

**COMMENTS FROM THE GUINNESS PARTNERSHIP ON THE DRAFT REPORT  
AND FINDINGS PACK**

	<b>Comments on the Draft Report</b>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Recommendation 2.12 – Monthly meetings – we cannot recall these being agreed at our meeting. What we do recall being agreed was that any ad hoc queries would be raised by the Councillors with the relevant Housing Manager or via Tracey Wood so that issues could be answered / addressed asap.</b>
<b>Officer Response</b>	<i>This recommendation details monthly contact discussions, not meetings. These discussions could be regular phone conversations between officers from this Council and the Guinness Partnership on matters of interest to both parties. This is not anticipated to be an additional burden and may only mean a 5-minute catch-up via telephone. Recommendation 2.13 is recommended to formalise the current process for dealing with ad hoc queries from Councillors.</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>8.1 – We feel that it is inappropriate to single out and name one scheme. Could this be reworded “a complaint from a resident in the Borough”</b>
<b>Officer Response</b>	<i>It is accepted that it is inappropriate to single out one scheme. The first sentence of paragraph 8.1 of the report has therefore been amended to read:  “This review was instigated after a Councillor received complaints from residents <b>at two of the sheltered schemes in the Borough</b>” - Amendments are shown in bold italics)</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>9.1 – “Although the Guinness Partnership issues advice and publications to all its tenants prior to occupation, their tenants appear to expect more services to be provided under a sheltered housing scheme than is promised by the Partnership; in contrast Portsmouth City Council has higher levels of satisfaction”</b>  <b>We do not feel that this is a comparison. Advice and publication is given to TGP tenants prior to them moving in how is this comparable to PCC satisfaction? And also what publication is given to the PCC tenants?</b>
<b>Officer Response</b>	<i>This section has been amended to the following: ‘Both the Guinness Partnership and Portsmouth City Council give publications on the service provided to tenants prior to move-in. However, compared to the tenants of Portsmouth City Council a larger percentage of Guinness Partnership tenants had a higher expectation of the anticipated services provided under a sheltered housing scheme than was actually provided by the Partnership.’  <i>Publications published by the Partnership and Portsmouth City Council is included in Section H of the Findings Pack</i></i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>9.3 – TGP do not have sheltered housing schemes but housing for older persons – this is why the same handbook is used.</b>

<p><b>Officer Response</b></p>	<p>According to the Council's records the schemes surveyed are historically known as sheltered housing schemes. This term has been used in correspondence and at a meeting with representatives of the Partnership and at no time prior to the receipt of the comments of the Partnership on the draft report and findings pack has the use of this term to describe the Partnership's schemes been challenged. The fact that the Partnership refer to Herriot House as a "sheltered housing scheme" in a recent advertisement for a job</p> <p><a href="http://www.jobsgopublic.com/jobs/domestic-j2382/from/fbabb9o3txw0/1/of/19/opening_at/desc">http://www.jobsgopublic.com/jobs/domestic-j2382/from/fbabb9o3txw0/1/of/19/opening_at/desc</a></p> <p>justifies the use of the term to describe the schemes surveyed.</p> <p>The fact that the use of this term has been questioned at this stage of the review emphasises the need for better communication by the Partnership as recommended in paragraph 2.14 of the report.</p> <p>In working practice, officers refer to schemes as housing for older persons.</p>
<p><b>Comment</b></p>	<p><b>9.4 – TGP do measure and publicise it's performance</b></p>
<p><b>Officer Response</b></p>	<p>Guinness has accepted that its does not provide statistics against all of its performance targets e.g. the amount of repairs not undertaken within timescales (see the answer to question 1 (page 93 of the findings pack) and the notes of the Panel held on 3 October 2016 on page 223 of the findings pack.</p>
<p><b>Comment</b></p>	<p><b>9.5 – Wording is not correct - "Guinness Partnership claim that 92%" . This is not a claim but the result of our survey.</b></p> <p><b>This is based on a very small % of residents that responded to the questionnaire ( only 71 residents out of over 1000 older persons residing in Guinness housing for older persons)</b></p> <p><b>We feel that 100% checks on all repairs carried by PCC is incorrect. We are not aware of any RSL that has the resource to check 100% of all repairs carried out – to achieve this, the rents would need to be increased significantly.</b></p>
<p><b>Officer Response</b></p>	<p><i>It is accepted that the reference to the 92% satisfaction record needs to be clarified.</i></p> <p><i>The problem of the number of responses to the Councillor survey is addressed in page 34 of the Findings Pack</i></p> <p><i>Portsmouth City Council has in its response to questions raised by the Council indicated that "Customer satisfaction is sought from the resident at the point the repair is completed..." which suggests all repairs are checked. This statement has not been challenged by Portsmouth City Council and therefore there is no reason to doubt this part of paragraph 9.5.</i></p> <p><i>As a result, paragraph 9.5 has been amended to read:</i></p>

	<p><i>'Although Guinness Partnership record 92% satisfaction with repair contractors, this figure relates to all properties owned by the Partnership and not solely repairs in sheltered housing schemes. The Panel's survey shows that 51% of those that took part in the survey consider that the repair service is poor. This suggests that the partnership's policy of only checking 10% of repairs across all properties in Housing is not a true reflection of the views of their customers in sheltered housing schemes. In contrast Portsmouth City Council checks all its repairs and has a higher level of satisfaction with repairs.</i></p>
<b>Comment</b>	<p><b>9.9 – From the completed questionnaires we could only find one resident that reported they were unhappy with the way TGP handled ASB reports. Therefore, we do not feel that this comment is factually correct and should be taken out.</b></p> <p><b>“The Panel acknowledges that Guinness Partnership has a robust anti social behaviour policy and processes for dealing with such behaviour can be lengthy”.</b></p> <p><b>It is the legal process through the courts that is lengthy, not TGP processes.</b></p>
<b>Officer Response</b>	<p><i>Our records show that more than one resident made complaints about anti-social behaviour and the way this was dealt with. Therefore the first sentence of paragraph 9.9 is correct and does not need to be removed.</i></p> <p><i>It is accepted that the reason for the time taken to resolve anti social behaviour complaints need to be clarified. Therefore the second sentence of paragraph 9.9 of the report has been amend to read (changes highlighted in bold)</i></p> <p><i>'The Panel acknowledge that Guinness Partnership has an anti social behaviour policy <b>and the legal processes</b> for dealing with such behaviour through the courts can be lengthy'</i></p>
<b>Comment</b>	<p><b>All of the above points are repeated in the Finding Pack. Therefore, if changes are made please can you ensure they are also made in the Finding Pack as well.</b></p>
<b>Officer Response</b>	<p><i>The Findings Pack has been amended accordingly</i></p>
	<p><b>Comments on the Findings Pack</b></p>
<b>Comment</b>	<p><b>Pg. 3 – “The objective of this Scrutiny was to investigate the standard of accommodation for residents in supported sheltered housing”. TGP does not have supported sheltered housing but housing for older persons – these are not the same type of housing so the services provided can not be compared like for like.</b></p>
<b>Officer</b>	<p><i>The Panel feel the original statement is appropriate and requires no changes.</i></p>

<b>Response</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Recommendation 2 – As above (2.2) – we do not recall monthly meetings agreed.</b>
<b>Officer Response</b>	<i>Response set out above</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>9 – “a link to the definition of Sheltered Housing be included in the Home Choice website”. There is a clear difference between the types of housing by both providers and the services offered. This needs to be made clear on the website.</b>
<b>Officer Response</b>	<i>Agreed - The purpose of this recommendation is to ensure that this is clear for any potential tenants</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Pg. 35 – Figure 2 – in the graph what does the red in the index represent? This is not clear</b>
<b>Officer Response</b>	<i>This has been corrected in the findings pack</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Pg. 39 – “Although anti social behaviour is given a high priority the process of working with a multitude of partner bodies to build up the necessary evidence to enable Guinness to evict troublesome tenants can take up to 2 years”. It is the legal process that can take up to 2 years not TGP process. Can “troublesome” be taken out – we do not feel that it is needed.</b>
<b>Officer Responses</b>	<i>The Panel feels that the use of ‘troublesome’ in this paragraph is appropriate. The first paragraph on page 39 of the findings pack has been amended to read as follows:  “Although anti social behaviour is given a high priority, the legal processes to enable Guinness to evict troublesome tenants can take up to 2 years’</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Pg. 39 - Complaints – the complex complaints are investigated and responded to in 10 days not 3 days as detailed</b>
<b>Officer Responses</b>	<i>The findings pack has been amended accordingly</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Pg. 39 Support Services – “the previous service whereby residents where they were contacted every day to check on their well-being was supplied by Hampshire County Council and ceased when supported people funding was withdrawn. There was a long lead-in time for this change and residents were informed through letters, roadshows, meetings and conversations with scheme managers. Scheme managers were also discontinued due to funding constraints, and were replaced by ‘Retirement Living Advisors’ (RLAs) who are only on-site for specific times. Daily checks on residents were now not possible due to funding constraints.” The service was not provided by HCC but funded by them. Scheme Managers were not also discontinued. This was the service funded by HCC.</b>

	<i>(The Partnership have clarified that this paragraph was read as if it was saying that 2 different services had been withdrawn/discontinued– a service where residents were contacted every day &amp; also a scheme manager service. The Scheme Managers were the service where residents were contacted every day. The service was not supplied by HCC but was funded by them)</i>
<b>Officer Responses</b>	<i>To address this concern the second paragraph under the heading Support Services on page 39 of the findings pack has been amended as follows:  ‘The Scheme Manager service whereby residents were contacted every day check on their well-being was funded by Hampshire County Council and ceased when Supporting People funding was withdrawn There was a long lead-in time for this change and residents were informed through letters, roadshows, meetings and conversations with scheme managers. The current arrangement is for Retirement Living Advisors’ (RLAs) to be on site for specific times only. Daily checks on residents were now not possible due to funding constraints.’</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>“RLA’s have their main offices located at The Lodge and this is where they conducted administrative tasks. Staff were often out at the various schemes they look after during the day and when staff were present at The Lodge, they may not be available to help Residents”. We do not feel that this is relevant to the report – please can it be taken out.</b>
<b>Officer Responses</b>	<i>This was mentioned at the meeting with the Panel and is relevant to the review (see notes of the meeting of the Panel held on 5 October 2016 on page 226 of the findings pack)</i>

**COMMENTS FROM PORTSMOUTH CITY COUNCIL ON THE DRAFT REPORT AND FINDINGS PACK**

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Page 209 of the Findings Pack refers to PCC Housing Association schemes - could this be amended to PCC Sheltered Housing Schemes - ie delete a reference to Housing Association.</b>
<b>Officer Responses</b>	<i>This comment is accepted and the final Findings Pack has been amended accordingly</i>

**COMMENTS FROM THE CABINET LEAD FOR COMMUNITIES AND HOUSING**

<b>Comment</b>	<p><b>May I point out that as the relatively new Cabinet Lead for Communities and Housing, I have already requested that Tracey Wood arrange regular meetings for us both with our sheltered housing providers.</b></p> <p><b>It is therefore not necessary for this to be recommended by the Scrutiny Panel.</b></p>
<b>Officer Response</b>	<p><i>It is pleasing to note that the recommendations of the Panel are being implemented prior to formal approval by the Scrutiny Board and Cabinet.</i></p> <p><i>However, the Panel's recommendation will remain as part of the final report.</i></p>