply distribution funding grant will reduce and SP must prepare for that</li> <li>• Assurance given that unless service users and providers agree current arrangements in sheltered accommodation will not change</li> </ul>
CFE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for more joint intelligence in working with families so there can be earlier intervention</li> <li>• Know of many families in desperate need of accommodation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SP agrees – one mechanism could be single agency/joint assessment processes</li> <li>• Housing need as such is the responsibility of Local Housing Authorities</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Feedback	SP Response
Service User Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P.13 - More support needed for people misusing alcohol</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SP agrees with this and is committed to maintaining specialist provision for this client group</li> </ul>
Executive Board of Providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P.15 – Concern about funding extra care on same basis as sheltered accommodation: people in extra care require more support, runs counter to older people having options to live independently</li> <li>General lack of recognition of older people’s support needs and long term services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SP supports older people having options to enable them to live independently. However, a task analysis exercise in extra care sheltered services has identified that such services do not provide more housing related support than sheltered schemes</li> <li>Surveys and research have shown that older people’s aspirations are changing and many want stay in their own homes as long as possible. SP is committed to supporting them to do so. Long term supported housing should not be seen as the only option for people who have outgrown its usefulness and wish to live in their own accommodation possibly with a partner/family</li> </ul>
Providers	<p><u>Anchor Trust</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Older people with support needs are identified as a growing group in Kent. Should be one of the Programme’s top priorities for new service development, especially in areas where current distribution does not reflect population size. Older people being at significant risk to themselves or the community if support is not provided</li> </ul> <p><u>Porchlight:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P.6 - Aims of strategy should include ‘to help people in crisis’ as many SP funded services do just this when statutory services are not able to</li> <li>P.7/8 - Diversity is much broader than gender and ethnic origin and we believe that this needs to be reflected within the strategy.</li> <li>P.6 - Re ‘partnership’ working, be more specific about who are the partners</li> <li>Isolation is a central theme throughout the strategy; however there are actions within the strategy which are counterproductive to reducing isolation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SP has to balance the needs of all client groups and needs to prioritise the housing related needs of those for who no statutory agency has responsibility</li> <li>SP committed to distribute flexible floating support services more equitably throughout the Kent so that the needs of older people living in their own homes in the community can be better met</li> <li>Bullet point added under aims of strategy</li> <li>SP agrees and has expanded on this under ‘Diversity’ and ‘Commissioning Priorities’ (p.14)</li> <li>SP has named partners</li> <li>The programme wants to see providers take more responsibility for linking service users to resources in the community, including social groups and</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Feedback	SP Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.14/15 - Single homeless people and rough sleepers should be in top priorities because a person who is homeless/rough sleeping is extremely vulnerable and at high risk of harm e.g. from physical assault, exploitation and abuse</li> <li>• P.14 - Consider decommissioning supported lodgings – contradicts what is one of the current trends in the development of services for young people</li>   <li>• P.17 - Clarify 'strategic withdrawal from accommodation-based service provision in Cliftonville West and Margate Central': just no new funding or withdrawing existing funding and so service provision</li> </ul> <p><u>West Kent Housing Association:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P. 15 – Funding existing housing related support in extra care sheltered housing on the same basis as sheltered housing is wrong because older people in such services have the greatest support needs, may force the hand of providers/ housing associations to bring down the categorisation of these schemes to sheltered only services</li> </ul> <p><u>Maidstone Housing Trust:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.15 – Commissioning priorities should include long term accommodation based services for older people. Older people should have choice in what support services they want. Various national strategies request that older people's housing should be prioritised in regional and local housing strategies</li> <li>• P.16 – Delivering practical interventions does not offer the support requirements for older people as it does not address the 5 key outcomes and in particular social isolation</li>   <li>• Include commitment to review utilisation of the SP rent deposit scheme</li> </ul>	<p>peer support building</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have to balance the needs of all client groups and have to prioritise new development</li>   <li>• SP has qualified this and has made amendments: SP will decommission the supported lodgings service and commission services that is accessible to all young people at risk, including former relevant children and young offenders</li> <li>• SP has clarified this: to no new funding in those areas</li>   <li>• SP supports older people having options to enable them to live independently. However, a task analysis exercise in extra care sheltered services has identified that such services do not provide more housing related support than sheltered schemes</li>   <li>• The SP strategy is not a housing strategy but a housing related support strategy. The programme currently funds services to over 24,000 older people out of a total of just over 29,000 people</li>   <li>• More practical interventions are aimed at sustaining people staying in their own homes. Whilst the Programme promotes interventions to address social exclusion, support workers' contact with individuals through delivery of support does not constitute social inclusion. Longer term solutions look at housing related support linking people to social resources in the community</li> <li>• Funding was a one-off for a specific purpose</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Feedback	SP Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.13 – Query why young people are a priority group</li>   <li>• P. 14 – Targeting of support on families with support needs and people with physical disabilities</li> </ul> <p><u>Catch 22:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.13 – Disagree to decommissioning of supported lodgings. Service should be expanded to include young people at risk.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation exercises with our partners have identified a rising number of often very vulnerable young people being homeless. Many of these young people do not meet statutory criteria and hence fall through the net</li> <li>• The programme needs to continue monitoring the needs of these client groups and ensure generic floating support continues to provide support</li>   <li>• Access is currently restricted to clients of 16+. SP wants to make services accessible to young people at risk including former relevant children and young offenders. Hence, it proposes to decommission the supported lodgings and commission services for young people at risk.</li> </ul>
Districts/boroughs	<p>Dover, TMBC and Sevenoaks in broad agreement with commissioning priorities But noted some concerns.</p> <p><u>TMBC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.9, Obj.1, p.15 - Concerns re potential decommissioning of services for older people. Historical strong focus in borough on such services. Authority will not support withdrawal of legitimate services unless alternative source of funding found</li> </ul> <p><u>Sevenoaks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.15, p.59 – Re. Strategically reviewing HIAs and new commissioning approach must take account of savings to health of DFG provision: cost of preventing hospital admissions should be shared with health care providers. Also look at expanding service provision to include for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SP programme has suggested that a concierge service should be considered for people living in category 1 accommodation and who have not traditionally had access to a scheme manager/ warden. The generic and specialist floating support services will be available to clients across all age groups to meet specific housing related support needs. Also, the voluntary sector may well be able to meet the needs of service users who are not living in category 2 accommodation and who do not have a housing related support need but have other needs which can be met by other services but SP</li> <li>• SP agreed that HIAs contribute greatly to health targets and will be looking at potential match funding and extension of service provision. Text on page 50 amended to acknowledge HIAs role in addressing fuel</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Feedback	SP Response
	<p>example loft clearance and other measures to address fuel poverty</p> <p><u>Dover:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P. 14 – Concerns expressed about decommissioning supported lodgings</li> </ul> <p><u>Maidstone:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.13 - Concern about decommissioning the supported lodgings scheme. Will limit housing options for client group.</li> <li>• P.14 – Query inclusion of eastern European gypsies in the strategic review of housing related support needs of Minority ethnic groups</li> </ul> <p><u>Canterbury City Council:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.14 – Concern expressed about impact of reducing funding in extra care sheltered accommodation on KASS and clients who pay for services</li> </ul>	<p>poverty issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SP has qualified this and has made amendments: SP will decommission the supported lodgings service and commission services that are accessible to all young people at risk, including former relevant children and young offenders</li> <li>• Currently access to the service is restricted. The Programme proposes to commission services under ‘young people at risk’ in order to make the service accessible to all vulnerable young people, including former relevant children and young offenders</li> <li>• It is known that a considerable number of such peoples are living in poor housing conditions in north and east Kent (reference was also made in the 2006 report on the housing related support needs of Minority Ethnic groups</li> <li>• SP has carried out a task analysis that identified the funding of non-housing related support in such schemes. SP can not continue funding such support whilst other clients can not have their legitimate housing related support needs met</li> </ul>
Other stakeholders	<p><u>Mental Health Social Services:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.16 - strategic review of supported housing for people with mental health problems must involve MH commissioners</li> <li>• P.17 - Monies from any services decommissioned in Cliftonville West or Margate Central should be ring fenced for Thanet</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any strategic review involves consulting with wide range of stakeholders.</li> <li>• This is entirely dependent on strategic commissioning priorities across the entire county. The programme will not fund new services in those areas with the exception of already agreed resources to contribute to the work of the Thanet task force. It will also review current provision in those wards and whether or not they contribute to the residualisation in the area.</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Feedback	SP Response
	<p><u>KASS:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.13 – Deaf people and people with mental health problems should have highest priority to since the criteria include ‘who have few advocates’....</li> <li>• P.15 – Housing related support should be delivered irrespective of whether individuals have other support needs.</li>   <li>• P.15 – Different groups are pigeonholed under the label ‘learning disabilities. There is no mention of people on the autistic spectrum who could benefit from services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many deaf people and people with mental health problems are entitled to statutory services. SP prioritises people who fall through all the nets.</li> <li>• The SP vision acknowledges that SP services may ‘complement’ services delivered by statutory and non-statutory services. However, SP proposes to prioritise services for those who have no significant care packages in place and who live in the community rather than in long term accommodation based services.</li> <li>• People with autism can and do already access SP funded services, both accommodation based and floating support. However, SP acknowledges that more research in the needs of this particular group is required.</li> </ul>
	<p>A representative of the <u>Rainbow Forum</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P. 7/8, p.14 Obj.1 - ‘Diversity’ should include people of non-heterosexual orientation. Being gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender compounds other factors in terms of isolation, discrimination and difference/ inadequacy of treatment (e.g. the assumption that someone with learning disabilities, or a single older person living on their own, for example, are heterosexual and therefore "lumping them in" with the majority of service users</li> </ul> <p><u>Gravesham/Dartford Youth Housing LIG</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.14 - concerns about the potential decommissioning of Supported Lodgings for young people. Many young people need this type of longer term accommodation based intervention to facilitate transition to adulthood</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SP recognises the omission and has included reference under ‘Diversity’ and ‘Commissioning Priorities’</li>   <li>• SP has clarified the text: SP will decommission the supported lodgings service and commission services that are accessible to all young people at risk, including former relevant children and young offenders.</li> </ul>

#### 4. Need, Supply, Delivering the Strategy and Consultation Data (Appendices A-E)

Stakeholder	Feedback	SP Response
Other Stakeholders	<p><u>Mental Health Social Services:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.12 - Need for wide dissemination of the findings from the self directed support pilot re lessons learned</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A report will be produced and distributed at the end of the pilot</li> </ul>
Districts/boroughs	<p><u>TMBC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local assessment also show potential support need with regard to additional accommodation due to be provided for gypsies and travellers</li> </ul> <p><u>Sevenoaks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.45 – Incorporate affordable warmth issues into key issues, actions and measures of success for older people with support needs</li> <li>• P.24 – Indicate that some accommodation based units in T'Wells for single homeless (Colebrook Rd.) are shared between Sevenoaks, T&amp;M and Tunbridge Wells</li> </ul> <p><u>Maidstone:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SP should research gaps in provision of accommodation based housing related support for women fleeing domestic abuse with older dependants, high risk offenders and former armed services personnel</li> <li>• P. 18, appendix A – Make strategic context reference to delivering PSA16</li> <li>• P.50, appendix D – Expand on 'impact of allocation policies for social housing'</li> </ul> <p><u>Tunbridge Wells:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.18, appendix A - Add Kent Strategy for Later Life to strategic contexts</li> <li>• P. 39, appendix C – Identify where in west Kent there are gaps in provision for accommodation based services for people with alcohol problems</li> </ul> <p><u>Canterbury City Council:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.47, appendix D – include community safety partnerships in enhanced partnership working</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SP committed to carrying out a strategic review of Minority Ethnic - support needs of gypsies and travellers will be included in that review.</li> <li>• Incorporated into text</li> <li>• Indicated as footnote to table</li> <li>• SP will incorporate any data for those vulnerable groups in its needs analyses</li> <li>• Reference made on p.19</li> <li>• Some housing providers restrict access for particular individuals</li> <li>• Added on p.20</li> <li>• P.39, bullet point amended</li> <li>• P.48 - amended paragraph</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Feedback	SP Response
Providers	<p><u>Anchor Trust</u> expressed the view that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.48 - Capacity building is not appropriate for older people – the move from warden controlled sheltered accommodation to more floating support type service is already being challenged in court. Services taking on volunteers would be unworkable due to practical and management issues</li> <li>• Reconnection policy should go and runs counter to providers' allocation policies</li> <li>• Limiting floating support provision to one year's duration means that it is too prescriptive and not responsive enough in times of crisis</li> <li>• The strategy could be challenged on the breadth of different types of providers and/or current or future service users that were consulted in order to determine its findings</li> </ul> <p><u>Maidstone Housing Trust:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.19 – How does SP contribute to reducing the number of first time entrants to the youth justice system in Kent (young people aged 10-17)</li> <li>• P.19/20 – Targets, SP contributes should include a range of other indicators</li> <li>• P.28 – Units of floating support for older people includes both short and long term services</li> <li>• P.66 – Add third column to summary of provider and other stakeholder feedback to note SP team's views to responses received</li> </ul> <p><u>Porchlight:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs mapping is incomplete since referrals to short term accommodation based support services currently not monitored.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst SP is committed to service users being encouraged to move on to more flexible support provision with a focus on time limited practical interventions, in the case of older people in sheltered accommodation SP also supports self determination: any change can only be implemented where service users agree to it</li> <li>• The reconnection policy only applies to short term accommodation based supported housing – SP has clarified this (p.50 under access to services')</li> <li>• Where individuals need on-going long term support they may require social care rather than housing related support</li> <li>• SP has added a list of providers and more information about service users consulted as part of the drafting the strategy at the end of Appendix E</li> <li>• SP contributes to this objective through supporting young people at risk aged 16/17, and support delivered to families with support needs</li> <li>• The section makes clear that SP contributes to a range of targets and that the quoted ones are not the only ones. However, section has been expanded to include more</li> <li>• Footnote added to table</li> <li>• The SP team works to the governing bodies and is not a stakeholder. Therefore it would not be appropriate to add SP team views to responses</li> <li>• SP agrees that needs analysis would be enriched by monitoring of referrals centrally. The Programme will strategically review referrals into short term</li> </ul>



Stakeholder	Feedback	SP Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be done by SP centrally. Also, providers should be monitored re refusals and acceptance to ensure fair and equal access for all service users</li> </ul> <p><u>Stonham:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.51 – Utilisation and throughput, users experience the process of accessing the rent deposit as slow which might result in loss of identified suitable accommodation</li> </ul>	<p>accommodation based services. Additional bullet points added to strategic actions under objective 5, p.11</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As part of monitoring activities, SP will also monitor access to the rent deposit scheme. Text expanded to take account of this.</li> </ul>