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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report was commissioned by the Northamptonshire Councils and CCGs with the aim of

- Building and defending a robust evidence base/toolkit which covers demand and supply, affordability, tenure and type of housing/care across the County
- Highlighting emerging models of provision and comparing costs/benefits and affordability with present models as represented by both the existing stock and ongoing new provision by established providers
- Engaging with the range of stakeholders, including providers, planners and health, housing and social care teams across Northamptonshire to draw up appropriate development briefs/marketing information to ensure provision of a range of housing and care options across the County.

The project was intended to supplement the Northamptonshire County Council (NCC) Older Persons Accommodation Strategy and to form part of the evidence base for emerging Part II local plans in both North Northamptonshire and West Northamptonshire.

The project was carried out using a combination of desk research, compilation of good practice and literature review, modelling of demand for various older persons housing and care options and an email survey of local registered providers to collect their views on the condition and suitability of their older persons housing stock.

The report forecasts demand for new provision to the end of the local plan period of 319 units of older persons housing per annum in North Northamptonshire and 306 units per annum in West Northamptonshire. The figures for North Northamptonshire are higher than those quoted in the Joint Core Strategy and represent a move to increase the proportion of older person households living in specialist accommodation.

In all districts except Corby demand for retirement housing is predominantly for outright purchase. In Corby potential demand is stronger for shared ownership. Because the majority of older households in Northamptonshire are home owners but most of the existing older persons stock is social rented there is no need to provide additional social rented accommodation. However we were advised by registered providers that the existing social rented stock, though structurally sound and without excessive voids, was nonetheless of poor quality compared with modern standards. There is therefore likely to be a need to modernise the existing social rented stock in the County.

Northamptonshire does not have enough good quality care home beds (3 goods CQC rating) to meet current demand and will need to increase provision, particularly outside Northampton and Wellingborough. An additional 909 care home beds are needed by 2030.

More than half (56%) of all care home beds are currently occupied by people with dementia and memory problems. Potential demand for care home beds could be reduced and quality of life improved by provision of dementia villages and other specialist housing schemes for people with dementia. Each district should aim to make suitable provision within its area.

Such a step change in older persons housing provision will be challenging within current housing allocations. The report makes a number of recommendations for how local plans and neighbourhood plans can facilitate provision of retirement housing including
• Support for windfall sites which come forward for retirement housing and care homes from other uses.

• Allocation of employment and retail sites for housing usage, specifying that they must include or be provided solely for retirement housing and care homes.

• The preparation of Brownfield Registers should incorporate criteria that assess the suitability of identified sites to make provision for retirement housing.

The report also recommends that all public sector bodies should review their land holdings in order to identify the existence of sites which are potentially suitable for retirement housing provision.

A location with good access to public transport links and to local facilities is essential for retirement housing and care homes and we recommend that such schemes are not located in rural areas without public transport. Hub and spoke models may have a role in improving care provision in more remote villages.

Sustainable Urban Extensions can play an important role in meeting future needs for specialist older persons accommodation and should do so in the first instance by zoning sites for future development of older persons housing/care homes and public transport routes are in place.

The Housing White Paper (paragraph 2.49) proposes to introduce a new ‘housing delivery test’. This will focus attention on monitoring the progress that local authorities are making towards achieving development plan housing requirements. If development is not progressing as planned this will have implications for whether the development plan remains up-to-date. Whether older persons housing counts as Use Class C3 (housing) or C2 (residential care) therefore has implications for the delivery of housing targets.

We recommend that the local councils immediately set out the current pipeline of commitments and recent record of completions for retirement housing and / or care homes and identify which of these that are considered to contribute towards development plan housing requirements.

The Part 2 Local Plans (or supporting SPD) should provide a clear definition of what is C2 and what is C3.

It will be important to plan for and monitor provision of retirement housing and care home beds and also to ensure that units provided are of good standard. Clear guidance needs to be given to potential developers as to the standards which are expected to be achieved and we provide a checklist as part of our recommendations (chapter 5).

There is scope for a wider range of specialist providers to become active in the County and the local authorities should work together to improve links with providers and to market Northamptonshire as a place where retirement housing and care provision is welcomed.

We were asked to comment on the potential for provision of retirement housing to reduce the frequency of patients being stranded in hospital for long periods when there was no medical need for them to be there. We were unable to obtain local information about the reasons why people remain in hospital when they could potentially be discharged but national

1 Noting that according to one major retirement housing provider around 90% of their housing is provided on windfall sites.
data compiled by the GMB suggests that unsuitable housing accounts for less than 3% of stranded patients.
1. INTRODUCTION

Study brief

1.1 Three Dragons and Associates (Celandine Strategic Housing, Mead Consulting and Troy Planning and Design) were commissioned by a consortium of local authorities and Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) in Northamptonshire to carry out a study into Housing and Support of Older People across Northamptonshire. The client team was led by Northamptonshire County Council (NCC) and we are very grateful to all members of the client team for their support.

1.2 The study brief set out a range of objectives which can be summarised as follows:

- Building and defending a robust evidence base/toolkit which covers demand and supply, affordability, tenure and type of housing/care across the County
- Highlight emerging models of provision and compare costs/benefits and affordability with present models as represented by both the existing stock and ongoing new provision by established providers
- Engage with the range of stakeholders, including providers, planners and health, housing and social care teams across Northamptonshire to draw up appropriate development briefs/marketing information to ensure provision of a range of housing and care options across the County.

1.3 The project was intended to supplement the Northamptonshire County Council (NCC) Older Persons Accommodation Strategy and to form part of the evidence base for emerging Part II local plans in both North Northamptonshire and West Northamptonshire.

1.4 The research brief was very wide-ranging and multi-disciplinary. Some aspects of our report will already be familiar to some members of the commissioning group, while others bring little known information to a wider audience and enable all concerned to have a shared level of understanding. We anticipate that the research can be used in a range of ways:

- Evidence of demand will enable local authorities to encourage new development that is appropriate to local needs
- Awareness of the national context and how good practice can be applied in local policies and plans
- It can be a starting point for more detailed work to make best use of the existing stock
- To make advice and information on housing options available to older people
- Enable informed decision-making when commissioning new development
- Awareness of emerging approaches to provision can inform local initiatives.

Method

1.5 The study included the following components
• Literature review identifying examples of good practice in retirement housing provision

• Review of local plan policies re older persons housing in London and the South East – and a brief analysis of emerging practice in Neighbourhood Plans

• Email survey of social housing providers in Northamptonshire to assess demand for voids, stock condition and affordability and new development intentions (Note: due to commercial confidentiality and the scope of the research brief there was no comparable survey of private sector providers)

• Use of the Retirement Housing Group (RHG) model to forecast demand for older persons housing in Northamptonshire to the end of the local plan period (2029 in West Northamptonshire and 2031 in North Northamptonshire)

1.6 This report summarises findings from the study and identifies key items which should be included in any marketing information to potential developers and in the preparation of development briefs. More detailed information setting out information gathered through the various workstreams is set out in Annexes 1-4.

1.7 The study was carried out in the period from July 2016 to February 2017.
2. WHAT IS RETIREMENT HOUSING?

2.1 The ethos for all specialist housing for older people is that it provides an environment where residents can care for themselves, retaining independence and security of tenure.

2.2 It is essential that there is a common understanding among policy makers, developers and older people regarding the nature of the specialist housing facilities, services and costs in order that needs can be met appropriately.

2.3 To reflect current provision and the types of specialist housing required for the future in Northamptonshire, this report adopts the following descriptions:

- **Age-restricted or age-exclusive independent accommodation** i.e. housing provided for sale or rent (with the full legal rights of being a tenant or homeowner) with occupation restricted (through planning conditions) to people of above a specified age - usually 55 or 60. It offers self-contained accommodation with no additional facilities or services. New accommodation will be built to the access standards set out in Part M of the Building Regulations which include criteria for accessibility at the entrance level. More detailed information about the Part M provisions are included in Annex 4, the review of literature and practice (p24). The Housing White Paper now sets a clear expectation that all planning authorities should set policies using the Optional Building Regulations to bring forward an adequate supply of accessible housing to meet local need.\(^2\)

- **Specialist housing for older people** i.e. all forms of housing for older people provided for sale or rent (with the full legal rights of being a tenant or homeowner) which offer self-contained accommodation for each household and additional facilities or services. In all cases, the purpose is to facilitate self-care, independence and to provide a secure home for life.

  I. **Retirement housing** i.e. a sub-group of specialist housing for older people which provides some additional facilities. These could typically include a secure main entrance, residents’ lounge, access to an emergency alarm service and a guest room. Additional support to maintain independence can be purchased as needed. This is often known as “sheltered housing” in the affordable sector and “retirement living” leasehold accommodation in the private sector. A scheme manager may be based on site for a set number of hours or the entire working day. The manager service and costs such as cleaning and heating communal areas would be paid for through a service charge. The level of service varies considerably from provider to provider with the private sector typically offering greater on site presence. Retirement housing would also include “independent living” schemes (sometimes former affordable sheltered schemes where support services have been discontinued) which are designed for ease of access, may have some communal areas and are restricted to older people but where no additional

---

\(^2\) Para 4.42 Fixing our Broken Housing Market (Housing White Paper), February 2017
services are provided automatically. This type of accommodation falls within Planning Use Class C3.

II. **Supported housing** i.e. a sub-group of specialist housing for older people with a greater range of facilities than retirement housing and with support and care services available. Each household has self-contained accommodation. The additional facilities will include restaurants, communal lounges, social space and staff on site 24 hours a day. Service charges are likely to be higher than in retirement housing, reflecting this more extensive range of facilities. The accommodation is often described as “care ready” and care services are provided in a manner that can respond flexibly to increasing need while enabling the individual to retain their place within that community. Emergency support is available on a 24-hour basis and planned support can be arranged from on site or external staff. Supported housing of this type is often known as Extra Care housing or “assisted living”. This type of accommodation has been interpreted as falling within Planning Use Class C3 and C2.

III. **Retirement Villages** i.e. a larger-scale variant of specialist housing for older people first developed in the UK in the late 1990’s involving clusters of accommodation with a central hub providing a range of facilities, including restaurants, cafes, shops, swimming pools, gyms/spa to create a village atmosphere. Some of these also include registered care home accommodation for people with high levels of dependency/health problems. Again, the concept is that residents can “age in place” without needing to move again. These villages are usually developed close to existing centres of population and promote the use of village facilities by non-residents, both to enable integration and generate income.

- Residential and nursing homes i.e. institutional establishments which are not specialist housing. They provide accommodation, care and/or nursing for people whose care or health needs mean that they cannot live independently. Each resident will have a bedroom rather than a self-contained flat. Meals, housekeeping services, care and nursing are provided by the establishment. This type of accommodation falls within Planning Use Class C2.

**What level of support and care do retirement and supported housing provide compared to general needs housing?**

2.4 The support and care services provided in specialist housing for older people vary between tenures, types of accommodation (retirement or supported housing) and between providers; typical characteristics are described here.

2.5 General needs housing (including age-restricted or age-exclusive independent accommodation provided for people above a specified age) includes no additional services. A person with support or care needs would need to obtain services assessed and funded via local authority Adult Social Care (ASC) or privately.

2.6 **Retirement housing** will often provide a support service as well as housekeeping of communal areas, grounds and building maintenance. In private leasehold schemes a
manager is usually available on site to support all residents throughout the working day. The support service and costs such as cleaning and heating communal areas are usually paid for through a service charge. Support services in social rented retirement housing may be charged separately. They are increasingly being provided on a needs basis rather than universally to all residents.

2.7 Support service design will be influenced by local commissioning decisions and will be funded by ASC or Housing Benefit (HB), depending on local circumstances. As a resident’s needs change the level of support can be reassessed and changed. Care needs can be assessed separately by ASC and a care package agreed with the cost met by ASC or the individual, depending on eligibility.

2.8 **Supported housing** is often described as “care ready” and provides a higher level of assistance to residents with support and care provided on site on a 24-hour basis. There is normally a restaurant on-site. Care services can respond flexibly to increasing need, enabling the individual to retain their place within their existing community. Again, some support services may be eligible for HB but the remaining support services will be charged through service charges. Care costs will be met by ASC or the resident, depending on their needs and financial situation.

2.9 It should be noted that eligibility criteria differ for housing and care:
- Access to social rented retirement housing is based purely on housing need; eligibility criteria for shared ownership for older people can, in some cases, also include an element of housing need.
- Social rented supported housing will be available to people with both housing and care needs, with negotiated nomination rights for ASC clients. Many providers will aim to maintain a balance of residents with high, medium and low care needs in their schemes in order to sustain a sense of community. This can mean that the person with the greatest care need may not be suitable for a vacancy which arises.
- Private accommodation is available to anyone who can afford it and whose needs are not assessed as being beyond the scope of the services available.

2.10 In principle, all forms of specialist housing for older people are capable of catering for people with early and mid-stage dementia provided appropriate care is available. Late stage dementia which may be characterised by wandering and aggression is more difficult to deal with. Most people living with dementia are in older age groups and will therefore benefit from housing features that are age friendly. The literature review undertaken for this project goes into much greater detail regarding building and service design to support people with cognitive impairment (Annex 4, pp 5-7). Paragraph 2.18 below summarises good practice in design. Annex 4 p9 also describes the Dementia Care housing model which provides intensive support in a shared bungalow setting delivering positive outcomes at comparable costs to placement care.

**Good practice in design and service provision**

**Location and building design**

2.11 A desirable location for specialist accommodation for older people is one which enables residents to continue to carry out their usual activities, remain part of the
community and maximise their health and quality of life. This is recognised in the Housing White Paper which states that guidance produced by the Secretary of State will “place clearer expectations about planning to meet the needs of older people, including supporting the development of such homes near local services\(^3\).

2.12 Given the significance of location, it will be important for public bodies in Northamptonshire to work together to identify suitably situated public land and to consider options for undertaking or encouraging development for housing for older people on such sites.

2.13 Criteria for development location, building and service design are discussed in detail in Annex 4, pp14-17. Table 2.1 below represents a synthesis of the good practice sources described in Annex 4.

---

\(^3\) Para 4.42 Fixing our Broken Housing Market (Housing White Paper), February 2017
Table 2.1 Criteria for site selection, building and service design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA FOR SPECIALIST HOUSING SCHEMES FOR OLDER PEOPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of demand in the immediate area (including evidence from independent modelling such as that undertaken for the Northamptonshire research into the housing needs of older people in 2016-17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum area of 0.2 to 0.6 hectares (ideally at least 0.5 ha). Retirement villages and some supported housing schemes will be much larger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level or with a slope of no more than 1:20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a town centre, established community or phased development as an SUE becomes established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe, level walking route to facilities and services. Within 400m of public transport route with regular service (at least half hourly) to town centre transport hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services within 400m High priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General store; ATM; doctor; pharmacy (or with an established delivery service to the area); access to public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdresser; day and cultural centres; places of worship; newsagent; public garden or park; post office or bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping centre; restaurants; café; allotments; bookshops; sport centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets HAPPI criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generous internal space standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plenty of natural light in the home and in circulation spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Balconies and outdoor space, avoiding internal corridors and single-aspect flats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adaptability and ‘care aware’ design which is ready for emerging telecare and tele-healthcare technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Circulation spaces that encourage interaction and avoid an ‘institutional feel’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shared facilities and community ‘hubs’ where these are lacking in the neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plants, trees, and the natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High levels of energy efficiency, with good ventilation to avoid overheating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extra (external) storage for belongings and bicycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shared external areas such as ‘home zones’ that give priority to pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional features:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mobility vehicle storage and charging area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Broadband available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lifts to upper floors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Secure main entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-centred services (**Additional features of supported housing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to an emergency alarm service or a regular wellbeing check (by phone, intercom or visit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Needs-based support service to facilitate independent living e.g. assistance with literacy, budgeting, self-care, mental health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Signposting or referral to specialist support agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social integration - leisure activities, events and outings organised by residents or delivered by support provider or scheme manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Games room and equipment (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Onsite emergency response and personal care services**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Restaurant providing at least one nutritionally balanced main meal per day which can be delivered to residents who are sick or recently discharged from hospital **
- Treatment room where physician, chiropodist, physiotherapist or other health professionals can visit and provide confidential advice **
- Onsite defibrillator **
- Organisation signed up to the NHICE End of Life Care for Adults Quality Standard **

### FEATURES OF GENERAL HOUSING DESIRABLE FOR OLDER PEOPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of home</th>
<th>Within the home</th>
<th>Beyond the home</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartment (with lift to first floor and above) or bungalow</td>
<td>• Meets Building Regulations Optional Access Standards Category M2 or M3 (standard to be decided locally based on evidence of requirements)</td>
<td>• Located in areas with features of Lifetime Neighbourhoods e.g. pavement seating, well maintained paving, access to WCs</td>
<td>• Connected to local facilities but home is in an age-restricted development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to open space – garden, balcony, courtyard</td>
<td>• Generous space standards and flexible room layouts suited to the lifestyle of older people based on co-design work in DWELL report Designing for Downsizers: <a href="http://www.housinglin.org.uk/_assets/DWELL_DesigningWithDownsizers.pdf">http://www.housinglin.org.uk/_assets/DWELL_DesigningWithDownsizers.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Met Building Regulations Optional Access Standards Category M2 or M3 (standard to be decided locally based on evidence of requirements)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The maximum advised gradient for slopes and ramps for use by older people, Factsheet on The Design of Streets with Older People in Mind, Inclusive Design for Getting Outdoors.

### Car parking

2.14 Specialist housing for older people will generally have a lower level of parking provision than general needs housing. In the past, this has typically been one space for every two dwellings (including 5-10% disabled parking spaces). However, as people continue to drive at an older age, developers and some local authorities have found that provision closer to one space per household is required. Urban/ rural location and public transport links will also influence decisions regarding provision.

2.15 In a supported housing scheme, additional spaces are likely to be required for staff and visitors plus a pick-up area for ambulances.

### Gardens

2.16 The provision of access to a garden is extremely important to the wellbeing of residents. The active and passive use of gardens can offer older people physiological, psychological and social benefits⁴. Good practice in design is discussed in detail in Annex 4, p22.

---

⁴ York and Wiseman 2012
Designing for People with Dementia

2.17 There is no single definition or benchmark for dementia friendly housing, but emerging good practice has been developed in relation to:

- building design
- furniture & fittings
- services and support.

Good practice in these areas is covered more fully in Annex 4, pp 5-9.

2.18 *Practice Advice on Dementia and Town Planning* provides a summary from a planning perspective of what dementia is, its current and projected prevalence, why and how good planning can benefit people with dementia and reduce health and social care costs. While looking more widely than housing design, the Practice Advice highlights key principles of which planners can usefully be aware:

- safe environment
- visual clues (e.g. to orientation and way-finding)
- interior design
- noise
- natural or stronger artificial light
- outside space.

The cost of development

**Affordable and mixed tenure**

2.19 Traditionally, registered providers of affordable housing (RPs) have developed specialist housing schemes for older people using a combination of commercial borrowing, social housing grant from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) and capital funding for supported housing from the Department of Health. HCA funding is made available in line with Government policy. Until recently the current programme favoured shared ownership and low cost homes for sale, making very limited grant available for rented accommodation. RPs with appropriate financial strength also access funds via the bond market.

2.20 In the past, RPs subsidised the development of social rented units in mixed tenure schemes through sale of shared ownership and market sale properties. Current Government priorities for funding and restrictions on social rent levels mean that cross-subsidy has become increasingly difficult. Recent policy changes taking a broader approach to providing homes in all tenures are reported more fully in Annex 4, pp34-35. While these may be helpful when considering upgrading existing social rented retirement housing schemes, our modelling indicates that local demand is primarily for home ownership, not for social or affordable rent.

2.21 In 2015, the Government introduced measures placing additional pressure on social housing businesses and impacting on their ability to raise funds for development. This includes rent reduction of 1% per year from 2016-2020, sale of high value council

---

3 Dementia and Town Planning, RTPI, January 2017
homes, extension of the Right to Buy. A particularly significant threat to social landlords’ income is the announcement that housing benefit payments for social rents are to be capped at the same level of the maximum payable against private rents. This level is set through the Local Housing Allowance (LHA) system. Some of these measures are now being reconsidered but have left an atmosphere of uncertainty among RPs and local authorities which is not conducive to taking financial risks on the scale required for specialist housing development. It is therefore unsurprising that those providers which responded to our survey were not planning additional developments. However, it should be noted that development may also be held back by other factors such as the supply of land and the existence of up to date evidence of need and demand (such as that provided by this report).

Private development

2.22 Capital for privately developed retirement and supported housing is raised from the commercial banking and investment sector. More stringent banking requirements since 2008 have forced developers to act more cautiously in taking sites forward. They are required to achieve higher levels of forecast surplus/gross profit/internal rate of return (IRR) in order to protect investors from possible losses. The financial viability of developing a site is therefore fundamental to the ability to build additional specialist housing.

The cost of occupation

2.23 As a general principle, developing and operating supported housing costs more than for retirement housing because a larger site is required for more on-site facilities and larger units with a much higher percentage of communal areas including sufficient space for care provision and equipment. These additional costs feed through into higher selling prices and service charges and mean that although there is a market for leasehold supported accommodation, some older people will be able to afford to buy retirement housing but not supported housing.

2.24 Evidence collected by Retirement Housing Group provides an illustration of the difference in development standards and potential capital cost to the consumer between retirement housing and supported housing. RHG suggests that:

- Typical scheme size is 0.5 ha accommodating approximately 50-60 retirement housing or 40-50 supported housing units
- Unit sizes: retirement housing 50 sq m 1 bed flat, 75 sq m 2 bed flat, supported housing 65 sq m 1 bed flat, 80 sq m 2 bed flat
- Communal space: retirement housing 20-30%, supported housing 35-40% of gross internal area
- Minimum house price: 1 bed retirement housing 75% of price of an existing 3 bed semi, 2 bed retirement housing 100% of price of an existing 3 bed semi. Supported

---

6 Funding ExtraCare Housing Technical Brief, Housing Learning Improvement Network, 2013
7 Pages 21-41 and page 44, Funding ExtraCare Housing Technical Brief, Housing Learning Improvement Network, 2013
8 CIL and sheltered housing and extra care developments: a briefing note on viability, RHG, updated February 2016
housing properties are on average 25% more expensive than retirement housing properties.

2.25 Service charges (excluding care costs) are also higher for supported housing than for retirement housing. McCarthy and Stone is one of the few providers to have provided comparative information on the cost of these two housing options. The company’s website FAQs states that:

- “For a typical Retirement Living [i.e. retirement housing] apartment (based on Emma Court in Basingstoke), the service charge is £35.35 per week for a one bedroom apartment for the financial year of 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2016. For a two bedroom apartment, it is £53.03 per week.

- For a typical Assisted Living [i.e. supported housing] apartment (based on Lady Susan Court in Basingstoke), the service charge is £118.85 per week for a one bedroom apartment for the financial year of 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2016. For a two bedroom apartment, it is £158.59 per week.

- Costs in Assisted Living developments are higher than in Retirement Living schemes to reflect the increased staffing costs, the provision of domestic support packages, and the table service restaurant provided on site."

2.26 Comparing the cost of occupying different types of specialist housing for older people with residential care is complicated by the range of charges, the way those charges are expressed and variations in the services which are included. The table below attempts a simplified comparison by showing rent and service charges (where relevant) for local specialist housing options plus a fee for ten and a half hours’ care per week charged at the County Council rate alongside residential care fees which include care and accommodation (see note 5). In practice, the level of care will, of course, vary according to the needs of the individual.

---

9 Note that while provision of one meal per day in a group setting is a key service distinguishing supported housing from retirement housing, it is not always delivered as a table service.

10 This represents Level 2 of care in the County’s Personal Support Service in 2016 as detailed in NCC briefing note on Client Contributions in Extra Care
Table 2.2: Comparative weekly cost of different types of 1 bedroom accommodation for older people in Northamptonshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social rented retirement housing (sheltered) (1)</th>
<th>Private leasehold retirement housing (retirement living) after initial purchase (2) (4)</th>
<th>Social rented supported (Extra Care) housing (1)</th>
<th>Private leasehold supported housing (assisted living) after initial purchase (3) (4)</th>
<th>Residential care (single room) (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent and service charges</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>£435 - £1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5 hours Care pw</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Care already included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total pw</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>£435 - £1,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
1: Maximum figure for rent and service charge reported by a local provider. Most or all of this will qualify for HB under current rules. Government decisions on the maximum amount of rent and service charge that will be eligible for HB will determine the future affordability of specialist housing for affordable rent.
2: Typical service charge and ground rent for a comparable market area
3: Service charge and ground rent for a development in Northamptonshire opened in 2016
4: A small number of residents may be paying a mortgage in addition to the service charges. However, the majority will have funded their property purchase from the sale of their previous home.
In addition, an "event fee" is chargeable when the property is sold or sub-let. The fee can vary from 1% to 30% of the open market value depending on provider.
When the property is sold, the event fee can be taken from the proceeds of sale.
5: Range of fees reported in NCC briefing note on comparative costs and client contributions. Fees cover the combined cost of accommodation, housekeeping, meals and care.
All figures are rounded.

2.27 NCC advise that weekly payments for residential home placements are inclusive sums covering all costs i.e. accommodation, care, housekeeping, laundry and meals. A key disadvantage of this approach is lack of personalisation with the possibility that staff attention may be concentrated on residents with the highest care needs to the detriment of those with lower needs.

2.28 NCC also advise that the wide range of residential home fees arises from factors including the cost of development and borrowing, the size of the home and the number of placements made by the local authority, staffing levels and skills and variation across the county.

2.29 Figures\(^{11}\) published by the BBC in December 2016 looked at 2014-15 (i.e. predating the data in Table 2.2) showed the average cost of residential care provided by NCC as £529

\(^{11}\) Based on sources including NHS Digital, LaingBuisson and local authority responses to Freedom of Information requests
per person per week of which NCC paid £389 and the individual receiving care contributed £140 per week.

**Shared ownership and shared equity**

2.30 Specialist shared ownership housing for older people has been provided in England for several years but on a very small scale. The level of provision can be attributed to factors including limited willingness of mortgage lenders to lend for shared ownership and the overall size of the sector. Apart from specialist providers such as the Extra Care Charitable Trust, RPs will be unlikely to favour specialist housing development for shared ownership unless this is sought by the local authority and there is evidence of demand. The HCA Older People Shared Ownership scheme allows people to buy up to 75% of the equity and where they opt for the full 75% they pay no rent on the remaining 25%.

2.31 Some private sector providers, most notably Retirement Security Ltd, operate shared equity schemes which provide a similar product.

**Affordable rented specialist housing (sheltered and Extra Care housing)**

2.32 Social housing tenants will be charged for rent, the cost of any housing-related support and service charges for services provided on site such as heating of communal areas, grounds maintenance, cleaning and caretaking. Service charges will generally be higher in supported housing due to the greater range of facilities and services provided. Support or care costs will be agreed in advance and charged for separately by the provider, which may be the landlord. Changes to Housing Benefit Regulations as to which support costs qualify for HB and forthcoming decisions regarding the LHA cap will have implications for the ability of some residents to afford to pay charges which cease to be covered by HB. These issues are discussed more fully in Annex 4.

**Private leasehold specialist accommodation (Retirement and Assisted Living)**

2.33 Properties tend to be purchased outright using equity from the sale of the previous home. Mortgage lending to the older age group is very limited, although this is an issue currently being reviewed by the Council of Mortgage Lenders. Service charges will be payable to the manager or agent and support or care fees payable at an agreed rate to the provider. Reduced costs for items such as heating, maintenance, council tax and insurance may mean that household outgoings are lower than for the previous home (see illustration in Annex 4).

2.34 Event fees (see paragraph 2.29) can have very substantial financial implications for the leaseholder (or their estate, if they have died). In the past leaseholders have not always been informed in advance about the event fee they may be required to pay and have suffered financially as a consequence. The Law Commission has recently reviewed practice and put forward proposals to establish a fairer approach. The Law Commission report\(^\text{12}\) recognises the benefits of retirement housing and sees the removal of uncertainty around event fees as removing an obstacle to increased demand for and development of “leasehold retirement housing”. The Law Commission has recently consulted on proposals for implementation.

---

\(^{12}\) Residential Leases: Fees On Transfer Of Title, Change Of Occupancy And Other Events (“Event Fees”) Progress Report, Law Commission, June 2016
Funding sources and solutions

2.35 People living in affordable accommodation may be eligible for HB to meet the cost of some or all their rent and service charge depending on the level of income and savings. They may also qualify for other benefits such as Attendance Allowance.

2.36 The service user and ASC may both contribute to paying for care, regardless of where it is delivered, depending on income level and income protection. This can have implications for the choice of accommodation and care. Residents who qualify for help and support with their care through the ASC authority do not have access to welfare benefits and will have to make a “client contribution” towards the costs incurred, leaving them with a guaranteed minimum income of £25 a week.

2.37 Northamptonshire County Council has undertaken internal analysis of the relative costs of paying for care in “Extra Care” (supported) rented housing and residential homes and has concluded that in most cases supported rented housing is more cost effective for the Council and for service users. The exception is, for people with the highest levels of care needs, the Minimum Income Guarantee (MIG) requirement means that there is no financial advantage to the Council in placing people in supported rented housing. Clarification of this very technical area could usefully be an area of joint work between NCC and its partners.

2.38 A person whose care needs are directly linked to their health may be eligible for NHS Continuing Healthcare: a package of care arranged and funded solely by the NHS for individuals who are not in hospital and have been assessed as having a "primary health need" i.e. they have substantial and ongoing care needs and the main or primary need for care must relate to their health. NHS Continuing Healthcare can be provided in a person’s own home or a care home.

2.39 The London Borough of Enfield’s Keeping House enables people to contribute to the cost of living in residential care without eroding their savings or releasing equity in their home. Their house is leased to the Council in return for guaranteed rent for a fixed period. The scheme is currently focussed on people moving to residential care. A fuller description appears in Annex 4. When forecast future limitations on access to home ownership are considered, there appears to be potential for developing similar schemes linked to a supported housing rental model.

Issues with implications for NHS and social care budgets

2.40 Specialist housing for older people is recognised as less costly than care/nursing homes and results in reduced use of public services, particularly health and social care\textsuperscript{13}. The most recent estimate of annual cost saving of delayed admission to residential care is £28,080 per person\textsuperscript{14}.

\textsuperscript{13} Financial Benefits of Investment in Specialist Housing for Vulnerable and Older People, Frontier Economics for the Homes and Communities Agency, 2010

\textsuperscript{14} Top of the Ladder, Demos, 2013
2.41 Research comparing living in supported (Extra Care) housing with residential care has found that supported housing achieves both financial and health and wellbeing advantages:

“Costs in extra care housing were slightly lower for the matched sample, compared with care homes (£374 and £409 per week respectively). There was a slight improvement in physical functioning and the level of cognitive functioning was stable in the extra care housing sub-sample. This contrasted with slight declines in both physical and cognitive functioning in the matched care home sample.”  

2.42 A presentation by Essex County Council to the All Party Parliamentary Group on housing and care for older people in November 2016 reported a projected annual net revenue saving per unit of £4,475 through increased use of “Extra Care” (i.e. supported) accommodation in preference to residential care.

2.43 Reducing or preventing ill health in older age through provision of specialist housing also offers substantial potential savings for the National Health Service. Falls and resultant fractures in people aged 65 and over account for over 4 million bed days each year in England. The estimated cost to the NHS of treating falls is £2.3 billion per year. Prevention of falls and other causes of ill health and injury through living in more accessible and easily managed accommodation clearly has the potential to make inroads on these figures.

2.44 Some organisations have identified the provision of care in supported housing as more cost effective than domiciliary care in the community due to the ability to provide care responsively to a group of people living in the same development, generating savings on travel costs and reduced time spent travelling. Across a larger, often rural, area, the hub and spoke approach (described at 4.21 and in Annex 4) can enable providers to achieve economies of scale by delivering services to more people across a wider area.

2.45 A meeting with representatives of Northamptonshire Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) on 20 October 2016 clarified that priority issues for the CCGs are availability of:

- the appropriate type of accommodation and care for people with dementia/cognitive impairment and
- the right combination of housing and re-ablement to enable patients stranded in hospital to move on to intermediate care, either at home or in a more specialised environment.

2.46 Given the lead-in time required for specialist housing development and the impact on RPs of current uncertainty around the LHA cap on rent eligible for housing benefit, it is unlikely that any additional new affordable supply will be ready for occupation in the next 5 years. Private providers are continuing to take new sites forward but can be expected to manage their development programmes to respond to economic

---

15 Pp 16-17, Improving housing with care choices for older people: an evaluation of extra care housing, Ann Netten, Robin Darton, Theresia Bäumker and Lisa Callaghan, Personal Social Services Research Unit, University of Kent, December 2011

16 Clinical Guidance on Falls 2013, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
changes e.g. UK exit from the EU, the availability of labour and cost of building materials. Local engagement with providers will be critical in encouraging their interest.

2.47 Specialist housing providers are, nonetheless, well placed to relieve pressure on hospital beds and reduce NHS costs through re-ablement, respite and earlier discharge. Examples of successful initiatives are included in Annex 4. Due to the shorter-term nature of such needs, this may be more achievable through a separate service rather than through provision of specialist housing for older people.

2.48 It will be essential for the provision and use of all specialist and independent, age-exclusive housing to be recorded and monitored to ensure that it meets need and the scale of any additional requirement is understood.

2.49 Members of the commissioning partners for this research also drew attention to the pressures placed on a range of public services by vulnerable residents of affordable retirement (sheltered) housing. Examples were given of tenants repeatedly calling support services without justification, even to the extent of emergency ambulances being called. Joint working and use of resources to identify and develop preventive support mechanisms for people in this situation has the potential to address costs incurred through the inappropriate use of services.
3. FUTURE REQUIREMENTS FOR SPECIALIST HOUSING FOR OLDER PEOPLE IN NORTHAMPTONSHIRE

Current supply

3.1 There were 7,697 units of specialist housing for older people in Northamptonshire in 2015.\(^\text{17}\) The vast majority of these, 6,671, were retirement housing units: 5,992 in the social rented sector, 679 private leasehold. There were 637 units of social rented supported housing and 389 units for home ownership.

3.2 An email survey was sent to more than 30 social landlords operating in Northamptonshire find out more about the scale and condition of their housing stock designated for older people. The aim was to learn whether the existing stock is fit for purpose and could legitimately be counted as suitable for older people going forward. This included asking about age of property, date of modernisation or refurbishment, accessibility (level or lift access) and whether the properties meet the Decent Home Standard. We also asked about rent and service charge levels to find out more about affordability compared with the cost of residential care.

3.3 The survey elicited a mixed response which covered approximately 58% of the retirement housing stock, of which 90% was found to be fit for purpose. While far from comprehensive coverage, this was sufficient data to enable robust modelling of future demand.

3.4 We also learned from this and a companion survey looking at the popularity of properties which had come up for reletting, that there is a very sizeable stock of social rented bungalows across the county which is not included in the EAC supply data set out above. Some of these are linked to retirement housing schemes but many are age-restricted independent accommodation and are very popular with residents.

3.5 The stock condition survey also asked about future plans to develop specialist housing for older people. Apart from Corby Borough Council which already has a programme of development, no such plans were reported. In view of the current uncertainty regarding the LHA cap, reported at paragraph 2.21 this is unsurprising. The complete survey report appears at Annex 5.

Demand modelling

Specialist retirement housing

3.6 We have modelled potential demand for specialist retirement housing in Northamptonshire using the Retirement Housing Group (RHG) model which is one of the modelling approaches recommended in “Housing in Later Life\(^\text{18}\)”.

\(^{17}\) Data from the Elderly Accommodation Counsel Statistics on specialist housing provision in England, March 2015

\(^{18}\) Housing Lin http://www.housinglin.org.uk/Topics/type/resource/?cid=8654
Currently in England an estimated **8% of households aged 65 and over live in specialist retirement housing (515,666 dwellings)**. This is a lower proportion of households than would potentially live in this type of accommodation if more of it was available. Analysis of SHMA findings from surveys of over 13,500 households aged 50 plus suggests that around 20% of all older households would consider moving to specialist retirement housing if it was available. If we look at countries where a good quality retirement housing supply is available research for the Housing LIN suggests that, based on comparisons with the USA and Australia where the stock of older persons’ housing is higher and those people who wish to live in specialist accommodation have a practical option to do so, the proportion of older person households moving into specialist retirement housing could be as high as 13-17%.

**The RHG model**

The RHG model is based on propensity to move. We have assumed that 15% of older person households (aged 75 and over) would live in retirement housing if it was available. Analysis of residents of McCarthy and Stone properties shows that a small proportion (18%) of residents are aged under 75. If we assume that this is the normal age distribution for households living in retirement housing, and we compare the total number of households in each age group living in retirement housing with those living in the general housing stock, then an estimated 2.5% of households aged 65-74 would live in retirement housing if it was available in their area and their chosen tenure. The RHG model therefore assumes that 15% of households aged 75 and over and 2.5% of households aged 65-74 would live in retirement housing if it was available.

**Key data used**

Our information on household projections is derived from the ONS 2014 based household projections. We take 2017 as our base year and model projected demand to 2029 in the case of West Northamptonshire and 2031 in the case of North Northamptonshire. In both cases this is the end of the local plan period. Details of the base data used can be found in Annex 1.

The RHG model analyses potential demand for specialist older persons’ accommodation by tenure working on the assumption that social and private renters require affordable rented retirement housing and that home owners require outright sale or shared equity accommodation. Analysis of the price of newbuild retirement

---


20 “Downsizing for older people into Specialist Accommodation” Janet Sutherland for Housing LIN February 2011

21 Michael Ball: Housing Markets and Independence in Old Age fig 4.7

22 A very small number of households aged below 65 live in McCarthy and Stone retirement properties. This is because McCarthy and Stone will accept households aged 60 and over. Households aged below 65 have been excluded from this calculation.

23 It should be noted that this is different from the household projections used in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy and for deriving the district based North Northamptonshire older persons housing targets as set out in Policy 30 Housing Mix and Tenure. The district based targets in the JCS assume that a much lower proportion of older person households (in the region of 8%) will live in retirement housing ie there is no increase in the proportion of older person households living in retirement housing.
housing suggests that it is rarely priced at less than the value of secondhand semi-detached property so owners of terraced or flatted properties are unlikely to be able to buy new, although they will usually be able to afford a secondhand retirement property. We use ONS census data from 2011 to show home ownership by age of household and ACORN/CACI data to identify the split between outright and shared equity purchasers.

3.11 We roll forward information on home ownership among households aged 50-64 in 2011 to derive forecast home ownership rates for households aged 70-84 in 2029/31 and apply home ownership rates for households aged 65-74 in 2011 to derive home ownership rates among households aged 85 and over in 2029/31. More than three-quarters of older person households in Northamptonshire are home owners so our model shows relatively limited demand for new social rented retirement housing, when compared with current supply. It should however be noted that much of the existing social rented stock of retirement housing is built to historic standards and may not provide the range of services required to meet modern standards. There is therefore likely to be a continued need for updating and replacement of older social rented stock.

3.12 86% of current supply of retirement housing in the County is social rented. For information on individual districts see Annex 1.

3.13 We use data from the Elderly Accommodation Counsel database to identify current (2015) supply of specialist retirement housing in each district (see Annex 1). This information is provided at district level by tenure and type of accommodation (housing with support and housing with care). We have checked this data against the stock condition survey which was carried out by email among providers of affordable housing including Northampton Partnership Homes (see section 3.2-3.3 above).

3.14 We do not attempt to split potential demand for retirement housing between different types of housing (eg retirement vs supported housing). This is partly because we have been unable to find research evidence which clearly identifies types of people (or degrees of frailty) whose needs are better dealt with in extra-care housing than in retirement living and any differentiation between the two is likely to be further blurred by the growing use of personalised care budgets. Experience has also shown that people with a wide range of physical conditions move into both retirement living and extra-care, with the decision about where to move to being driven largely by what is available at the time and how convenient its location is for friends and family, rather than on the suitability of the facilities/care offered to deal with any individual physical condition.

3.15 It should be noted that the Housing White Paper places increased emphasis on assessing the needs of older people and indicates that in future these will have to be

---

24 In terms of ACORN classification we have allocated more prosperous older home owners in groups 10, 11, 19, 31 to outright purchase and less prosperous home owners in groups 32, 42, 43, 44, 45 and 54 to shared equity.
25 This methodology is not perfect since it assumes that owners and renters die in equal proportions and we know that in fact poorer people are likely to die earlier than richer ones. This would imply that actual rates of home ownership may be higher in 2029/31 than we have modelled.
26 "note the poor standard of designated social rented sheltered housing – which the facts and numbers do not reflect!!" ! Survey comment from Northampton Partnership Homes
prepared in line with Government guidance. It states that there will be a new statutory duty on the Secretary of State to produce guidance on how local development documents should meet the housing needs of older and disabled people. It goes on to say that:

“Guidance produced under this duty will place clearer expectations about planning to meet the needs of older people, including supporting the development of such homes near local services.”

Key findings

North Northamptonshire

3.16 Table 3.1 below shows potential annual targets for retirement housing provision by district. It will be seen that there is no demand for additional social rented housing, although local authorities and registered providers may well wish to upgrade or in some cases decommission and replace existing stock.

3.17 Demand for home ownership exceeds potential demand for shared equity/shared ownership in East Northamptonshire, Kettering and Wellingborough, but not in Corby where there is more demand for shared equity provision. In the absence of shared equity, we would expect potential shared owners to seek to meet their needs in the social rented sector, though some households may be deterred from such a move by the prospect of losing the asset growth/protection of home ownership and may therefore remain longer in properties which no longer meet their needs.

Table 3.1: Potential annual targets for provision of retirement housing by district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>Outright Sale</th>
<th>Shared Ownership/Equity</th>
<th>Social Rent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corby</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Northamptonshire</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

West Northamptonshire

3.18 Table 3.2 below shows potential annual targets for retirement housing provision by district. It will be seen that there is no demand for additional social rented housing, although local authorities and registered providers may well wish to upgrade or in some cases decommission and replace existing stock.

3.19 Demand for home ownership exceeds potential demand for shared equity/shared ownership in all districts. In the absence of shared equity we would expect potential

---

27 See Pt I 7 (2) (b) Neighbourhood Planning Bill 8/2/17
28 Para 4.42 Fixing our Broken Housing Market (Housing White Paper), February 2017
shared owners to seek to meet their needs in the social rented sector, though some households may be deterred from such a move by the prospect of losing the asset growth/protection of home ownership and may therefore remain longer in properties which no longer meet their needs.

**Table 3.2: Potential annual targets for provision of retirement housing by district**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>Outright Sale</th>
<th>Shared Ownership/Equity</th>
<th>Social Rent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daventry</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Northamptonshire</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dementia care housing**

3.20 Feedback from providers suggests that although specialist retirement housing can provide a supportive environment for people with early or mid-stage dementia (and for their partners) it is not well suited to catering for people with severe dementia. Recent years have therefore seen the growth of specialist dementia care housing schemes. These offer a safe supportive environment and specialist activities for people with dementia. They may or may not include specialist care home provision. Because these schemes are relatively new it is not yet possible to say what proportion of residents will be able to live there until they die and what proportion will require a move to a specialist care home.

3.21 Table 3.3 below shows prevalence of dementia by district in Northamptonshire in 2013. It is based on a study carried out by the Alzheimer’s Society. The same publication suggests that it is very difficult to forecast potential future dementia prevalence since there are various factors which mitigate in different directions: the ageing of the population which could lead to increased numbers of people with dementia, set against healthier lifestyles and improved prevention and control of cardiovascular risk factors which may be contributing to a reduction in prevalence of dementia in high income countries such as the UK30. A 40% increase by 2025 in the number of people with dementia and a 157% increase by 2051 are suggested as worst case scenarios, broadly matching the increase in the older population – we show in table 3.3 below the impact of a 40% increase in dementia cases.

**Table 3.3: Number of people with dementia 2013 and 2025 (source Alzheimer’s Society)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corby</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Northamptonshire</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>1655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td>1695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 Dementia UK Update Appendix A 2014
30 Ibid section 4.3
Most people with dementia can live in the community and it is only during the final third of the time with the illness that it is likely that specialist accommodation will be required\textsuperscript{31}. However, if even one third of the population with dementia need specialist accommodation this amounts to 2,784 people in 2013 and 3,897 by 2025. These figures equate to an average of 4.5% of the total population aged 75 and over (2% of the population aged 65 and over).

Most people with late stage dementia are currently accommodated in care homes and this situation is likely to continue into the foreseeable future. We do not have any information which will allow us to judge the relative merits of specialist dementia housing against specialist care homes. It therefore does not seem sensible to set a specific annual target for provision of dementia care housing. Instead we recommend that each district in both North and West Northamptonshire should seek to encourage provision of 1 dementia care housing scheme within the next 3-5 years and that the districts and CCGs should share experience in facilitating and monitoring these schemes with the aim of identifying best practice and encouraging new provision to increase the range of housing options open to people with dementia and their partners.

**Demand for care home places**

Currently there are 5,332 care home places in Northamptonshire\textsuperscript{32}, equivalent to 4.3% of the population aged 65 and over. This is a higher figure than the national average (the 2011 Census recorded 3.2% of the total population of England and Wales aged 65 and over living in a care home).

Nationally the proportion of the total population aged 65 and over living in a care home has fallen from 3.5% in 2001 to 3.2% in 2011\textsuperscript{33}. ONS comments that

- “One explanation is the improvement in the health of the population between 2001 and 2011”
- A major contribution is likely to be due to the increase in unpaid carers. However, as the provision of unpaid care seems to have negative consequences for the health of the carer, there is an increased likelihood that these people will themselves require care in later life

\textsuperscript{31}Older Londoners and the London Plan GLA 2016 . American research suggests that on average, a person with Alzheimer’s disease will spend more years (40 percent of the total number of years with Alzheimer’s) in the most severe stage of the disease than in any other stage. Much of this time will be spent in a nursing home, as nursing home admission by age 80 is expected for 75 percent of people with Alzheimer’s compared with only 4 percent of the general population. Taken from Arrighi HM, Neumann PJ, Lieberburg IM, Townsend RJ. Lethality of Alzheimer disease and its impact on nursing home placement. Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord 2010;24(1):90–5

\textsuperscript{32} Source Northamptonshire County Council Care Home Customers and Population

\textsuperscript{33} Source ONS Changes in the Older Resident Care Home Population between 2001 and 2011 01 August 2014
• The Health Survey 2011 suggested that a substantial proportion of older people receiving formal care are funding this themselves. Relatives or friends may be more inclined to provide unpaid care to relieve the burden of care home costs

• Care in the Community may also encourage people to stay at home for longer

3.26 None of these factors seems likely to change in the foreseeable future. It therefore seems probable that the proportion of older people living in a care home will continue to decrease. We have assumed firstly that the number of people requiring to live in a care home in Northamptonshire will diminish to come in line with the national average and also that nationally the proportion of older people living in a care home continues to decline but at half the rate of the decline from 2011 to 2011. On this basis by 2031 we expect that 2.9% of people aged 65 and over will be living in a care home. For Northamptonshire this would produce a requirement for 5,704 care home places in 2031 compared with current provision of 5,332 care home places.

3.27 It should be noted that there may be some double counting with the data on demand for dementia care housing in sections 3.19-3.22 above. Data from CareFirst shows that 55% of persons aged 65 and over living in care homes are suffering from memory and cognitive impairment. To the extent that these people are accommodated in dementia housing this will reduce the demand for care home places. However we have already assumed that the proportion of older persons living in a care home will fall from 4.3% to 2.9% (a drop of 1.4%). It is reasonable to assume that some of the fall in demand for care home accommodation will come from provision of a range of alternative options for dementia care sufferers and some of it will come from increased provision of alternative options (including extra-care) for older people needing personal care and support, the second largest category (36%) of older people living in a care home.

3.28 Current supply of care home accommodation is much lower if one includes only those care homes which score good or outstanding on the Care Quality Commission indicators. This gives a total of 4,410 care home places. There is therefore a requirement for an additional 909 care home places by 2030, plus the possibility that some existing care homes may lose their good/outstanding status although others may improve their status. Table 3.4 below shows how this figure is allocated between the districts.

Table 3.4: Target provision of additional care home places (this could be expressed as an annual target)

---

34 Proportion of people aged 65 and over fell by 0.3% in 10 years from 2001 to 2011 when it was 3.2%. We assume that the rate of change halves to 0.15% in 10 years or 0.3% in the 20 years from 2011 to 2031. So in 2031 the proportion of people living in a care home is 3.2%-0.3% = 2.9%

35 Based on 2.9% of total population aged 65 and over of 196,7300 in 2030 (source ONS 2014 based population projections)
It will be seen that the two major towns of Northampton and Wellingborough have a very limited need for additional care home provision in the case of Wellingborough and a surplus in the case of Northampton. It seems likely that residents of other districts are moving to Northampton and Wellingborough to find care home places and this type of movement of people between districts can be expected to continue.

These targets make no allowance for any increase in retirement housing provision which reduces demand for care homes. We have no evidence which would allow us to draw firm conclusions about the proportion of residents in retirement housing who would otherwise be in a care home. Nor do we know how successful the districts will be if they choose to seek to encourage provision of retirement housing. It will be necessary to keep targets and achievements in provision of retirement housing and care homes under review and to collect and monitor information from retirement housing providers on the proportion of residents who receive regular domiciliary care and who would otherwise be in a care home.

**Downsizer housing**

Downsizer housing frees up family homes and encourages movement through the housing market. HAPPI 3 suggests that every downsizer move triggers 3 further moves and releases more starter homes for people looking to enter the housing market. The Councils may therefore wish to encourage provision of downsizer housing.
Key messages

- Northamptonshire’s social rented older persons housing stock is generally fit for purpose with no significant evidence of voids or difficult to let properties.

- There is a significant additional stock of retirement bungalows for social rent, which are very popular with tenants.

- The supply of social rented housing is sufficient to meet the need but the stock may require upgrading in order to meet modern standards.

- There is a shortfall of retirement housing for sale and shared ownership.

- In most districts potential demand for sale housing exceeds demand for shared ownership but this is not the case in Corby.

- We have modelled potential demand for retirement housing and generated annual targets for each district to the end of the local plan period. North Northamptonshire needs to provide 319 units a year for sale and shared ownership and West Northamptonshire needs to provide 306 units a year for sale and shared ownership.\(^{36}\)

- Across the County there is a current shortfall of care home provision which meets CQC standards. A further 909 care home beds will be required by the end of the local plan period.

- There is a need for more specialist care provision for dementia patients, particularly those with severe dementia and we recommend that at least one dementia housing scheme should be provided in each district over the next 3-5 years and that a wider range of providers, including providers of dementia care housing/villages should be encouraged to operate in the County.

---

\(^{36}\) The targets for North Northamptonshire are higher than those shown in Policy H30 of the Joint Core Strategy, but reflect the potential for an increase in supply of specialist retirement housing in relation to total older person households. Such an increase in specialist provision for older person households has the potential to free-up family housing, therefore reducing the need for new provision in other sections of the housing market.
4. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

**National and local plan policy position**

*National policy and guidance*

4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework\(^{37}\) (NPPF) refers specifically to the needs of older people, requiring local planning authorities to “plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes) and identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand.”

4.2 National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) emphasises the importance of assessing and planning for the housing needs of older people and the wider policy benefits of downsizing: “The need to provide housing for older people is **critical** given the projected increase in the number of households aged 65 and over accounts for over half of the new households ... Plan makers will need to consider the size, location and quality of dwellings needed in the future for older people in order to allow them to live independently and safely in their own home for as long as possible, or to move to more suitable accommodation if they so wish.”\(^{38}\) The guidance requires the full range of need, i.e. “**types of general housing, such as bungalows**, sheltered, extra care, registered care to be assessed and broken down by tenure.

4.3 Other types of general housing that may allow residents to stay in their homes or move to accommodation that is already suitable or capable of adaptation (e.g. bungalows) should also be identified as part of the assessment of housing needs.

4.4 NPPG also explicitly states that “**the assessment should set out the level of need for residential institutions (Use Class C2)**” as part of fully establishing the accommodation requirements of older people. It is important to note that the starting point to identify need amongst this category is provided by a separate dataset for “institutional populations” published alongside, but outside of, projections for household change. Although the assumptions for the two data sources can be modified, in principle the need for residential institutions is typically **added** to housing demand identified by objectively assessed housing need.

4.5 National guidance does not prescribe how these different types of specialist accommodation should be treated in determining future development proposals in terms of their definition under the Use Class Order. Such accommodation might address a wide range of housing needs, ranging from general market housing in appropriate locations through to residential institutions (which fall under Use Class C2). Housing which provides for the needs of older people, including residential

\(^{37}\) National Planning Policy Framework, Department for Communities and Local Government, March 2012 (Paragraph 50)

\(^{38}\) How should the needs for all types of housing be addressed? Paragraph: 021 Reference ID: 2a-021-20160401, NPPG, Updated April 2016
institutions, should generally be counted against housing requirements. However, the approach for doing so should be “clearly set out in the Local Plan” and is therefore closely related to whether the total needs for different types of accommodation are fully identified.

4.6 Having established the demand for specialist accommodation, the NPPG explains that Local Plans should recognise the diverse types of need and where appropriate identify specific sites to meet anticipated requirements. This could include “sites for older people’s housing including accessible mainstream housing such as bungalows and step-free apartments, sheltered or extra care housing, retirement housing and residential care homes.”

4.7 The NPPG goes on to explain that “where local planning authorities do not consider it appropriate to allocate such sites, they should ensure that there are sufficiently robust criteria in place to set out when such homes will be permitted. This might be supplemented by setting appropriate targets for the number of these homes to be built.”

Local planning position

4.8 Adopted Part 1 Local Plans (‘Joint Core Strategies’) (JCSs) provide up-to-date policy coverage for the whole County including an agreed position for overall housing numbers and policy direction for the distribution of development and maintaining a sufficient supply of land for housing.

4.9 Northamptonshire has 2 JCSs. The JCSs introduce the strategic direction for specialist accommodation but are partly affected by subsequent changes to national policy in terms of accessibility and space standards. There is a general focus on the main urban centres and a significant concentration of proposed development within ‘Sustainable Urban Extensions’. The approach to the spatial distribution of development is relatively similar across the County and reflects a successful record of joint plan-making.

North Northamptonshire JCS

4.10 The North Northamptonshire JCS (adopted July 2016) covers the districts of Corby, East Northamptonshire, Kettering and Wellingborough and runs to 2031. Key JCS policies relating to housing for older people are:

• Policy 30 – Housing Mix and Tenure
  - The evidence base in relation to specialist accommodation for older people is covered within the supporting text to this policy. Forecasts of special forms of housing for older people have been produced from a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (‘SHMA’) ‘Toolkit’ which in-turn is based

39 How should local planning authorities deal with housing for older people? Paragraph: 037 Reference ID: 3-037-20150320
40 Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 12-006-20150320
upon the household projections informing the JCS. This highlights the growth in older (65+ age group) households and the associated issues of allowing people to stay in their own home whilst freeing up ‘under-occupied’ housing.

- The categories of accommodation considered do not include a separate forecast of the level of need for residential institutions or by extension the projected change in this population group outside of the main household projections. (the “institutional population”).
- The policy requirements are based upon the requirements for three types of specialised housing, determined under three separate categories of Designated, Sheltered or Supported, and Extra Care as defined by and calculated from the Toolkit. These data are provided for each constituent authority in North Northamptonshire although the JCS summarises the totals for the whole plan area. The table below sets out the full breakdown on Toolkit outputs which inform the JCS Policy for specialist accommodation in North Northamptonshire are set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>65+ Households</th>
<th>65+ Totals</th>
<th>Under-Occupying</th>
<th>Designated42</th>
<th>Sheltered43</th>
<th>Extra Care44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Northamptonshire</td>
<td>20,670</td>
<td>12,177</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corby</td>
<td>3,545</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Northamptonshire</td>
<td>6,656</td>
<td>4,125</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>5,825</td>
<td>3,385</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td>4,644</td>
<td>2,654</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The outputs of the ‘Toolkit’ are based on the 2011-based household projections prepared based on the 2011 Census and are therefore somewhat dated. However, the detailed forecasts provided by the Toolkit have provided useful evidence to support the plan-making activities of the constituent local planning authorities. Thus, the detailed breakdown in terms of forecast requirements for individual authorities has been used to inform the requirement for specialised accommodation in consultation drafts of emerging ‘Part 2’ Local Plans in North Northamptonshire. This is consistent with the role of such ‘Part 2’ Plans, which rely on the JCS for strategic direction and are not required to re-assess housing or other

42 Such as private sector retirement bungalows and apartments with features included fully adapted accommodation and integrated alarms (North Northamptonshire JCS Para 9.42a)
43 As Designated Housing above but providing personal support to residents as required (North Northamptonshire JCS Para 9.42b)
44 Crosses the boundary between high- level support needs and high-level care needs, with a larger proportion in the latter category (North Northamptonshire JCS Para 9.42c)
development needs but aim to provide additional detail and may secure further site allocations to ensure requirements are met.

- Policy 30 of the North Northamptonshire JCS seeks that:
  - "f) Proposals will be encouraged for market and affordable housing provision to meet the specialised housing requirements of older households including designated, sheltered and extra care accommodation and other attractive housing options to enable older households to down-size to smaller accommodation. SUEs and other strategic developments should make specific provision towards meeting these needs."
  - In addition to this, criteria (b) provides for the Nationally Described Space Standards to be met in the internal floor area of all new dwellings. This allows for flexible internal layouts “to allow for cost-effective alterations (including extensions) as demands and lifestyles change”. Criteria (c) requires that all new dwellings achieve Category 2 of the National Accessibility Standards (accessible and adaptable homes – equivalent to Lifetime Homes).
  - Although Policy 30 offers support and encouragement to meet specialised housing requirements across a range of locations and development types it does not prescribe the proportion or type of provision that should be achieved by a given scheme or what mode of delivery will be acceptable or preferred. To give further support to securing specialised housing provision there is limited reference elsewhere in the JCS.
  - The requirement to provide affordable housing is dealt with under criteria (d) and (e) of the same Policy 30. The policy text does not specify a separate approach to seeking obligations from different types of specialist accommodation or provide reference to assessing planning Use Class but that the SHMA Toolkit should be taken into account. Criteria (d) sets requirements based on the additional dwellings provided by a development. Provision may also be subject to the viability of the development.

- Policy 14 Deenethorpe Airfield Area of Opportunity (criteria (f)(ii)) seeks
  - “Specialist provision to meet the needs of an ageing population” as one element of delivering a mixed and balanced community.

**West Northamptonshire JCS**

4.11 The main policy to direct the provision of specialised accommodation in the West Northamptonshire JCS is summarised below. The supporting text to the policy does not introduce evidence that specifically addresses the forecast need for different types of accommodation nor does it separately identify the need for provision within residential institutions (typically care home facilities).

4.12 The supporting text indicates that the policy approach is intended to cover a range of provision which may include traditional nursing homes but also schemes to support independent living. The anticipated or desired scale of delivery of specialist
accommodation is not quantified. The policy does not directly explore different models of provision or any implications for determining planning Use Class.

- **Policy H1 – Housing Density and Mix and Type of Dwellings**

  “Across West Northamptonshire new housing development will provide for a mix of house types, sizes and tenures to cater for different accommodation needs including the needs of older people and vulnerable groups.”

4.13 The West Northamptonshire JCS does not provide a comprehensive approach in terms of which specific location or types of sites are expected to secure specialist accommodation; nor does it quantify any expected scale of supply of the type of delivery anticipated. However, the policy for one site (Policy B2 – Brackley East Sustainable Urban Extension) identifies a specific requirement to make provision for a Care Home alongside a primary care facility.

4.14 **Policy H2** addresses affordable housing requirements. The supporting text to the policy explains that contributions will be sought from all developments that provide self-contained units “including sheltered and assisted living housing schemes”. The policy text itself does not provide any specific reference to specialist accommodation or whether obligations will be sought in accordance with planning Use Class. The policy generally clarifies that in all cases affordable housing requirements may be subject to viability on a case-by-case basis.

4.15 The West Northamptonshire JCS policies pre-date the latest National Planning Practice Guidance on optional accessibility standards. **Policy H4** seeks to provide new housing in accordance with previous Lifetime Homes standards. Optional requirement M4(2) (accessible and adaptable dwellings) is broadly similar to Lifetime Homes but adopting this policy standard in up-to-date plans requires evidence of need. It will be important for the partner authorities in West Northamptonshire to monitor development outcomes against the existing policy since the change in guidance.

*Preparation of ‘Part 2’ Local Plans*

4.16 No ‘Part 2’ Local Plans have yet been adopted or submitted since the current JCS have been in place. These plans are currently being prepared. A number of the emerging plans include measures to better enable the provision of specialist accommodation as an important element of their wider scope.

**Neighbourhood Plan policies**

4.17 Neighbourhood Planning undoubtedly represents an opportunity to deliver specialist accommodation across Northamptonshire. The constituent local planning authorities should engage with those preparing neighbourhood plans and discuss the recommendations of this report with relevant groups. The modelling undertaken by this report provides a clear indication of the demand for specialist accommodation as well as the position in terms of institutional accommodation. This is an important

---

45 Paragraph 9.18
46 Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 56-007-20150327
aspect of demonstrating how the provision of such development can meet wider housing needs.

4.18 This is a necessary part of clarifying existing development plan policy and overcoming the risks associated with how different development types should be counted towards supply, particularly where existing policies are silent on the definition of Use Class or the level of need for C2 ‘bed spaces’ in institutional establishments. It is important that irrespective of the final determination of Use Class for any individual proposal the evidence demonstrates that it would make additional supply available to meet need or release existing dwellings back to the market.

4.19 The authorities across Northamptonshire should also consider the extent to which any provision of specialist accommodation through Neighbourhood Plans is likely to be additional to the requirements for different locations, scales and types of development set out in the Part 1 Local Plans. On the basis of the minimum scale of provision typically required to deliver specialist accommodation development types (i.e. 50 – 60 units) such schemes may represent a locally significant total depending on where they are provided.

4.20 The Part 1 Local Plans appear to have few location or area-specific requirements to meet a residual need for development in specific places. This typically forms part of considering the settlement hierarchy and strategy for distributing development. However, Neighbourhood Plans may look to provide specialist accommodation in areas not typically considered suitable or identified for development. Examples might be locations in main urban areas (potentially forming part of allowances for ‘Urban Capacity’) or where opportunities for specialist accommodation are on previously developed land or seek alternative uses for existing sites e.g. B-Use employment land.

4.21 Across Northamptonshire, the approach taken to preparing Neighbourhood Plans and their interpretation of Local Plan policy (and the evidence of need for specialist accommodation) will be of great importance in terms of satisfying the basic conditions and determining whether any support (or allocations) for specialist accommodation meets general housing needs. The preparation of Part 2 Local Plans should also consider whether setting specific development requirements for individual places (which may subsequently be addressed by Neighbourhood Plans) would affect the ability of neighbourhood planning to support the provision of specialist accommodation i.e. introducing a conflict with other strategic policies.

4.22 In areas where the development plan does identify a specific requirement for a location or area (or one is established in Part 2 Local Plans and an emerging Neighbourhood Plan looks to provide for that amount) the need to ensure general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan is greater. Additional attention must be paid to the type of development and accommodation it will provide in relation to housing needs. This is particularly true for C2/C3 Use Class definitions and by extension the ability to achieve requirements for affordable housing. Particularly for C2 schemes it will also be important to clarify that the scheme would meet local needs in the same way as the requirement for development identified in the Local Plan i.e. residents in accommodation that provides a higher level of care may be drawn from a wider catchment.
4.23 This is most relevant where a Local Plan identifies a specific proportion of growth or requirement for development to meet housing needs in a given location. Even where a specific need is not set out, a Neighbourhood Plan should contribute to delivery of the Local Plan as a whole. A failure to conform with strategic policies may exist if a Neighbourhood Plan prevents development or supports alternative forms of development where Local Plan policies might otherwise provide for development that meets general housing needs. This raises important questions about how the requirement for development, need for different types of specialist accommodation (and institutional accommodation) and how the definition of planning Use Class is expressed (if at all) in the Local Plan.

Use Classes, affordable housing and CIL

4.24 Local authorities are allowed to seek affordable housing from all types of housing which falls within use class C3 “Housing”. Residential Institutions which fall within use class C2 are not classified as housing and are not expected to make an affordable housing contribution. This discrepancy has led to attempts by private providers of supported housing to argue that their product falls into use class C2 and should be exempt from affordable housing targets.

4.25 Local authorities have responded to this approach in various ways. Some have sought to specify the minimum number of care hours which must be provided to all residents for a scheme to qualify as C2. Others, most notably the GLA when setting out its approach to older persons housing provision in the Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP) 2015 have argued that affordable housing should be sought from C2 older persons housing provision subject to viability appraisal. The London Plan, which is one of the few examples of policies on this subject which have been tested at Local Plan Enquiry, states that

3.51 In view of the scale of the projected growth in London’s older population and the housing affordability issues it raises, this Plan supports boroughs in seeking application of the principles of its affordable housing policies (policies 3.10, 3.11, 3.12 and 3.13) to the range of developments – including those falling within Use Class C2 – which cater specifically for older people. These principles include taking account of site circumstances, development viability, needs assessments and availability of development capacity and relevant public subsidy; the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and to promote mixed and balanced communities and circumstances where ‘off-site’ contributions, ‘contingent obligations’ or other phasing measures may be appropriate. The way in which these principles can be applied most effectively will vary with local circumstances and will require close integration between planning and other borough strategies to meet social needs.

4.26 North Hertfordshire has taken a similar approach in its emerging draft policy:

Para 14.4.12

The requirement for affordable housing extends to all types of residential development, including specialist accommodation, such as sheltered or ‘extra care’ housing for older

47 A useful but outdated discussion of this issue can be found at the Housing LIN Viewpoint 20 Planning Use Classes and ExtraCare housing 2011
people. Where such schemes provide accommodation that is self-contained and fall within the Use Class C3 ( Dwelling Houses), affordable housing will be expected in accordance with Policy HOU3. Proposals which fall within the Use Class C2 (Residential Institutions), such as residential care and nursing homes, and do not provide self-contained accommodation or support independent living, will not be expected to contribute to the provision of affordable housing.

4.27 This issue is a complex one and the individual district councils will need to come to their own views on how to treat supported housing. It may be appropriate to seek legal opinion based on the following initial discussion set out below.

Viability Considerations

4.28 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a locally set charge on development levied at a fixed rate per square metre. It is not chargeable on affordable housing. Some local authorities have excluded some or all forms of specialist housing for older people from their CIL charging schedules. Local authorities are expected to charge the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on all types of development, subject to viability appraisal when setting the CIL charging rate. Recommended CIL charging rates across Northamptonshire are set out in the literature review.

4.29 There is some doubt as to whether CIL viability studies across North Northamptonshire considered Extra Care or specialist housing for market as part of testing. Equally, there does not appear to have been any testing of affordable housing contributions at any level from specialist accommodation falling under Use Class C3. If CIL charging is taken forward this would be an area where further clarification would be helpful.

4.30 The government has announced its intention to examine options for a potential reform of the Community Infrastructure Levy and make further statements at the time of the Autumn 2017 Budget. We do not recommend that the local authorities make any amendment to their current policies on CIL until after this time. In the event that further work is undertaken to consider introducing CIL (in North Northamptonshire) or reviewing rates (in West Northamptonshire) the following points are relevant:

- Before setting local CIL rates for retirement housing the North Northamptonshire local authorities should request a specific appraisal of the viability of retirement housing compared with general needs housing and give consideration to setting separate CIL rates.

- West Northamptonshire authorities should monitor planning applications and viability appraisals submitted for retirement housing schemes and seek to identify whether CIL has an impact on scheme viability and hence either on affordable housing provision or in extremis on the ability of development to proceed. If it appears that CIL has either of these impacts on scheme viability, then they should request a specific appraisal of the viability of retirement housing compared with general needs housing and give consideration to setting separate CIL rates.

48 Housing an Ageing Population, Savills, 2015

49 Local authorities in West Northamptonshire do not charge CIL on C2 uses (defined as Care Homes and Institutional Accommodation) but have set a charge on C3 uses. Local authorities in North Northamptonshire have not yet set a CIL charge.
In general terms, we would encourage the partner authorities to acknowledge the viability considerations that relate to proposals for specialist accommodation for older people. National Planning Practice Guidance specifically highlights this issue by stating that “for older people’s housing, the specific scheme format and projected sales rates may be a factor in assessing viability.” This is an important element of giving appropriate consideration to the viability of different development types in decision-making as relevant factors can vary from one land use type to another.

There is wider recognition that flexibility is necessary to ensure that burdens within the planning system do not discourage meeting the housing needs of older people. The House of Lords Select Committee for the Built Environment reported the issue in February 2016 as part of the ‘Building Better Places’ Report of Session 2015-16. Paragraph 155 of the Report calls on “the Government to examine ways in which the provision of specialist retirement housing can be incentivised and increased. We recommend that the Government should examine and review the case for exempting such housing from Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy payments.” The recommendation followed an exploration of the increasing need and social benefits of such accommodation alongside the lack of a clear exemption from these relevant obligations unlike for other types of housing (such as ‘starter homes’) or support for small builders.

As a minimum, schemes proposing specialist accommodation for the elderly should be afforded the same scope to submit an assessment of viability where this is a perceived barrier or constraint upon development going ahead. This provides some overall increase in risk that support for development which otherwise contributes towards meeting the overall need for housing may not provide a policy compliant contribution towards affordable housing requirements. The scope for future changes or clarification within national policy should be monitored going forward.

However, following the announcements in the government’s Housing White Paper (2017), we recommend that future (including Part 2) Local Plans should set affordable housing targets for older persons housing which reflect the need for affordable housing for older people rather than the general needs affordable housing target.

This would accord with a recommendation that all new housing developments except for “residential care homes” are to include 10% “affordable home ownership” products alongside the proposed broader definition for affordable housing. However, the definition of supported housing that provides specialist accommodation and includes an element of support is not exhaustive or closely defined in the Housing White Paper and other types of development may continue to seek exemption from any affordable housing requirements.

This approach would nevertheless focus affordable housing provision on shared ownership rather than on social rent and would accord well with the 10% affordable

---

50 Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 10-018-20150326
home ownership requirement. Where a higher affordable housing target is sought, it will continue to be subject to scheme specific viability appraisal.

**Advice for Monitoring Supply and Determination of Use Class**

*Advice for Monitoring Supply of Specialist Accommodation*

4.37 The recommendations in this section of the Report are based on reinforcing the substantial benefits and opportunities for increasing the supply of specialist housing for older people. These benefits include a contribution towards overall housing needs as part of providing such accommodation. However, it is necessary to present these findings in the context of the current development plans alongside the wider context provided by national policy and guidance and Local Plan and Planning Appeal Caselaw from elsewhere.

4.38 In short, we identify a risk for the instructing local planning authorities should they identify all potential future provision of specialist housing as contributing towards current Local Plan housing requirements. We would caution against the authorities adopting a stance where they count all accommodation – and in particular that falling under Use Class C2 – against current targets. The basis for our recommendation is set out as follows.

4.39 The issue was essentially summarised by the Inspector for the Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucestershire Joint Core Strategy when she recognised that “extra-care housing is sometimes used as an alternative to care homes/nursing homes and that the distinction between these housing types is blurred”. This finding is not an issue in principle and reflects the wide range of products that provide specialist accommodation for older people. However, it underlies the importance of understanding the full range of housing needs. For the Plan in question, the authorities also provided a clear assessment of the need for care home bed-spaces and how these might be provided; and a mechanism whereby if additional extra care housing was delivered as an alternative to care home places the objectively assessed need could be increased accordingly.

4.40 In a Recovered Appeal Decision from August 2016, the Secretary of State endorsed an Inspector’s findings that provide a reasonably clear indication of how national guidance for assessing housing needs (including C2 institutional accommodation) and subsequently counting supply are intended to operate:

“Whichever way C2 Uses are accounted for must be consistent on both sides of the equation. While the LP Inspector did not specifically state that the C2 figures should be removed from the supply side, he did not confirm that they had been included. The absence of evidence that C2 Uses were included in the HLS [Housing Land Supply] target means that there is a justification for excluding them from the supply side.”

4.41 The issue of counting accommodation provided under Use Class C2 in these circumstances is essentially one of possible or perceived ‘double-counting’ that may leave authorities open to challenge on land supply matters. The issue was also

---

considered by the Inspector for the South Worcestershire Development Plan, who determined that without a separate provision for sites providing C2 accommodation within the plan, delivery of these schemes could not be associated with an ‘allowance’ for existing dwellings released back to the market. This is on the basis that without a specifically identify range of sites or mechanism for supply, such delivery would take place on allocations or ‘windfall’ sites that would otherwise be available for general housing. In extremis, this might ultimately mean provision of care home beds being counted towards general housing requirements, despite modelling if demand identifying a need for these on a separate basis (i.e. the institutional population).

4.42 The approach of Inspectors in these circumstances is typically to exclude the provision of Use Class C2 accommodation from supply against the Local Plan housing requirements and to exempt such developments from contributions towards affordable housing.

4.43 Having summarised the concerns outlined above, we conclude that a similar range of circumstances apply across Northamptonshire. The adopted Local Plans do not contain requirements for non-self-contained institutional bed-spaces (i.e. care homes) and nor do they set out a specific supply of land to provide accommodation under Use Class C2 or indicate how this should be monitored.

4.44 Prior to the modelling undertaken for this Report, there does not appear to be any evidence base indicating the level of need for care home places alongside other accommodation needs. However, while this evidence base is useful in itself, further work is needed to identify how any additional care home places required can be delivered. Alternatively, the authorities may determine that this element of need might better be provided through alternative facilities such as Extra Care housing. In either case, there is no current indication of the levels of need that are additional to the housing requirements in adopted development plans.

4.45 This does not mean that in principle all specialist accommodation for older people is not contributing towards development needs; it simply means that the full range of development needs is not currently fully articulated in the development plan as required by national guidance.

4.46 The preparation of Part 2 Local Plans (or alternatively a review of the Part 1 Local Plans) gives an important opportunity to address any refinements to the definition of retirement housing within the development plan.

4.47 Further dialogue between the authorities may help to inform a collective view on how Use Class C2 accommodation should be treated. Identifying a certain proportion of supply (e.g. 50%) as additional to requirements identified in the Local Plans would be arbitrary but has been accepted by Inspectors during Planning Appeals.

55 For a useful discussion see South Worcestershire Development Plan, Inspector’s Report, February 2016: ANNEX A Paragraph 77
56 For a recent discussion see the Inspector’s Report for the Stratford-upon-Avon Local Plan, June 2016, Paragraph 383
57 For example, see Paragraph 23 in APP/Q3115/W/15/3035899 - Land to the east of Newington Road, Stadhampton, Oxfordshire
4.48 It may, however, be prudent for the authorities to await further consultation on the ‘standardised methodology’ for assessing housing need proposed in the Government’s 2017 Housing White Paper, which is expected to encompass the needs of older people\textsuperscript{58}. This methodology, coupled with the modelling provided in this Report, is likely to provide a firm foundation to clarify the approach or review development requirements as an element of the emerging Part 2 Local Plans.

4.49 The decision is ultimately a matter for the authorities themselves. We would advise that further dialogue is undertaken between the constituent authorities in Northamptonshire to reach an agreed starting point and priorities moving forward. However, we acknowledge that guidance on the subject is not definitive and it may be that different authorities adopt a different view or approach.

4.50 As part of this Report we contacted Officers at the relevant Joint Planning Units responsible for housing monitoring who in-turn liaised with colleagues in individual authorities. The purpose of this exercise was to determine firstly the extent of existing monitoring records for the delivery (and current ‘pipeline’) of additional housing for older people; and secondly how, if at all, this was counted towards Local Plan housing requirements.

4.51 The responses revealed an inconsistent position across the County, but one where most authorities do not currently count accommodation in Use Class C2 towards development plan requirements. Notwithstanding the provisions in National Planning Practice Guidance that authorities may count housing for a wide range of different needs (including residential institutions) against their housing requirements, the current position amongst the authorities is unsurprising. This reflects the uncertainties outlined earlier in this section. Our recommendations would therefore not represent a significant change in practice for the majority of authorities across Northamptonshire.

4.52 However, we recommend that the local councils immediately establish the current pipeline of commitments and recent record of completions for retirement housing and/or care homes as part of the evidence base for future plan-making. This will be an important element of understanding supply and demonstrating how demand has been met over future plan periods.

\textsuperscript{58} Para 1.12 Fixing our Broken Housing Market (Housing White Paper), February 2017
**Determination of Use Class**

4.53 The recommendation of this Report is that local authority planners should anticipate any increase in the supply of housing for older people to be delivered across both Use Class C2 and C3 developments. Prescription regarding whether particular types of accommodation fall within Use Class C2 or C3 is generally resisted. The process is neatly summarised in the Inspector’s Report for the South Oxfordshire Local Plan:

“The Use Class categorisation of any element of an individual scheme will need to be judged on its particular facts. The [Local Plan] should avoid premature judgements about whether or not various potential models of ‘extra care’ or other specialist forms of provision fall into class C2 or C3.”

4.54 The topic remains a ‘live’ issue within planning. The recent (2016) conclusions of the Inspector in the Stratford-upon-Avon Local Plan indicate that authorities must have regard to the nature of a scheme, including the relevant planning unit, in determining whether a scheme falls under Use Class C3 and therefore whether certain policy provisions (such as affordable housing contributions) apply. The distinction is relevant where decision-takers are required to acknowledge that despite potentially incorporating individual units of accommodation that appear to serve as separate dwellinghouses, the proportions and extent of other functions and uses within the development (e.g. care, services, ancillary facilities) affect the classification. The following summary is a useful indication:

> “the 1987 Use Classes Order makes the simpler distinction as to whether any particular premises are in use as a dwelling house, which is more important in a policy requirement of this nature. A unit within an extracare development might appear to be self-contained on plan, but if it forms part of a wider care complex then it might well fall outside of Use Class C3.”

4.55 We repeat the recommendation that this is a complex area where the local authorities may require legal advice in determining individual proposals. Promoters may seek to classify accommodation under Use Class C2 for a broad number of reasons. These might relate to (but are not limited to) the proportion of non-residential uses; relationship with other elements of the scheme (e.g. traditional care home places); the approach to control occupancy and care provision through legal obligation; and views of viability and an ability to pay towards other obligations such as affordable housing. These elements are interdependent and their validity may vary on a case-by-case basis.

**Older people and Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs)**

4.56 A relatively high proportion of new development in Northamptonshire is proposed to take place in Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs). Table 4.1 below sets out the proportion of new development in each district

---

59 South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, Inspector’s Report 2012 Paragraphs 11 and 12

60 Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy, Inspector’s Report June 2016 Paragraph 404
Table 4.2 Proportion of new development in SUEs: Local Plan Part I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daventry DC*61</th>
<th>‘Northampton Related’ Development Area7</th>
<th>South Northants DC*7</th>
<th>Corby BC6263</th>
<th>Kettering BC69</th>
<th>East Northants DC69</th>
<th>BC Wellingborough8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total LPA Provision</td>
<td>6,985</td>
<td>28,473</td>
<td>7,173</td>
<td>14,372</td>
<td>11,506</td>
<td>8,721</td>
<td>9,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUE provision</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>16,850</td>
<td>3,910</td>
<td>9,152</td>
<td>5,280</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUEs as proportion of Total</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excluding provision for the Northampton Related Development Area to meet needs arising in Northampton

4.57 SUES, at least in the early stages of development, have not historically been places which are popular with either old people or with specialist retirement housing providers. The absence of local facilities and good public transport and the presence of mud, noise and disruption discourage potential older residents. This does not mean that SUES do not have an important role to play in securing retirement housing provision in the longer term. Milton Keynes has one of the highest rates of retirement housing provision in the country due to its historic policy of reserving key sites adjacent to local centres for development of older persons housing. Larger schemes which create their own community may also be suited to SUES, though again local facilities and public transport need to be in place before they can be provided.

4.58 Care home providers may be more willing to locate in SUES than retirement housing providers, but again good access to public transport (including outside peak times) is needed to enable care workers to get to work and friends and family (who may also be old and unable to drive) to visit residents.

4.59 Because of the limited role of the SUES in meeting older persons housing need, at least in the short term it is appropriate to look at other locations with better access to local facilities where specialist older persons housing could be provided. Across Northamptonshire most capacity is already identified within the system through permissions, completions and existing housing allocations. There is only limited scope to identify additional capacity in the main towns and urban centres. This is set out in table 4.3 below. It will be seen that there is no additional capacity in the towns of Kettering or Wellingborough and very little in the main settlements in South

---

61 SUE Totals taken from Policy S5 of the West Northamptonshire JCS
62 SUE Totals taken from Appendix A of the North Northamptonshire JCS
63 Total 2011-2031 LPA Provision taken from North Northamptonshire JCS Examination Document EXAM8 – ‘Updates to Housing Supply Information’ inclusive of all components of supply including completions and existing commitments
Northamptonshire. Daventry, Corby, East Northamptonshire and Northampton do have scope to identify or promote allocated urban sites for older persons housing.

### Table 4.3 Urban capacity / ‘Residual Requirement’ in major settlements in Northamptonshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daventry</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towcester/Brackley</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corby</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushden</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oundle</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desborough</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.60 In this context, it must be recognised that housing numbers should not be seen as a maximum or ceiling and that older persons housing has often been provided on sites that were not allocated for residential development, including former pub, healthcare and employment sites. It may therefore be appropriate to consider the re-use of existing allocations or under-used employment sites – including Brownfield Registers - and updates to Housing and Employment Land Assessments.

**Supplementary Planning Documents and Further Advice**

4.61 The findings of this Report provide a County-wide assessment of housing for older people and its recommendations are intended to support an increase in the delivery of opportunities to meet these needs. Going forward, a clear understanding of need alongside the criteria that govern delivery of successful schemes should enable providers, developers, policy-makers and other stakeholders to identify the opportunities available and the types of site and location that may be supported. Specific marketing may be undertaken to encourage positive outcomes.

4.62 For planning, the Report in itself provides a framework to inform future planning policy, site assessment and identification; and to support decision-taking on planning applications. However, the authors are mindful that the Report forms part of the evidence base for planning rather than the development plan itself. The Report also post-dates the adopted ‘Part 1’ Local Plans, albeit it should be useful in informing the emerging ‘Part 2’ Local Plans or other future Local Plan reviews.

4.63 In these circumstances, we recommend that it is important that the partner authorities in Northamptonshire take account of the scope to further support and direct proposals for specialist accommodation through the adoption of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD). This represents a recommendation for work under the ‘next steps’ of providing for more development of such schemes. However, in order to make the guidance in any SPD appropriately focused initial work outside of (and developing the evidence base for the SPD) will need to reflect on the delivery mechanisms and type of provision that will be supported in principle. It is not necessary, however, for any SPD to be unduly prescriptive about locations or scale of

---

64 Note that these figures are based on the information at the time the Joint Core Strategy Part 1 Local Plans were adopted and may alter based on further changes to the level of planning commitments.

65 West Northamptonshire Housing Technical Paper Second Update (December 2013) Schedule of Sites

66 North Northamptonshire JCS Examination Document EXAM8 – ‘Updates to Housing Supply Information’
development. The consultation processes undertaken as part of preparing SPD would also raise industry awareness of older persons’ accommodation issues.

4.64 A comprehensive case study is provided by the local authority of South Gloucestershire. The SPDs summarised (see Annex 5) are also included in the Planning Advisory Service Good Practice Case Study: ‘Planning for older people’s housing: the shock of the new’ (September 2015).

4.65 These SPD are regarded as particularly helpful in terms of helping to ensure promoters provide the necessary information with their application and where debate arises in determining Planning Use Class. For detailed planning matters, such as the drafting of S106 planning obligations governing occupancy criteria for new development, SPD can provide useful additional criteria and guidance such the types of facilities and minimum level of care that should be provided.

4.66 At a specific level, looking at development outcomes, SPD offer the opportunity to define the particular features, characteristics and facilities sought by typical schemes as well as setting out (in supplementary advice) why certain design standards such as minimum unit size are promoted. The SPDs in South Gloucestershire also set out the specific reasons for supporting the provision of specialist accommodation on the strategic ‘New Neighbourhood’ allocations, which offer parallels to the circumstances in Northamptonshire.

**Rural Retirement Housing**

4.67 Many of Northamptonshire’s villages already have social rented retirement housing, often in the form of bungalows and these have proved popular with high demand in villages such as Brixworth, Desborough, Greens Norton and Potterspury. This type of housing is popular with the “young old” but there may be problems as people age and become frailer and care providers have expressed concerns about the cost of sending carers to village locations where the journey time is relatively long and there may be only one or two care recipients.

4.68 “Hub and spoke” models seek to address this issue by siting a care facility (including supported housing) in a village location and then employing care workers who provide care to residents in the central “hub” facility and who also service older residents in the same village and in other villages nearby.

This model can prove useful and help address the needs of older residents in Northamptonshire’s villages. Again, it is important that the hub is sited in a location which is served by public transport. Chart 4.3 below shows a map of Northamptonshire’s rural bus routes.

**Table 4.3 Bus services in Northamptonshire**

---

http://www.pas.gov.uk/documents/332612/0/Aging+Population+Case+Study/86293aaa-cf4a-469e-b732-6c675d716159
5. **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

In this chapter we summarise the key recommendations emerging from this report.

1. **Local authority planning departments**

   - Local authorities in both West and North Northamptonshire are currently preparing Stage 2 Local Plans to complement the two Joint Core Strategies. Those Local Plans should provide a clear steer to the development industry about the local authorities’ ambitions with regard to provision of retirement housing (including specialist dementia care housing) and care homes. In particular they should:

   - Set clear **targets** in Local Plans setting out by type and tenure objectives for provision of specialist retirement housing, care homes and dementia friendly housing. Possible targets are shown in Box 1 below

   - **Monitoring**: ensure that policy targets are monitored and this information is set out in Authority Monitoring Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOX 1: POTENTIAL LOCAL PLAN TARGETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• We have modelled potential demand for retirement housing and generated annual targets for each district to the end of the Local Plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>North Northamptonshire</strong> needs to provide <strong>319 units a year</strong> for sale and shared ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>West Northamptonshire</strong> needs to provide <strong>306 units a year</strong> for sale and shared ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Across the County there is a current shortfall of care home provision which meets CQC standards. A further <strong>909 care home beds</strong> will be required by the end of the Local Plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a need for <strong>more specialist care provision for dementia patients</strong>, particularly those with severe dementia and we recommend that at least one scheme should be provided in each district over the next 3-5 years and that a wider range of providers, including providers of dementia care housing/villages should be encouraged to operate in the County.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   - **Defining retirement housing**: When developing policies, strategies, guidance and commissioning documents, adopt terminology that clearly explains, in terms of the outcomes for residents, the types of buildings, services and tenure sought.

   - **Setting standards**: Identify key features that local authorities wish to see provided in new housing schemes and summarise these in either SPD or a checklist for developers (see specimen checklist at Box 2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site</strong></th>
<th>Evidence of demand in the immediate area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum area of 0.2 to 0.6 hectares (ideally at least 0.5 ha). Retirement villages and some extracare schemes will be much larger.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level or with a gradual slope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a town centre, established community or phased development as an SUE becomes established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe, level walking route to facilities and services. Within 400m of public transport route with regular service (at least half hourly) to town centre transport hub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Services within 400m</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High priority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desirable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optional</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Building Design</strong></th>
<th>Meets HAPPI criteria:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Generous internal space standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plenty of natural light in the home and in circulation spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Balconies and outdoor space, avoiding internal corridors and single-aspect flats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adaptability and ‘care aware’ design which is ready for emerging telecare and tele-healthcare technologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Circulation spaces that encourage interaction and avoid an ‘institutional feel’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shared facilities and community ‘hubs’ where these are lacking in the neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plants, trees, and the natural environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High levels of energy efficiency, with good ventilation to avoid overheating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extra (external) storage for belongings and bicycles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shared external areas such as ‘home zones’ that give priority to pedestrians.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional features: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mobility vehicle storage and charging area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Broadband available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lifts to upper floors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Secure main entrance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Person-centred services** | |
| --- | |
| • Access to an emergency alarm service or a regular wellbeing check (by phone, intercom or visit) | |
| • Needs-based support service to facilitate independent living e.g. assistance with literacy, budgeting, self-care, mental health. | |
| • Signposting or referral to specialist support agencies | |
Social integration - leisure activities, events and outings organised by residents or delivered by support provider or scheme manager

Games room and equipment (optional)

Onsite emergency response and personal care services*

Restaurant providing at least one nutritionally balanced main meal per day which can be delivered to residents who are sick or recently discharged from hospital *

Treatment room where physician, chiropodist, physiotherapist or other health professionals can visit and provide confidential advice *

Onsite defibrillator *

Organisation signed up to the NHICE End of Life Care for Adults Quality Standard *

* Additional features of supported housing

**Sustainable Urban Extensions and Garden Villages**

- SUEs can play an important role in meeting long term demand for retirement housing. However they are unlikely to be popular places for older people to live in until local facilities and bus services are in place. Sites for older persons housing should be allocated in Masterplans and Development Briefs in locations with easy access to local facilities and public transport routes, even if the scheme is not developed until appropriate facilities are in place.

- Retirement Villages can establish their own older person friendly environment within a SUE or Garden Village and these types of developments could come forward earlier in the development process. However such schemes should be required to provide a minibus or similar service enabling residents and their friends and families to travel between the scheme and the nearest town centre without being dependent on private transport.

- Care homes can be located in SUEs and Garden Villages at an earlier stage than retirement housing, since they are less dependent on local facilities. There will however need to be access to a regular bus service so that carers can get to work and friends and family can visit residents.

- When preparing local plans, masterplans, SPD or drawing up s106 requirements, require SUEs to include a proportion of older persons housing, to be delivered at a time when local facilities and transport connections are in place.

**Retirement housing in rural areas**

- More work needs to be done to identify the scale of potential demand for retirement housing from existing residents in rural areas. The Councils can use the RHG or SHOP model to do this and should aim to provide a steer on the split between urban and rural demand in their Local Plan Part 2.
• **Neighbourhood Planning**: there is emerging evidence to show that Neighbourhood Plans may be more willing to accept retirement housing than they are to accept general needs housing and that this can increase overall housing provision within the district. The Councils should draw this evidence to the attention of those parishes currently preparing Neighbourhood Plans and should liaise with the Planning Advisory Service and National Association of Local Councils to monitor good practice in the use of Neighbourhood Plans to promote provision of retirement housing.

• **Hub and spoke models**, where a supported housing scheme in one village offers care services to residents in that village and others within a 5 mile radius, can help local residents remain in general needs housing. The Councils should work with the Housing LIN to explore how such models could work in Northamptonshire.

• **Public transport connections**: Neither retirement housing nor care homes should be provided in villages without public transport connections. This is because carers and residents’ friends and family will need to access the scheme and may not have private transport.

**Retirement housing in urban areas**

• Much of the new housing provided in Northamptonshire has been allocated to the SUEs and our analysis shows relatively modest housing allocations in the urban areas. However the bulk of the need for retirement housing and care homes will continue to be in the urban areas, because this is where the bulk of the need occurs and because of their good access to local facilities and public transport. The local authorities will therefore need to take steps to encourage provision of retirement housing in urban areas in addition to what is expected to come through on allocated sites. Such steps should include:
  
  o Support for windfall sites which come forward for retirement housing and care homes from other uses⁶⁸
  
  o Allocation of employment and retail sites for housing usage, specifying that they must include or be provided solely for retirement housing and care homes
  
  o A review of public sector land holdings (including NHS properties) to identify sites which could be marketed for retirement housing provision or care homes
  
  o The preparation of Brownfield Registers should incorporate criteria that assess the suitability of identified sites to make provision for retirement housing

• Any such encouragement of retirement housing provision and care homes should be subject to the proviso that retirement housing sites have good access to local facilities and public transport routes and that care home sites have good access to transport routes.

---

⁶⁸ Noting that according to one major retirement housing provider around 90% of their housing is provided on windfall sites.
**Retirement housing, CIL/S106 and Affordable Housing**

- The Government has made a number of announcements in the Housing White Paper (para refs in brackets below) which have implications for both CIL and affordable housing provision:
  - The definition of affordable housing is to be revised to include a range of sale and “affordable private rented” housing options (para A121 and box 4) – out for consultation
  - All new housing developments except for “residential care homes”\(^{69}\) are to include 10% “affordable home ownership” products (paras A126-129) – out for consultation
  - The CIL review found that CIL is not “as fast, simple or transparent as intended”. The Government intends to examine options for reform and make an announcement at the time of the Autumn 2017 Budget (paras 2.28-29)
- The revised broader definition of affordable housing accords well with our findings which suggest that there is potential demand for a wider range of retirement housing options, both by type and tenure.
- The requirement for 10% affordable home ownership within retirement housing schemes should be beneficial in terms of meeting a wider range of demand.
- We recommend that Part 2 Local Plans should set affordable housing targets for older persons housing which reflect the need for affordable housing for older people rather than the general needs affordable housing target. This would focus affordable housing provision on shared ownership rather than on social rent and would accord well with the 10% affordable home ownership requirement. Where a higher affordable housing target is sought it will continue to be subject to scheme specific viability appraisal.
- With regard to CIL, none of the North Northamptonshire local authorities currently charge CIL. All of the West Northamptonshire local authorities charge CIL on all residential developments (Use Class C3) with no distinction between retirement housing and general needs housing.
- We do not recommend that the local authorities make any amendment to their current policies on CIL until after the Autumn Budget.
- Before setting local CIL rates for retirement housing the North Northamptonshire local authorities should request a specific appraisal of the viability of retirement housing compared with general needs housing and give consideration to setting separate CIL rates.
- West Northamptonshire authorities should monitor planning applications and viability appraisals submitted for retirement housing schemes and seek to identify whether CIL

---

\(^{69}\) Full text refers to dedicated supported housing, such as residential care homes, which provide specialist accommodation for a particular group of people and which include an element of support; this could extend following consultation to include extra-care or all schemes with a C2 use class, but given that the product is no longer a starter home, but merely affordable home ownership product it becomes much more difficult to argue this case.
has an impact on scheme viability and hence either on affordable housing provision or in extremis on the ability of development to proceed. If it appears that CIL has either of these impacts on scheme viability then they should request a specific appraisal of the viability of retirement housing compared with general needs housing and give consideration to setting separate CIL rates.

- S106 development contributions to infrastructure provision should be appropriate to the services required by the residents (e.g. education is not a service that older people will require or benefit from).
- Car parking requirements should be flexible within a range that reflects lower levels of car ownership and traffic generation in specialist older people’s housing but also local transport options.

**Use classes and housing delivery**

- The Housing White Paper (paragraph 2.49) proposes to introduce a new ‘housing delivery test’. This will focus attention on monitoring the progress that local authorities are making towards achieving development plan housing requirements. If development is not progressing as planned this will have implications for whether the development plan remains up-to-date. Whether older persons housing counts as Use Class C3 (housing) or C2 (residential care) therefore has implications for the delivery of housing targets.
- We recommend that the local councils immediately set out the current pipeline of commitments and recent record of completions for retirement housing and / or care homes and identify which of these that are considered to contribute towards development plan housing requirements.
- The preparation of Part 2 Local Plans (or alternatively a review of the Part 1 Local Plans) gives an important opportunity to address any refinements to the definition of retirement housing within the development plan.
- We recommend that the Part 2 Local Plans (or supporting SPD) provide a clear definition of what is C2 and what is C3. This report recommends that, as with the London Plan, all units which have their own front door should be classified as C3. However there are a range of possible definitions. For instance the Inspector at Stratford on Avon Local Plan Enquiry commented that “the 1987 Use Classes Order makes the simpler distinction as to whether any particular premises are in use as a dwelling house, which is more important in a policy requirement of this nature. A unit within an extracare development might appear to be self-contained on plan, but if it forms part of a wider care complex then it might well fall outside of Use Class C3.”
- The Inspector at South Oxfordshire appears to recommend that this issue should not be addressed in the Local Plan “‘The Use Class categorisation of any element of an individual scheme will need to be judged on its particular facts. The C5 should avoid premature judgements about whether or not various potential models of ‘extra care’ or other specialist forms of provision fall into class C2 or C3.’” Further legal opinion may be required before coming to a final view on this matter.
2. **Local authority housing departments**

   **Working with the affordable housing sector:**
   - Our modelling indicates that there is very limited demand for additional provision of retirement housing for rent. However it is important that the rented stock continues to be of a high standard and to meet modern standards as they evolve (eg with more use of mobility scooters and more widespread access to IT and the internet). The District and Borough Councils should take active steps to improve their understanding of demand for and supply of affordable retirement housing and should:
     - improve record keeping and encourage RP partners to do the same, where possible maintaining records in a consistent format. This will enable more effective monitoring of demand across the County.
     - initiate more in-depth investigation of reasons for low demand to inform future asset management decisions
     - seek to set common minimum standards for affordable rented retirement housing with a view to encouraging remodelling or withdrawal of these schemes which either fall short of specified standards or suffer from persistent low demand
     - If a persistent, local issue is identified regarding long term empty private leasehold properties offered for sale at lower values, look into the possibility of the local authority or RPs purchasing the properties for use as private rented or shared ownership accommodation.

   **Working with the sale housing sector**
   - Our modelling points to potential strong demand for both sale and shared ownership products. There are examples of both sale housing providers and RPs who can provide a range of such products for the retirement housing sector (in the case of RPs often in association with a mixed tenure development incorporating social rented housing).
   - Local authority housing teams should take the lead in engaging with private developers and RPs aiming to:
     - better understand the range of products available
     - identify a range of organisations who wish to be active partners in working in Northamptonshire to create a specialised housing development pipeline to deliver the required types and tenures.

3. **For NCC and local housing teams:**
   - To make most effective use of resources, NCC and the seven district councils should seek to develop a single, agreed approach to the use of supported housing top up funding allocated to local authorities following the introduction of the LHA cap.
   - Following publication of the LHA cap policy decisions in 2017, engage (with the assistance of the Northamptonshire Social Landlords Development Forum) with existing partners and specialist providers to explore the appetite for development to meet assessed need.
   - NCC briefing of local authority housing teams and RPs on relevant aspects of care funding to support future decision-making on nominations, rents and service charges.
• Releasing/developing on public land. It may be possible to take advantage of Government proposals to consult on extending local authorities’ flexibility to dispose of land at less than best consideration. (Housing White Paper para 1.27.)
• In view of forecast future limitations on access to home ownership, explore the potential to develop a supported housing rental model linked to a scheme for older people to lease their family home to the local authority or an RP.
• **For NCC Social Care, CCGs and social landlords but funded by multiple agencies:**
  • To address the inappropriate use of support, care and health services by vulnerable social tenants, introduce a trial prevention service which would engage regularly with those tenants, supporting them to become more socially integrated.

4. **CCGS**

*Stranded patients*

• At present the only information we have on stranded patients is that they are unable to go home. We do not know what are the key factors which prevent them going home.
  
  o These may be related to physical unsuitability of the property they live in, in which case we need to know what it is about the home which makes it unsuitable for the patient to be discharged to.
  o They may be related to a shortage of trained nurses/carers who can provide the necessary support in the home environment.
  o They may be related to the complexity of the process of organising home based care and support and/or the lack of a patient representative who has power of attorney and is able to take part in the decision-making process.

• Each of these problems requires a different type of solution, of which only the first can be solved by a wider range of housing provision. More information is required about the complex of reasons underlying a report of “unable to go home”.
  
  o The local authorities and CCGs should improve the monitoring of stranded patients and record more fully reasons why each individual cannot go home.
  o There may be a case for commissioning further research into emerging best practice solutions to the problems identified, but the first step is to collect more detailed and robust data.

4. **All public sector partners**

• **Identifying sites for specialist housing provision and care homes:** Given the importance of location as a key criterion for successful provision of older persons housing there is scope for the County Council, CCGs and local authority planning and housing teams to work together to identify publicly owned sites which are in suitable locations for development.

• **Innovative dementia care:** Seek to encourage provision of a range of care options. Explore the feasibility of a partnership of the County Council, District/Borough Council partner, relevant CCG and a specialist Registered Provider of Social Housing (RP) to establish a Dementia Care model scheme.
• Engage with providers which have developed re-ablement and interim care services to develop fresh options for stranded patients.

• Consider the cost benefits of introducing downsizing incentives (including practical assistance with preparing to move) across all tenures.

• Consider developing options which support older people to move to rented specialist retirement accommodation while generating income from letting the home they own (and preserving a capital asset).

• Developing a private rented market: Seek to encourage development of a private rented retirement housing market (either as standalone developments or as individual units within larger schemes).

• Marketing Northamptonshire to specialist providers: Draw up marketing documents which identify Northamptonshire as a location which welcomes retirement housing provision and seeks to ensure provision of a range of options for provision of care, including for dementia patients. Organise special events where specialist housing providers and care home operators can get to know the Councils and CCGs better.

5. Local authorities and CCGs: working with consumers

• Although we were not specifically asked to address the issue of how members of the public obtain information about retirement housing and care options, it became clear that there is no obvious information point which people can turn to. Analysis of the stock condition data also highlighted that the local authorities have considerable information about social rented housing options but very little information about the options currently available in the private sector. There is also very little published information about services (and the cost to consumers) provided in both affordable and market schemes.

• As the population ages and more people have to fund their own care and housing provision as they age, reliable and easy access to this type of information becomes increasingly important to older people and to their carers and family members. We believe that the local authorities and CCGS could do more to encourage providers to make this type of information available on an easily comparable basis and to ensure that members of the public know where to go to access this type of information – with doctors’ surgeries and public libraries being obvious, but not the only, possible first ports of call. We therefore make the following recommendations:

• Publicising housing options: ensure that members of the public can access up-to-date information about the range of housing and care options available. This may be as simple as ensuring that local libraries have access to the First Stop Housing Choice and HOOP tools and that library staff have received training in how to use these tools.

---

70 Girlings, now part of Places for People are the main operator in this sector, buying individual units within sale schemes or acting as an agent for individuals who want to rent out an apartment.

71 There is scope for consideration as to whether this information is best provided in a marketing document, a Market Position Statement or a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Much will depend on the process of consultation envisaged and the extent to which the key points are covered in Part 2 Local Plans.
• Set up a **County wide database** which lists all retirement housing and care schemes and sets out up to date information on services provided and costs to residents (including event fees, service charges and add-on fees for additional care).

• **Enforcement**: Require developers to submit this information at the time they are granted planning permission. Monitoring officer to be funded by developer contributions.
ANNEX 1; KEY STATISTICS ON HOUSING DEMAND AND SUPPLY IN NORTHAMPTONSHIRE
### Population and Households by Age

#### Population by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>% change 2015 - 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>52,800</td>
<td>54,300</td>
<td>48,400</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>84,400</td>
<td>96,100</td>
<td>104,600</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>72,300</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>90,600</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>37,300</td>
<td>45,100</td>
<td>64,400</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>17,700</td>
<td>28,400</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Households by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>% change 2015 - 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>48,791</td>
<td>54,900</td>
<td>59,424</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>44,590</td>
<td>47,501</td>
<td>53,112</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>26,352</td>
<td>31,403</td>
<td>44,643</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>10,875</td>
<td>12,391</td>
<td>19,870</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 75+</td>
<td>37,227</td>
<td>43,794</td>
<td>64,513</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Households by Tenure 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% owned</th>
<th>Owned:</th>
<th>Owned with a mortgage or loan or shared</th>
<th>rented:</th>
<th>Social rented:</th>
<th>rented: Private landlord or letting</th>
<th>rented: Other private rented or</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>26,552</td>
<td>32,662</td>
<td>6,194</td>
<td>3,652</td>
<td>5,817</td>
<td>1,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>22,450</td>
<td>3,716</td>
<td>3,375</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>16,124</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>2,736</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>5,911</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Supply of Retirement Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Rent</td>
<td>6,146</td>
<td>5,992</td>
<td>-154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Sale</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtraCare Rent</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtraCare Sale</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,781</td>
<td>7,697</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Households by Tenure 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% homeowners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### No of Units per 000 households aged 75 & over by tenure 2015

- Sheltered Rent: 594.9
- Sheltered Sale: 25.0
- ExtraCare Rent: 63.2
- ExtraCare Sale: 14.3

Total: 206.8
### Corby

#### Population by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>% change 2015 - 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>-2.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>30.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>54.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Households by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>% change 2015 - 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>4,415</td>
<td>5,160</td>
<td>5,495</td>
<td>24.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>3,302</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>39.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>2,323</td>
<td>3,115</td>
<td>44.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>65.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>2,904</td>
<td>3,167</td>
<td>4,362</td>
<td>50.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Supply of Retirement Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Rent</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Sale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtraCare Rent</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtraCare Sale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Households by Tenure 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% Homeowners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Households by Age

- **55-64**: 73% of 1,945 homes moved to 2,933 homes, a 30.26% increase.
- **65-74**: 71% of 1,764 homes moved to 3,261 homes, a 86.00% increase.
- **75-84**: 68% of 1,243 homes moved to 3,261 homes, a 174.26% increase.
- **85+**: 63% of 374 homes moved to 1,019 homes, a 272.46% increase.

#### % Homeowners by Age

- **55-64**: 56.0% of homes were owned outright.
- **65-74**: 73.2% of homes were owned outright.
- **75-84**: 67.9% of homes were owned outright.
- **85+**: 63.5% of homes were owned outright.

---

**Sheltered Rent**

= 397 homes in 2013, increased to 483 homes in 2015, an increase of 86 homes.

**Sheltered Sale**

= No homes in 2013, 0 homes in 2015.

**ExtraCare Rent**

= 70 homes in 2013, increased to 70 homes in 2015, no change.

**ExtraCare Sale**

= No homes in 2013, 0 homes in 2015.

---

**Supply of Retirement Housing**

= Total of 467 homes in 2013, increased to 553 homes in 2015, an increase of 86 homes.

---

**Households by Tenure 2011**

- **50-64**: 72.7% of homes were owned outright.
- **65-74**: 71.2% of homes were owned outright.
- **75-84**: 67.9% of homes were owned outright.
- **85+**: 63.5% of homes were owned outright.

---

**% Homeowners by Age**

- **55-64**: 56.0% homeowners.
- **65-74**: 73.2% homeowners.
- **75-84**: 67.9% homeowners.
- **85+**: 63.5% homeowners.

---

**Households by Tenure 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>Homes Moved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>1,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>2,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>3,874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**% Homeowners by Age**

- **55-64**: 56.0% homeowners.
- **65-74**: 73.2% homeowners.
- **75-84**: 67.9% homeowners.
- **85+**: 63.5% homeowners.

---

**Sheltered Rent**

= 397 homes in 2013, increased to 483 homes in 2015, an increase of 86 homes.

**Sheltered Sale**

= No homes in 2013, 0 homes in 2015.

**ExtraCare Rent**

= 70 homes in 2013, increased to 70 homes in 2015, no change.

**ExtraCare Sale**

= No homes in 2013, 0 homes in 2015.

---

**Supply of Retirement Housing**

= Total of 467 homes in 2013, increased to 553 homes in 2015, an increase of 86 homes.

---

**Households by Tenure 2011**

- **50-64**: 72.7% of homes were owned outright.
- **65-74**: 71.2% of homes were owned outright.
- **75-84**: 67.9% of homes were owned outright.
- **85+**: 63.5% of homes were owned outright.

---

**% Homeowners by Age**

- **55-64**: 56.0% homeowners.
- **65-74**: 73.2% homeowners.
- **75-84**: 67.9% homeowners.
- **85+**: 63.5% homeowners.
## Daventry

### Population by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>% change 2015 - 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>-19.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>12,900</td>
<td>20.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>22.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>74.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Age Band 2015 2020 2030 % change 2015 - 2030 Age Band 2015 2020 2030 % change 2015 - 2030 Age Band % homeowners by age of household

### Households by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>% change 2015 - 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>6,053</td>
<td>6,854</td>
<td>7,115</td>
<td>17.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>5,666</td>
<td>5,866</td>
<td>6,355</td>
<td>12.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>3,247</td>
<td>4,080</td>
<td>5,736</td>
<td>76.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>103.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Households by Tenure 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% owned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Homeowners by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% home owners by age of household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supply of Retirement Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Rent</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Sale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtraCare Rent</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtraCare Sale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Households by Tenure 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% home owners by age of household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### No of Units per 100 households aged 75 & over by tenure 2015 (assumes tenure breakdown the same as in 2011)

- **Sheltered Rent**: 153.0
- **Sheltered Sale**: 0.0
- **ExtraCare Rent**: 23.6
- **ExtraCare Sale**: 0.0

### Total

|          | 58.8 |

---

**Note:** The data reflects the percentage change and distribution of age bands, home ownership, and tenure types in Daventry. The figures indicate a notable increase in the older age groups, particularly 75-84 and 85+, with a significant rise in homeownership and tenure diversity.
## Population by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>% change 2015 - 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>-13.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>24.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>86.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Households by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>% change 2015 - 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>6,359</td>
<td>7,041</td>
<td>7,765</td>
<td>22.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>6,237</td>
<td>6,860</td>
<td>7,485</td>
<td>20.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>4,489</td>
<td>6,652</td>
<td>84.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>1,778</td>
<td>3,043</td>
<td>105.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Households by Age - % change 2015-30

### Households by Tenure 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% homeowners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% home owners by age of household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Supply of Retirement Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Rent</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Sale</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtraCare Rent</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtraCare Sale</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% home owners by age of household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Households by Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% home owners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% home owners by age of household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Households by Tenure 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% owned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% owned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Kettering

#### Population by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>% change 2015 - 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>-7.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>27.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>18.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>74.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>78.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Households by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>% change 2015 - 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>6,446</td>
<td>7,176</td>
<td>8,018</td>
<td>24.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>6,279</td>
<td>6,565</td>
<td>7,077</td>
<td>12.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>3,652</td>
<td>4,368</td>
<td>6,156</td>
<td>68.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>1,627</td>
<td>1,781</td>
<td>2,845</td>
<td>74.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>5,279</td>
<td>6,149</td>
<td>9,001</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Supply of Retirement Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Rent</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Sale</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtraCare Rent</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtraCare Sale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Households by Tenure 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% homeowners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### No of Units per 100 households aged 75 & over by tenure 2015 (assumes tenure breakdown the same as in 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>75-84</th>
<th>85+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Rent</td>
<td>429.6</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Sale</td>
<td>429.6</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtraCare Rent</td>
<td>429.6</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Northampton

#### Population by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>% change 2015-2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>22,900</td>
<td>26,100</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>24.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>20,200</td>
<td>23,700</td>
<td>29.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>66.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>62.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Houses by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>% change 2015-2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>13,780</td>
<td>15,673</td>
<td>17,312</td>
<td>25.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>11,603</td>
<td>12,609</td>
<td>14,586</td>
<td>25.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>7,025</td>
<td>7,950</td>
<td>11,299</td>
<td>60.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>2,944</td>
<td>3,222</td>
<td>4,793</td>
<td>62.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Supply of Retirement Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Rent</td>
<td>2,957</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Sale</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtraCare Rent</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtraCare Sale</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,822</td>
<td>3,846</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Houses by Tenure 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% homeowners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Households by Age - % change 2015-30

- 55-64: 25.63%
- 65-74: 25.71%
- 75-84: 60.84%
- 85+: 62.81%

#### % home owners by age of household

- 55-64: 72.0%
- 65-74: 74.0%
- 75-84: 76.0%
- 85+: 78.0%

---

### Households by Age

- 55-64
- 65-74
- 75-84
- 85+

#### Age Band

- % change 2015 - 2030

---

### Households by Tenure 2011

- % owned:
  - Owned:
    - 50-64: 75.9%
    - 65-74: 77.3%
    - 75-84: 77.7%
    - 85+: 70.3%
  - Rented:
    - Private landlord or letting agency
    - Other social rented
    - Council or housing association
    - Private rented
    - Other private rented or living rent

---

### Other Social Rented

- 50-64: 75.9%
- 65-74: 77.3%
- 75-84: 77.7%
- 85+: 70.3%

---

### Private Rented

- 50-64: 75.9%
- 65-74: 77.3%
- 75-84: 77.7%
- 85+: 70.3%

---

### Households by Tenure 2011

- %% homeowners:
  - 55-64: 1,205.8
  - 65-74: 45.4
  - 75-84: 125.0
  - 85+: 34.3

---

### Households by Age - % change 2015-30

- 55-64: 25.63%
- 65-74: 25.71%
- 75-84: 60.84%
- 85+: 62.81%

---

### % home owners by age of household

- 55-64: 72.0%
- 65-74: 74.0%
- 75-84: 76.0%
- 85+: 78.0%
### South Northamptonshire

#### Population by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>% change 2015 - 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>-15.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>20.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>22.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>80.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>104.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Households by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>% change 2015 - 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>6,426</td>
<td>7,217</td>
<td>7,432</td>
<td>15.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>6,332</td>
<td>6,626</td>
<td>7,345</td>
<td>16.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>3,672</td>
<td>4,572</td>
<td>6,359</td>
<td>79.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>3,232</td>
<td>108.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>6,491</td>
<td>9,829</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Households by Tenure 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% homeowners</th>
<th>Sheltered Rent</th>
<th>Sheltered Sale</th>
<th>ExtraCare Rent</th>
<th>ExtraCare Sale</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>243.3</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>117.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>235.0</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>117.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>228.6</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>117.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>222.4</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>117.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Supply of Retirement Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Rent</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>-186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Sale</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtraCare Rent</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtraCare Sale</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>-186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Households by Tenure 2029

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% home owners by age of household</th>
<th>Sheltered Rent</th>
<th>Sheltered Sale</th>
<th>ExtraCare Rent</th>
<th>ExtraCare Sale</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>243.3</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>117.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>235.0</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>117.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>228.6</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>117.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>222.4</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>117.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### No of Units per 000 households aged 75 & over by tenure 2015 (assumes tenure breakdown the same as in 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>No of units per 000 households aged 75 &amp; over by tenure 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>Sheltered Rent 243.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>Sheltered Sale 41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>ExtraCare Rent 49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>ExtraCare Sale 15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>Total 117.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Households by Tenure 2029

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% home owners by age of household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>Sheltered Rent 84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>Sheltered Sale 84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>ExtraCare Rent 84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>ExtraCare Sale 84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>Total 84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Population by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>% change 2015 - 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>19.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>15.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>69.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>76.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Households by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>% change 2015 - 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>5,312</td>
<td>5,779</td>
<td>6,287</td>
<td>18.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>5,171</td>
<td>5,385</td>
<td>5,664</td>
<td>9.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>3,096</td>
<td>3,621</td>
<td>5,088</td>
<td>69.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>71.34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Households by Tenure 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% homeowners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supply of Retirement Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Type</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Rent</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Sale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtraCare Rent</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtraCare Sale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Households by Age - % change 2015-30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>18.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>9.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>69.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>71.34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### % home owners by age of household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>% homeowners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction and Legislative Background

1.1 Neighbourhood Plans can be an important vehicle to support the provision of specialist accommodation for the elderly. They must, however, be interpreted as part of their relationship with the wider development plan and the legislation and guidance that covers their preparation. The central consideration here is that whilst Local Plans must satisfy the soundness tests prescribed in national policy, the test of a Neighbourhood Plan is to meet the (to some degree less onerous) requirements of the basic conditions.

1.2 Two key elements from the basic conditions are relevant. Firstly, any Neighbourhood Plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area)\(^2\). The requirement is less onerous than fully complying with or following an existing development plan policy but the identification of strategic policies is an important part of the test. Policies for the supply of housing and meeting housing needs are generally regarded as strategic. This is also true for policies seeking contributions towards affordable housing.

1.3 A failure to conform with strategic policies may exist if a Neighbourhood Plan prevents development or supports alternative forms of development where Local Plan policies might otherwise provide for development that meets general housing needs. This raises important questions about how the requirement for development, need for different types of specialist accommodation (and institutional accommodation) and how the definition of planning Use Class is expressed (if at all) in the Local Plan.

1.4 Secondly, there is no requirement to be in general conformity with non-strategic policies of the development plan. This can include details such as housing mix or design where more locally specific evidence may be available and could seek variations in setting out the locations where development will be considered acceptable. This also gives a wider scope to address issues not covered by the Local Plan (such as, for example, the location of residential care homes). In these cases, policies must contribute to achieving sustainable development (so, for example, development should be viable and ensure benefits outweigh harm across the environmental, economic and social dimensions) and may be subject to the requirements of Sustainability Appraisal. Under these circumstances, it is possible that Neighbourhood Plans can meet additional development needs to those covered by the Local Plan.

1.5 Under National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) there is no requirement for neighbourhood plans to include policies on specialist older person accommodation. Neighbourhood planning however can be a powerful vehicle to assist in the delivery of residential care homes, extra care housing, assisted living facilities, sheltered or supported housing or retirement housing where there is an identified need in the most up to date District level SHMA.

---

\(^2\) Paragraph: 065 Reference ID: 41-065-20140306
1.6 Neighbourhood plans under paragraph 070 of the NPPG should not promote less development than that set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies. Within this framework neighbourhood plans can positively build upon local planning authority (LPA) policy. They can raise awareness on the need to provide specialist older persons’ accommodation; information may gather more detail of the type of need required, and direct the most appropriate areas for the provision of specialist older person accommodation. Lastly, neighbourhood plans can be produced in a shorter time frame than a Local Plan and therefore they can put an up to date policy in place where the district level development plan is out of date.

1.7 The following section provides four best practice examples of policy approaches for addressing specialist older persons’ accommodation in completed neighbourhood plans. The legislation and supporting regulations for neighbourhood planning have only been in force since 2012. Factoring in the time it takes to prepare neighbourhood plans the extend their implementation can be monitored is limited. Interviews with the neighbourhood plan contacts for the Oakley and Dean Neighbourhood Plan and Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan on how the policies have facilitated the specialist older person accommodation in practice are set out in Appendix 1. These sought to trace the implementation of the neighbourhood plan policies as far as possible.

2. Neighbourhood plan best practice policy approaches

2.1 The best practice examples look at the following ways that neighbourhood plan policies can help bring forward specialist older person accommodation.

2.2 Supporting all types of specialist older person accommodation:
- Providing more local evidence.
- Raising awareness.
- Supporting applications.
- Identifying sites.
- Supporting the extension of existing sites.

2.3 Supporting the delivery of general housing (C3) needs for those looking to downsize:
- Promotion of smaller units for those looking to downsize.
- Allocating C3 retirement homes outside the settlement boundary.
- Promoting bungalows for retired people.

2.4 Supporting (C2) care homes and nursing homes:
- Allocating (C2) care homes and nursing homes outside the settlement boundary.
3. Case Study 1. Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan

3.1 Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan (ODNP) was made on 26 May 2016. At the referendum 94% of the voters on the said “yes” to the ODNP. The parish is in Basingstoke and Deane. The plan provides a good example of evidence based policies: to allocate sites for the development of (C3) housing for retired people looking to downsize, to promote bungalows and to alter the settlement boundary to accommodate this type of housing growth. The plan also has a good level of support from the local community.

3.2 The Local Plan for Basingstoke and Dean was adopted in 2016. The Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Group (ODNG) undertook a full assessment and appraisal of sites and allocated 150 sites for C3 housing to align with the local plan’s OAHN for the parish. It was identified though the evidence base that there was a strong increase in need for housing provision for the elderly within the parish. The ODNG also proactively engaged with developers who had promoted their sites through the SHLAA. The ODNP is accompanied by an SA Report, which considers the sustainability performance of the plan and reasonable alternatives in conjunction with a range of sustainability issues.

3.3 The proprietors of an existing care home Oakley Hall (C2) wanted to develop a retirement community at the site. The care home currently provides care for 60 people. The care home wanted to provide retirement dwellings for people who want to downsize. The site is outside the parish settlement boundary where development for (C3) is generally restricted. The neighbourhood plan policy 3 supports the extension of retirement offer of the care home and allocates the site for 30 individual units all of which will be for C3 retirement dwellings. The site is Grade 3 agricultural land. The SA of the site identified site constraints including large areas of Woodpasture and Parkland BAP Priority Habitats. There are also three Grade II listed buildings/structures present at the site including Oakley Hall, the stable block and courtyard, and the kitchen garden wall. The allocation specifically identifies the site for a committed level of housing growth for the parish and the expectation is that the site will come forward in the plan period. This provides the care providers with a degree of certainly and support for their plans whilst it is recognised that the application will need to plan sensitively regarding the constraints on the site.

3.4 The policy demonstrates that an allocation that in a relatively constrained site can be taken forward in a neighbourhood plan which is positive for the care home providers the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy 3. Site Allocation Oakley Hall.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakley Hall - approximately 30 units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.5 The site at Sainfoin Lane comprises of Grade 2 and Grade 3a agricultural land. The ODNP brings forward this site for general housing for people who want to downsize through two policies. Firstly, Policy 3. Site Allocation identifies the site for approximately 35 units. This policy also revises the parish settlement boundary to include the site and provides a map of the revised boundary. Secondly Policy 4. Site Specific Requirements sets out that 40% of the 35 units should be sheltered accommodation for the elderly in the form of bungalows. The site was assessed in the SA and there were no major constraints on the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy 3. Site Allocation Sainfoin Lane.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sainfoin Lane - The development of approximately 35 units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revised Settlement Policy Boundary is shown on Map 4 together with plans of each of the allocations, following this Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy 4. Site Specific Requirements Sainfoin Lane.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sainfoin Lane Development proposals will be supported if at least 40% of the dwellings are sheltered accommodation for the elderly in the form of bungalows. Development in each of the areas should, as far as possible, be well integrated with the existing built development in the village.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Case Study 2: Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan

4.1 Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan (MNP) falls within the Wiltshire County. The MNP was formally made by Wiltshire Council on 25 February 2015. Malmesbury Neighbourhood Steering Group (MNSG) was formed in April 2012 and lead on the preparation of the plan. In the referendum held on 27 November 2014 there was a 90.3% vote in favour of adopting the MNP. The MNP is an example of how a NP can raise awareness and support for the need to specialised accommodation for older persons and how NP policies can aid in planning permission being granted on such schemes.

4.2 The Wiltshire County Core Strategy (WCS) was adopted in January 2015. The WCS aims to deliver 270 new (C3) homes in the Malmesbury Neighbourhood Area. MNSG Local Neighbourhood Survey, November 2012 identified a major increase in the population over 65, and over 85. A growth aging population was highlighted as the most significant factor affecting housing need in the next 15 years. The MNP proactively sets out how this can be achieved including, identifying housing sites suitable for older people.

4.3 The Burnham House site in Malmesbury was identified in Policy 6 for the provision of 50 extra care mixed tenure units (C3) for single people or couples over the age of 55. Once delivered this would be Malmesbury’s first extra care housing scheme which contributes towards the general OAHN. The housing aims to provide fully independent self-contained apartments with a range of communal facilities. The site is previously developed land in Malmesbury town. The site was formerly a residential home and has been vacant since 2008. The site was identified and promoted by care home providers prior to the MNP. However, the MNP aimed to endorse the proposal to support its
delivery and implementation in more detail to the WCS. The development successfully received planning consent in July 2015 for 49 extra care units. Preference given to local people for rental of flats.

4.4 The policy is a good example of local engagement with key stakeholders. The policy was developed through joint working with Wiltshire Council and Bouygues UK the site promoters and the community. Since the permission was granted two classes from the local nursery school have been shown around the site and the site has been visited by both Council officers and local Members to celebrate it going forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy 6. The Redundant Burnham House Site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The redundant Burnham House site is allocated for redevelopment to provide approximately 50 dwellings as the first choice for Extra Care housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Case Study 3: Fernhurst Neighbourhood Plan

5.1 Fernhurst Neighbourhood Plan (FNP) was made by the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) on 14 April 2016. At the referendum 87.9% voted yes for the plan. The FNP is in the Chichester District. Chichester District Local Plan 1999 is the current development plan covering the Fernhurst parish. The SDNPA is also in the process of producing a South Downs National Park Local Plan.

5.2 The Chichester Objectively Assessed Housing Need, 2014 identifies that the largest growth will be in people aged 65 at a district Level. The population aged 85 and over is projected to increase significantly.

5.3 The FNP identifies the Syngenta site approximately 1.2 miles to the south of Fernhurst village centre of 11.3 hectares (28 acres) of previously developed land. In the adopted Chichester, Local Plan, the site is protected for employment use. The emerging South Downs National Local Plan states that a mix of uses could be appropriate for the site. The Syngenta site is one of the few major development opportunities in the National Park and housing needs are considerable. The FNP is a good example of how a neighbourhood plan can bring forward a policy to address housing in advance of a local development plan being in place. The site is outside the existing settlement boundary in the SDNP and landscape and visual impact are issues that would need to be addressed. Despite these constraints the FNP provides a good basis for development to come forward by undertaking evidence base studies such as a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment which considers how the careful redevelopment of the Syngenta site can be done to avoid any negative impacts on the landscape and how future growth here it
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could serve to restore and enhance the environment and settling in that location. The policy based on the identified local need outlines that a residential care home which would fall into the (C2) category could be included separately as part of the development.

Policy SA1. Site Allocation Former Syngenta Site.

The former Syngenta site can be brought forward for a sustainable mixed-use development incorporating residential and commercial development and other suitable uses. Its location within a National Park means that any scheme must be of the highest quality in terms of its design and environmental sustainability. It must also enhance the biodiversity of the area and should ensure that visitors to the National Park can use the site as a base to explore the surrounding countryside. Proposals for this site are ‘major development’ and must therefore meet the exceptional circumstances tests set out in NPPF paragraph 116 and be in the public interest. Proposals must be sustainable and will be assessed against the eight principles of sustainable development. Proposals must be master planned to support the development of a sustainable community within the parish of Fernhurst. Any planning application shall demonstrate how the development will address the following requirements: Housing The development will deliver approximately 200 new build dwellings as part of a mixed-use scheme for the whole site and subject to a masterplan. This masterplan will consider the aims of this policy, the viability of the scheme and the net benefits to the existing and future residents of Fernhurst and the Special Qualities of the National Park. 50% of the new dwellings will be affordable, subject to the viability assessment referred to above. Any new build dwellings are subject to the Highfield building being demolished.

Residential care home. If there is interest from a provider, then a residential care home for the elderly could be included as part of the development.

6. Case Study 4. Lavenham Neighbourhood Plan

6.1 On the 20th September 2016, Babergh District Council made the Lavenham Neighbourhood Plan (LNP) 2016 – 2031. The LNP is a good example of a general policy that supports the development of both smaller retirement units for people wishing to downsize and care homes in line with the district local plan. A Lavenham Neighbourhood Plan case study was prepared by DCLG supported by Campaign to Protect Rural England, and Action with Communities in Rural England.

6.2 Lavenham does not have assisted living or nursing home facilities for older residents even though over a third of its residents are aged over 65. Thus, the local community
sought to support and promote specialist older person accommodation. The Babergh Core Strategy Local Plan (BCS) 2014 does not allocate sites for specialist older persons’ accommodation. At a district level the strategic policy support for specialist older people accommodation is set out in two policies. Policy CS 11 sets out a criterion to allow appropriate developments outside the built-up area boundary.

6.3 The LNP Policy H6 provides more detail to Policy CS 11 and encourages care homes and housing for elderly people. This support the district in bringing forward new schemes both in and outside the settlement boundary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1 Policy H6. Homes for Elderly People.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development proposals for a residential care home, for a sheltered housing scheme or other specialist housing that will meet the needs of the older generation will be permitted if proposals are either located within or adjacent to the built-up area boundary of Lavenham and where the scheme can be clearly demonstrated to be well related to the existing pattern of development in Lavenham.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where proposals are being put forward outside the existing built up area boundary of Lavenham, they will be supported where they are accompanied by a completed CS11 assessment checklist, which considers any cumulative impact taken with other existing commitments in the village and demonstrates:
- that the scale and character of the proposal respects the landscape, landscape features, streetscape/town scape, heritage assets and important spaces and historic views into and out of the village;
- the proposal will make a positive contribution to the local character, shape and scale of the area;
- the scheme will be located within walking distances to the village centre and where it can be demonstrated that the development (for example through its scale) will not detract from the existing focal points provided by the village centre and the historic core;
- the development provides an adequate amount of accommodation for warden/staff;
- the development incorporates usable, attractive areas of communal garden and adequate car parking is provided.

Where permission is granted for an institutional use (Class C2 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended) the permission will be restricted to the use permitted only.

Where permission is granted for sheltered housing, it will normally be subject to a Planning Obligation under Section 106 of The Town and Country Planning Act 1990, restricting occupation to persons over 60 years of age.

7. Conclusions
7.1 Local plans need to ensure that they meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area (‘OAHN’). Therefore, their focus can be on the OAHN for (C3) housing. Neighbourhood plans can support the provision of general housing for people over retirement age, whose housing needs can encompass accessible, adaptable general needs housing (C3) for looking to downsize from larger units\(^\text{76}\) as part of facilitating the OAHN.

7.2 The pressure to meet the OAHN can mean that Local Plans don’t always have an equal focus for the provision of (C2) housing. Neighbourhood plans have greater degree of flexibility to focus on providing specialised housing for those with support or care needs under the (C2) care homes and nursing homes category.

7.3 In examples where Neighbourhood Plans have supported the provision of institutional accommodation and bed spaces (under Use Class C2) the total amount of provision is generally not specified or weighed against housing requirements set out in the development plan. These typically represent specific opportunities that than plan wishes to support or the scope for additional development alongside Use Class C3 dwellings.

7.4 Drawing form the four best practice policy approaches some key findings are set out below on how neighbourhood plans can support the provision of specialist older persons’ accommodation.

**Supporting all types of specialist older person accommodation**

7.5 **Better local evidence.** Neighbourhood plans can provide a valuable source of information for local care home providers about the localised evidence of need which can supplement the district level data including the SHMA and SHLAA.

7.6 **Raising awareness.** Neighbourhood plans can be good tools to create awareness on the need to provide specialist older persons’ accommodation. They can identify where there is existing support and win a new following that believe specialist older person accommodation is both needed and welcomed. This creates a positive context for related schemes to come forward both for planners and elected Councillors.

7.7 **Support of applications.** Neighbourhood plans can contain policies which support planning applications for specialised older persons’ accommodation in both the (C2) and (C3) categories subject to the other policies in the development plan.

7.8 **Identifying sites.** In cases where neighbourhood plan elect to allocate sites the process of engaging with the local authority, landowners, developers and care home providers can be beneficial to open-up the network of contacts involved in taking such proposals forward. The call for sites can result in sites being identified in addition to what is identified in the LAA. Local plans also focus on allocating strategic sites. Neighbourhood

\(^{76}\) Drawn from the NPPF glossary.
plans can allocate small sites at a local scale which helps give certainty to developers interested in bringing forward this type of scheme.

7.9 **Support the extension of existing sites.** Neighbourhood plans can support the extension of existing sites providing more detail to the local plan which provide specialist older persons’ accommodation allowing such facilities to extend their offer.

**Supporting the delivery of general housing needs for those looking to downsize.**

7.10 **Promotion of smaller units.** Some neighbourhood plans strongly encourage a wider level of housing mix so that new developments contain smaller units. This stock is suitable for the older generation to downsize. This type of housing will be considered as part of the affordable housing contributions that are negotiated on schemes.

**Supporting care homes and nursing homes**

7.11 **Allowing Care homes and nursing homes outside the settlement boundary.** Some sites have been allocated outside the settlement boundary for (C2) and (C3) which may not have been straight forward to develop in absence of a supporting localised policy.
ANNEX 3: MODEL SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS

South Gloucestershire – Example of Supplementary Planning Documents for Design and Affordable Housing

It is important that the partner authorities in Northamptonshire take account of the scope to further support and direct proposals for specialist accommodation through the adoption of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD). This represents a recommendation for work under the ‘next steps’ of providing for more development of such schemes. However, in order to make the guidance in any SPD appropriately focused initial work outside of (and developing the evidence base for the SPD) will need to reflect on the delivery mechanisms and type of provision that will be supported in principle. It is not necessary, however, for any SPD to be unduly prescriptive about locations or scale of development.

A comprehensive case study is provided by the local authority of South Gloucestershire. The SPDs summarised below are also included in the Planning Advisory Service Good Practice Case Study: ‘Planning for older people’s housing: the shock of the new’ (September 2015).

These SPD are regarded as particularly helpful in terms of helping to ensure promoters provide the necessary information with their application and where debate arises in determining Planning Use Class. At a specific level, looking at development outcomes, SPD offers the opportunity to define the particular features, characteristics and facilities sought by typical schemes as well as setting out (in supplementary advice) why certain design standards such as minimum unit size are promoted. The SPDs set out the specific reasons for supporting the provision of specialist accommodation on the strategic ‘New Neighbourhood’ allocations.

South Gloucestershire Briefing Guide (Design) SPD

South Gloucestershire Council has adopted a ‘Briefing Guide’ Supplementary Planning Document to provide a Design Brief to support and inform proposals for Extra Care accommodation. The SPD refers to the available evidence and sources which provides estimates of the future need and increasing demand for this accommodation. Whilst consistent with the strategic objectives and development plan policies for South Gloucestershire, it does not seek to deliver a specific requirement for specialist accommodation and nor is it expressed as a specific proportion of the overall housing need figure. The SPD is useful for those promoting sites or seeking development opportunities and summarises the work undertaken across the Council to promote sites for Extra Care Housing, including in ‘New Neighbourhood’ strategic allocations. The guidance further explains that the Council’s development plan policies support Extra Care accommodation in providing for emerging need and catering for mixed communities and that “regard will be had to the nature of the scheme to determine whether it comes within category C2 or C3 of the Use Classes Order and is subject to the provisions of Policy CS18 in relation to affordable housing provision.”

The SPD explains how as a general statement it supports the design aspirations of the “Housing our Ageing Population: Panel for Innovation” (HAPPI) but is also able to provide specific guidance in relation to the type of provision within individual apartments and also communal areas. For example, the SPD seeks and en-suite bathroom or wet room and recommends a mixture of one bed (2 person) flats (min 54m²) and two bed (3 person) flats (min 68m²). This is in-line with the ‘Design principles for ExtraCare’, published by the Care Services Improvement Partnership.
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Best practice is incorporated into specific suggestions for different types of communal areas. The general theme however seeks to ensure flexible use while avoiding impersonal spaces; securing appropriately sized facilities commensurate with the scale of provision and accessible to the core of the building and majority of residents.

Further recommendations include planning for adequate parking and open spaces (although avoiding specific standards for each) and planning for longevity in design terms by taking advantage of sustainable construction techniques and promoting a high standard of energy efficiency. Specific regard will be given for ‘Designing for Dementia’ – for example incorporating technology to mitigate risk when using utilities and promoting designs which allow residents to easily identify their location and floor level i.e. avoiding repetitive design.

In terms of making provision for this range of accommodation the SPD indicates that in terms of site characteristics “Area needs to be a minimum of 1.5 - 2 acres/or 1 hectare. A sustainable scheme will usually consist of 50 to 60 units of accommodation with a range of communal areas appropriate to the location.”

The Design SPD is also used to assess the ability to deliver care and support in Extra Care schemes. This recognises that some residents may initially require more limited assistance but the on-site provision of care and support services should be able to support a range of needs. Maintaining independence and dignity and opportunities for social activities are important objectives.

South Gloucestershire Affordable Housing and Extra Care Housing SPD (2014).

The Briefing Guide SPD is complemented by the more recent 2014 SPD for Affordable Housing and Extra Care Housing. This expands upon guidance that while recognising a minimum scale of provision is likely to be needed to maintain viability, proposals should nevertheless be well-related to their surroundings in terms of size and design. The Extra Care SPD is able to build upon development plan Policy CS20 in explaining the importance of promoters providing ancillary communal facilities to complement these available locally; avoid duplication; demonstrate the ability to provide links with nearby communities; and support public access. Although not prescriptive in terms of the locations that will be appropriate and not stating that a fixes proportion of Extra Care provision will be sought in any given scheme the opportunity to deliver accommodation of new strategic allocations is emphasised.

The requirement to make a contribution towards affordable housing is determined by whether developments fall within Use Class C2 or C3 (with only Class C3 ‘dwellings’ expected to provide affordable housing). Developments may be expected to enter into other S106 planning obligations, including setting out the possibility of ensuring future residents receive a minimum level of care needs. Receipt of care itself will not necessarily determine whether a development falls into Use Class C2, particularly where care “is not a requirement”. Determination will also have regard to the level of care provided – typically expected to be equivalent to the level associated with residential care homes when indicating Use Class C2 types of accommodation.

Accommodation will typically be regarded as Use Class C3 where individual units are self-contained and provide the necessary facilities for residential purposes and day-to-day existence. However, all characteristics of a scheme will be considered and no one factor is a defining criterion; the features which may make provision more expensive are recognised and the SPD allows the scope to assess viability where this appears to be an issue.

Importantly the SPD explains “where the development of Extra Care Housing forms part of a larger development, for example in a retirement community which might contain C2 residential nursing home
accommodation, the individual parts of the development will be treated separately in determining their use class, providing they are in separate buildings.” Provision across separate buildings generally follows the concept of identifying separate ‘planning units’ within any land use and may not be possible where there is an interdependence or reliance on services located in different areas across a site.
ANNEX 4: Review of Literature and Practice

Introduction

The evidence presented below was gathered between October 2016 and February 2017 from a wide range of sources. The topic areas, which are listed below, were selected in conjunction with the Northamptonshire authorities:

1. Types of housing for older people and related services
2. Providing accommodation for people with dementia
3. Reasons for moving to specialist housing for older people
4. The importance of location and access to facilities
5. Implications for NHS/Social Care budgets of providing specialist housing for older people
6. Planning policy considerations
7. Financing development
8. Ability to afford the cost of living in specialist housing for older people
9. Specialist housing for older people and Starter Homes
10. Consumer protection

This final version has been expanded beyond a basic literature review to respond to requests from members of the client consortium for more information in specific areas. This includes development of case studies and collation of rent and service charge information which has been provided by members of the commissioning consortium and a wider network of providers of housing for older people.

Although the definitions developed for this project are used in all the documents produced, terms taken from other publications are quoted in their original form.
1. Types of housing for older people and related services

Specialist housing for older people has been developed in England for around fifty years with different facilities and services provided depending on tenure, the needs of intended residents, government policy and guidance and changing attitudes to age and disability.

Housing for older people in the mid-20th Century placed less emphasis on internal design and configuration, and more on the grouping together of residents in one place to provide day to day practical support through the employment of on-site or locally based staff. More recently, accessible design and convenient location have been recognised as important to maintaining independence. Aspirations in terms of space and facilities have also changed, leading to new provision, upgrading of older developments and the creation of new models.

This evolution has led to a somewhat confused picture where a single form of provision may be known by multiple names and where misinterpretation and misunderstanding of what is available are common among professionals and the public.

To establish a common set of definitions that reflect current provision and the types of housing and support required for the future in Northamptonshire, this report adopts the following descriptions:

- **Age-restricted or age-exclusive independent accommodation** i.e. housing provided for sale or rent (with the full legal rights of being a tenant or homeowner) with occupation restricted (through planning conditions) to people of above a specified age - usually 55 or 60. It offers self-contained accommodation with no additional facilities or services. New accommodation will be built to the access standards set out in Part M of the Building Regulations which include criteria for accessibility at the entrance level. More detailed information about the Part M provisions are included in section 6 below, Planning Policy Considerations (page 24).

- **Specialist housing for older people** i.e. all forms of housing for older people provided for sale or rent (with the full legal rights of being a tenant or homeowner) which offer self-contained accommodation for each household and additional facilities or services. In all cases, the purpose is to enable self-care, independence and to provide a secure home for life.

IV. **Retirement housing** i.e. a sub-group of specialist housing for older people which provides some additional facilities. These could typically include a secure main entrance, residents’ lounge, access to an emergency alarm service and a guest room. Additional support to maintain independence can be purchased as needed. This is often known as “sheltered housing” in the affordable sector and “retirement living” leasehold accommodation in the private sector. A scheme manager may be based on site for a set number of hours or the entire working day. The manager service and costs such as cleaning and heating communal areas would be paid for through a service charge. The level of service varies considerably from provider to provider with the private sector typically offering greater on site presence. Retirement housing would also include “independent living” schemes (sometimes former affordable sheltered schemes where support services have been discontinued) which are designed for ease of access, may have some communal areas and are restricted to older people but where no additional services are provided automatically. This type of accommodation falls within Planning Use Class C3.

   1.2

V. **Supported housing** i.e. a sub-group of specialist housing for older people with a greater range of facilities than retirement housing and with support and care services available. Each household has self-contained accommodation. The additional facilities will include
restaurants, communal lounges, social space and staff on site 24 hours a day. Service charges are likely to be higher than in retirement housing, reflecting this more extensive range of facilities. The accommodation is often described as “care ready” and care services are provided in a manner that can respond flexibly to increasing need while enabling the individual to retain their place within that community. Emergency support is available on a 24-hour basis and planned support can be arranged from on site or external staff. Supported housing of this type is often known as Extra Care housing or “assisted living”. This type of accommodation has been interpreted as falling within Planning Use Class C3 and C2.

VI. **Retirement Villages** i.e. a larger-scale variant of specialist housing for older people first developed in the UK in the late 1990’s involving clusters of accommodation with a central hub providing a range of facilities, including restaurants, cafes, shops, swimming pools, gyms/spa to create a village atmosphere. Some of these also include registered care home accommodation for people with high levels of dependency/health problems. Again, the concept is that residents can “age in place” without needing to move again. These villages are usually developed close to existing centres of population and promote the use of village facilities by non-residents, both to enable integration and generate income.

- **Residential and nursing homes** i.e. institutional establishments which are not specialist housing. They provide accommodation, care and/or nursing for people whose care or health needs mean that they cannot live independently. Each resident will have a bedroom rather than a self-contained flat. Meals, housekeeping services, care and nursing are provided by the establishment. This type of accommodation falls within Planning Use Class C2.

The DWELL report, Designing for Downsizers, includes a diagram (too large to reproduce clearly here but shown as Figure 1 for illustration) which shows the range of different types of accommodation for older people, the level of care provided and how they relate to Planning Use Classes.  

---
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The relationship between these definitions and Planning Use Classes and the implications for developer affordable housing contributions are discussed more fully at section 6 (p27).
2. Providing Accommodation for People with Dementia

2.1 Design standards

There is no single definition or benchmark for dementia friendly housing, but there is emerging good practice in the areas of:

- building design
- furniture & fittings
- services and support.

Practical illustrations of issues in each of these areas are described below.

Building design

Navigation: Many people with dementia experience difficulties with making sense of the immediate environment and navigating their way to the places where they can undertake tasks they need to. The layout of buildings can provide visual clues by enabling a clear view from one room/area to another, for example being able to see the kitchen from the lounge. Another example is sliding walls between the bedroom and bathroom, that can be pulled back at night, so that someone wishing to use the toilet at night can see it from their bed\(^80^\).

Natural light and external views: Exposure to daylight is helpful in regulating natural body rhythms, which can reduce sleep problems (a problem for some people with dementia who are active at night and sleep during the day). Being able to view the outside environment also helps people navigate within the home. Natural light can be enhanced by the positioning and orientation of windows\(^81^\).

Wayfinding visual clues: Use of colours, textures, materials and layout to guide people to different locations within and outside the building. Within extra care schemes with more than one floor, internal atriums and glazing can allow people to see the different levels and distinguish between them. When within a larger building, the use of internal landmarks such as artwork in communal areas and at strategic points along corridors is helpful\(^82^\).

Acoustic issues: people with dementia can find sudden loud noises, echoes and background noise distressing and confusing. Choice of building materials and layout of communal space can have an impact, as well as fixtures and fittings.

Furniture and fittings\(^83^\)

Artificial lighting: dementia can cause problems with visual perception and use of light can alleviate these. Approaches include higher light levels, avoiding changes in light levels at thresholds: stronger and adjustable light for tasks; avoiding the pooling of light, shadows and glare; lights in cupboards and wardrobes, mirrors lit from the side.

Visible functions and items: Using glass on the front of kitchen cupboards to help people find items; avoiding the use of built in kitchen units where washing machines, dishwashers etc. are hidden behind

---

\(^80^\) HAPPI, Housing our Ageing Population Panel for innovation report, Homes and Communities Agency, 2009

\(^81^\) Dementia friendly design considerations- lighting, Alzheimer Knowledge Exchange Design and Dementia, Geriatric Programme of Eastern Ontario, Jan 2010

\(^82^\) Housing LIN Case Study 53, Tree Extra Care Housing – Highgate, Housing LIN, Aug 2011

\(^83^\) Designing Interiors for People with Dementia, Dementia Services Development Centre, University of Stirling, 2013
uniform doors; using more traditional designs for items like cookers and kettles, phones, clocks, taps. Use of pictorial signage to indicate what a room or space is to be used for, e.g. picture of a toilet on toilet door, picture of bed on bedroom door.

**Use of technology**: Audible warnings or messages to encourage people to complete certain tasks such as turning off the cooker, remember their keys when going out or to discourage them from leaving the house after a certain time at night. Electric clocks and calendars can be useful in reminding people of the day, date and time, as well as alerting them to appointments.

**Services and support at home**

Alongside the housing design features, it is the human support that people living with dementia receive that enables them to continue living outside institutional care. There are examples of people with dementia being supported to remain at home through support tailored to their particular needs. The ability to support people at home can depend on how their dementia manifests itself, and, if the person lives with family members, how those people respond to the situation.

The most important feature is continuity of support worker so the worker become a familiar person. In general, the support must be provided by people who understand the challenges that dementia brings for individuals and their families and provide a combination of:

- Help with practical and personal care
- Health related support such as reminder to take medication or actual treatment such as IV antibiotics or dressing leg ulcers.
- Support with administrative tasks such as paying bills (unless there is a family/friend who does this)
- Support to maintain social contact and ideally activity outside the home.
- Support for carers.

**2.2 Assessing and applying design standards**

The Kings Fund Environmental Assessment Tool (KFAT) looks across three areas (referred to as domains) and can be used to conduct a detailed assessment of existing accommodation or as a checklist of desirable features that can be incorporated in the design of new accommodation. The ability of the living environment to promote or encourage aspects of independence, health and wellbeing is assessed under seven headings:

- meaningful interaction and purposeful activity between residents, their families and staff
- wellbeing
- eating and drinking
- continence and personal hygiene
- orientation
- calm, safety and security
- mobility.

---

84 Dementia: Finding Housing Solutions, National Housing Federation
85 Dementia and Homecare: Driving Quality and Innovation, United Kingdom Homecare Association, 2015
Improving the design of housing to assist people with dementia\textsuperscript{87} produced by The Dementia Services Development Centre at the University of Stirling applies similar criteria, giving examples of how poor design can be improved in relatively simple and inexpensive ways.

Practice Advice on Dementia and Town Planning\textsuperscript{88} provides a summary from a planning perspective of what dementia is, its current and projected prevalence, why and how good planning can benefit people with dementia and reduce health and social care costs. While looking more widely than housing design, the Practice Advice highlights key principles which cover similar areas to the KFAT and of which planners can usefully be aware:

- safe environment
- visual clues (e.g. to orientation and way-finding)
- interior design
- noise
- natural or stronger artificial light
- outside space.

2.3 Suitability of accommodation

In principle, all forms of specialist housing for older people are capable of catering for people in the mild or moderate stages of dementia provided appropriate care is available. Most people living with dementia are in older age groups and therefore housing features that are age friendly are also beneficial to people with dementia. These include level thresholds into the home/garden and between rooms, easy access storage, walk in showers, efficient heating, rooms on a single level, slip resistant surfaces in bathrooms and kitchens.

There is some evidence that specialist housing for older people is not suitable for people with dementia in its more severe forms. Providing a dementia care facility on site can, to a degree, resolve this by minimising the impact of moving a person to unfamiliar surroundings with unknown staff\textsuperscript{89}.

People in later stages of dementia moving to a new “community” of any sort have had no opportunity to build relationships while still able to communicate clearly and present their history and personality. This makes it difficult for them to integrate into a new situation. If people move in when they have less severe cognitive impairment or if it develops or worsens after they have moved, then they are more likely to be able to stay. “Experience so far has shown that integrated extra-care (i.e. supported housing) is appropriate only where careful thought is given to matching the neighbours and where staff are well trained to provide care and support.”\textsuperscript{90}

Limited evidence exists of Councils which have succeeded in encouraging people with dementia to move early before a crisis is reached. We are aware of several studies (some unpublished) by housing associations which have sought to address the general challenge of older tenants living in family sized homes which become progressively less suitable for them.

\textsuperscript{87} Improving the design of housing to assist people with dementia, The Dementia Services Development Centre, University of Stirling, 2013
www.cih.org/resources/PDF/Scotland%20general/Improving%20the%20design%20of%20housing%20to%20assist%20people%20with%20dementia%20-%20FINAL.pdf
\textsuperscript{88} Dementia and Town Planning, RTPI, January 2017
\textsuperscript{89} David Hughes, Chief Executive, Pozzoni, Building.co.uk, September 2014
\textsuperscript{90} P24, Housing Options for People with Dementia, Dementia Care, September 2015
Peabody is unusual in having developed an organisational Strategy for Older People\(^1\) which has identified the scale of the development challenge. “We have a development pipeline of over 1,000 new homes a year …. With the number of people aged 65 and over in Peabody housing set to increase to over 7,500 people by 2030 (at a conservative estimate) we need to look at how we can provide attractive housing options to our older residents.”

Council staff working in Adult Social Care (ASC) could take a greater role in encouraging people to move to something more suitable, particularly in relation to the needs of a couple, one of whom has dementia. The challenge is that couples in that situation will want to continue living together and so would want to move somewhere suitable for both partners. Some retirement villages such as BELONG\(^2\), offer support to people living in supported housing apartments with high levels of need and also have small dementia units into which individuals can move if they need 24-hour support, enabling a couple to stay in the village when one person’s cognitive capacity deteriorates.

*Living Well with Dementia*\(^3\) includes an example of a retirement housing scheme that enables couples and individuals to move into the scheme, with resultant improved health and wellbeing and reduced use of NHS services.

Looking to the future, the case study below describes a new approach to the provision of specialist housing for people with dementia.

---


\(^2\) [https://www.belong.org.uk/what-is-a-belong-village#.WDWhluR74dU](https://www.belong.org.uk/what-is-a-belong-village#.WDWhluR74dU)

\(^3\) Case study 19 – Living Well with Dementia- Good Practice Compendium, Dept. of Health, Jan 2011
CASE STUDY: THE DEMENTIA CARE HOUSING MODEL

The Dementia Care housing model has been developed to provide an alternative to moving to a care home as dementia develops. It is based on a combination of building/scheme design and specialist care. A group of five (or more) 5-bedroom bungalows are built to the design guidelines developed by the University of Stirling Dementia Services Development Centre. Each resident has their own room with ensuite toilet and washbasin. There is a communal lounge, dining room, conservatory, kitchen/utility room and an enclosed rear garden.

A Team Leader manages all staff working within a bungalow. A Specialist Support Worker supports the Team Leaders and oversees the whole development. Care is provided through one member of staff always being in each bungalow, on a 12-hour shift system. All staff receive specialist dementia training.

The core principle for all care provided is the promotion of independence. Residents are encouraged and supported to do as much as they can in terms of Activities of Daily Living.

Data collated over two years indicates that the Dementia Care model appears to help people with middle to advanced stage dementia to maintain life skills over a longer period than would normally be expected. In some cases, it has even been possible to recover previously lost skills.

The Dementia Care report summarises how the model is funded through a mix of public and private funding1. It states that although the level of staffing and care is far higher than in a residential care home, the costs for care commissioners are typically at or below the standard rate for placement care and significantly below the cost of nursing care or intensive home support. There are associated financial savings for the NHS through reduced hospital admissions.

A more extensive dementia community in the Netherlands, designed along similar lines, is described in Practice Advice on Dementia and Town Planning.

---

1 Housing Options for People with Dementia, Dementia Care, September 2015
3. Reasons for moving to specialist housing for older people

3.1 Drivers for moving

The factors which most commonly motivate older people to move to specialist housing are physical ability, the location, design or condition of the existing home and the need for security and companionship.

Research into motivations for moving by ILC-UK\textsuperscript{95} found that respondents were attracted by the independent nature of specialist retirement housing (52.8%), a desire to maintain an active lifestyle (53.3%) and a desire to downsize (48.2%). Relief from the responsibilities of home ownership such as maintenance of the physical structure and garden were also highly valued.

Research by Shelter\textsuperscript{96} and the NHF\textsuperscript{97} shows that what older people want in a home matches closely the features available in specialist housing. Older people want a home that:

- Is accessible
- Is spacious and attractive
- Is safe and secure
- Is in an age-friendly environment
- Offers freedom, choice and flexibility
- Has help at hand
- Provides flexible, personalised support
- Enables people to socialise and feel included
- Allows individuals to make decisions.

Many older people living alone or with reduced mobility (e.g. due to loss of the ability to drive) have a greater need for companionship as they experience increasing loneliness or social isolation. It is estimated that among those aged over 65, between 5% and 16% report loneliness and 12% feel isolated\textsuperscript{98}. People who live alone, have been widowed or rent their homes are most likely to report being lonely.\textsuperscript{99}

A Frontier Economics report\textsuperscript{100} has shown that people living in specialist housing experience lower levels of crime and are less fearful of crime.

3.2 Health and wellbeing benefits

This type of accommodation has been recognised as beneficial to mental and physical health, thereby relieving pressure on public services. The Institute of Public Care (IPC)\textsuperscript{101} reports that one in four older

\textsuperscript{95} Dementia Care, September 2015
\textsuperscript{96} A Better Fit, Shelter, 2012
\textsuperscript{97} Breaking the Mould, Re-visioning older people’s housing, National Housing Federation, February 2011
\textsuperscript{99} Building Companionship: tackling loneliness and isolation in Britain’s older people, Demos April 2016
\textsuperscript{100} Financial Benefits of Investment in Specialist Housing for Vulnerable and Older People, Frontier Economics for the Homes and Communities Agency, 2010
\textsuperscript{101} Identifying the health gain from retirement housing, Institute of Public Care, Oxford Brookes University, June 2012 (quoting Heyword F and Turner L (2007). Better outcomes, lower costs. School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol on behalf of the Office for Disability Issues, Department for Work and Pensions.
people have symptoms of depression that require treatment. The IPC concluded that improved health and wellbeing (e.g. through living in specialist housing) are likely to prolong independent living.

Maintaining good physical health is important in sustaining the independence of older people who account for 55% of GP appointments, 68% of outpatient appointments and 77% of hospital admissions. Falls and resultant fractures in people aged 65 and over account for over 4 million bed days each year in England\textsuperscript{102}. Design features such as increased natural light, effective ambient lighting, accessible storage, step free interiors and level thresholds can mitigate some of the risk factors in falls such as visual impairment and poor gait\textsuperscript{103}.

Similarly, moving to more suitable accommodation can reduce the risk of chronic health conditions being exacerbated by housing conditions e.g. heart disease, mental health, stroke, pulmonary/respiratory conditions, arthritis and rheumatism\textsuperscript{104}. Evidence that health improves and care needs reduce when frail older persons move to more accessible accommodation is also presented in “Some social consequences of remodelling English sheltered housing and care homes to Extra Care”\textsuperscript{105} and the English House Condition Survey\textsuperscript{106}.

Moving to specialist housing for older people in the local area enables older people to remain in familiar surroundings. They can then retain contact with their family, social and service networks, reducing the degree of adjustment required.

3.3 Encouraging and supporting older people to move

Many sources including the HAPPI 3 report\textsuperscript{107} stress the need for information and advice about housing options for older people to be more widely available to enable decisions to be made earlier and for more informed choices to be made, even at a time of crisis.

The Elderly Accommodation Counsel (EAC) provides an independent, free telephone service - First Stop Advice\textsuperscript{108} - offering advice and information to older people, their families and carers about housing and care options for later life. The First Stop website also provides access to HOOP, a questionnaire designed for use by older people themselves, or working with an advisor, to help identify options available to address concerns about the existing home. EAC also provides a searchable directory of specialist accommodation for older people and features services in some parts of England which people can contact for more local information.

Many older people cite the practicalities of preparing to move as a disincentive to moving.

\textsuperscript{102} Strategic Housing for Older People Resource Pack, Housing LIN, 2011
\textsuperscript{103} Falls in Older People, Lord, Sherrington and Menz 2006
\textsuperscript{104} Care and Repair England
\textsuperscript{105} Some social consequences of remodelling English sheltered housing and care homes to Extra Care, Wright, Tinker et al. in Ageing and Society, Jan 2009
\textsuperscript{106} The English House Condition Survey 2007: Annual Report, Department for Communities and Local Government
\textsuperscript{107} PS5, Housing Our Ageing Population: Positive Ideas, All Party Parliamentary Group on Housing and Care for Older People, June 2016
\textsuperscript{108} www.firststopadvice.org.uk
Many older homeowners wish to continue to own their own home. It is uncommon for local authorities to help enable older homeowners to downsize more easily. However, as new evidence emerges of the future implications of demographic and social change, different options and business models may need to come to the fore for the long term. *Future of an Ageing Population*\(^{109}\) points out that “extending life expectancy and falling home ownership rates are likely to reduce or negate the value of future inheritances, as housing wealth increasingly funds longer periods in retirement and ill-health”. Younger generations may find that they do not inherit housing equity from their parents until they are in later life themselves, if at all. Market rental models of specialist housing for older people may have a place in the housing market of the future. Early initiatives are already being attempted which enable older people to retain ownership of their home while using its rental potential to fund their accommodation elsewhere.

---

The London Borough of Enfield have had some success in introducing a scheme enabling people moving into residential care to lease their house to the Council in return for guaranteed rent for a fixed period. Key features of the Keeping House scheme\(^1\) are:

- reduced cost of care home fees for the individual and the local authority as income is generated whilst in residential or long term care
- the property is fully repaired and renovated property at minimal cost.
- the Council finds and vets the tenants and manages and maintains the property
- no letting agent fees
- payment regardless of whether somebody is living in the property
- vacant possession of the property at the end of the lease period
- releases family housing in an area of high housing demand.

The scheme is currently focussed on people moving to residential care but could be applied to a supported housing rental model.
4. The importance of location and access to facilities

4.1 Location and site selection

Location is important to prospective residents in terms of meeting their needs and preferences and for developers and landlords in terms of ease with which they can sell or let the property.

A desirable location for specialist accommodation for older people is one which enables residents to continue to carry out their usual activities, remain part of the community and maximise their health and quality of life. Research by Professor Michael Ball\textsuperscript{110} and Shelter\textsuperscript{111} show that older people value locations which provide:

- The ability to move while remaining in a familiar setting
- Proximity to friends, family and social activities
- Safety and security
- Access to shops, services and transport
- Access to health facilities.

As indicated above, shorter-distance moves are particularly beneficial in enabling older people to continue to participate in the local community. (Professor Ball found that the majority of owner-occupiers of retirement housing play an active part in their local community and often have family and friends in the locality.)

European Good Practice\textsuperscript{112} recommends a range of services which should be available within 400 metres of older persons’ accommodation, encouraging independence and reducing the risk of marginalisation:

- Public transport and ‘indispensable’ services (food shop, cash dispenser, doctor, pharmacy) should be accessible within 400 metres
- As many ‘necessary’ services (healthcare, day and cultural centres, cultural and religious circles, newsagents, public gardens and parks, post offices and banks) as possible within 400m
- As many ‘useful’ services (shopping centre, restaurants, cafes, allotments, bookshops, sport centres) as possible within 400m.

(The increasing availability of services on line may mean that some of the above are less critical than previously but this has implications for access to the internet (in terms of connectivity and residents’ skills) at the new accommodation.)

The influential HAPPI 1 report\textsuperscript{113} and the subsequent HAPPI 2 Plan for Implementation (2012) highlighted that increased choice of good quality housing options for older people could both encourage people to move and enable continued health and wellbeing. HAPPI recommends design criteria which can deliver those benefits. While most of the criteria relate to the design of the scheme itself, HAPPI also emphasises that housing for older people should not be an island but should be in

\textsuperscript{110} Housing Markets and Independence in Old Age: Expanding the Opportunities, Professor Michael Ball, May 2011
\textsuperscript{111} A Better Fit, Shelter, 2012
\textsuperscript{112} Older Persons Housing Design: A European Good Practice Guide, Wel_hops, 2007
\textsuperscript{113} Housing Our Ageing Population Panel for Innovation, Homes and Communities Agency, 2010
a location that is well connected to the local neighbourhood, enabling interaction with the wider community. The full list of design criteria appears in the checklist below.

The Housing in Later Life toolkit, developed by the retirement housing sector in consultation with DCLG reflects the same points from a developer perspective, stressing that “The success of schemes for specialist housing for older people is largely dependent on site location.”

The toolkit describes typical features of good sites for specialist housing for older people as:

- Well-located and prominent - the most popular schemes are in busy areas with good access
- Within a catchment area with a specific need for this form of accommodation and able to support the proposed tenures
- Usually between 0.5 to 1.5 acres (0.2 to 0.6 hectares) (The current trend is for larger schemes which require sites of at least 0.5 ha. This is discussed further in section 5)
- Close to an established town centre and public transport, usually meaning the development of brownfield sites (although many “retirement villages” are built on green belt or agricultural land as they require larger sites, albeit close to centres of population)
- Sufficiently close to shops, amenities and facilities (such as a GP surgery and hairdressers) with ideally a level and safe route of access.

Similarly, Anchor Housing regards suitable sites as having level topography, self-contained with no through roads, close to local shops and other facilities and within easy reach of public transport links.

The points made above are summarised in the following table.

Table 1. Design, location and service criteria checklist for planning officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA FOR SPECIALIST HOUSING SCHEMES FOR OLDER PEOPLE</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Services within 400m High priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of demand in the immediate area (including evidence from independent modelling such as that undertaken for the Northamptonshire research into the housing needs of older people in 2016-17.)</td>
<td>Minimum area of 0.2 to 0.6 hectares (ideally at least 0.5 ha). Retirement villages and some supported housing schemes will be much larger</td>
<td>General store; ATM; doctor; pharmacy (or with an established delivery service to the area); access to public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level or with a slope of no more than 1:20*</td>
<td>In a town centre, established community or phased development as an SUE becomes established</td>
<td>Hairdresser; day and cultural centres; places of worship; newsagent; public garden or park; post office or bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe, level walking route to facilities and services. Within 400m of public transport route with regular service (at least half hourly) to town centre transport hub</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shopping centre; restaurants; café; allotments; bookshops; sport centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets HAPPI criteria:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meets HAPPI criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generous internal space standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

114 Housing in Later Life, Planning Ahead For Specialist Housing For Older People, National Housing Federation/ McCarthy and Stone/ Housing LIN et al, December 2012

- Plenty of natural light in the home and in circulation spaces
- Balconies and outdoor space, avoiding internal corridors and single-aspect flats
- Adaptability and ‘care aware’ design which is ready for emerging telecare and tele-healthcare technologies
- Circulation spaces that encourage interaction and avoid an ‘institutional feel’
- Shared facilities and community ‘hubs’ where these are lacking in the neighbourhood
- Plants, trees, and the natural environment
- High levels of energy efficiency, with good ventilation to avoid overheating
- Extra (external) storage for belongings and bicycles
- Shared external areas such as ‘home zones’ that give priority to pedestrians.

Additional features:
- Mobility vehicle storage and charging area
- Broadband available
- Lifts to upper floors
- Secure main entrance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person-centred services</th>
<th>Appliance to an emergency alarm service or a regular wellbeing check (by phone, intercom or visit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(<strong>Additional features of supported housing)</strong></td>
<td>Needs-based support service to facilitate independent living e.g. assistance with literacy, budgeting, self-care, mental health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signposting or referral to specialist support agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social integration - leisure activities, events and outings organised by residents or delivered by support provider or scheme manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Games room and equipment (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Onsite emergency response and personal care services**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurant providing at least one nutritionally balanced main meal per day which can be delivered to residents who are sick or recently discharged from hospital **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment room where physician, chiropodist, physiotherapist or other health professionals can visit and provide confidential advice **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Onsite defibrillator **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisation signed up to the NHICE End of Life Care for Adults Quality Standard **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FEATURES OF GENERAL HOUSING DESIRABLE FOR OLDER PEOPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of home</th>
<th>Apartment (with lift to first floor and above) or bungalow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within the home</td>
<td>Meets Building Regulations Optional Access Standards Category M2 or M3 (standard to be decided locally based on evidence of requirements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to open space – garden, balcony, courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generous space standards and flexible room layouts suited to the lifestyle of older people as described in the DWELL report Designing for Downsizers: <a href="http://www.housinglin.org.uk/_assets/DWELL_DesigningWithDownsizers.pdf">http://www.housinglin.org.uk/_assets/DWELL_DesigningWithDownsizers.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Located in areas with features of Lifetime Neighbourhoods e.g. pavement seating, well maintained paving, access to WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond the home</td>
<td>Connected to local facilities but home is in an age-restricted development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In smaller settlements where a large specialist housing development would not be in keeping with the area, a “hub and spoke” model may be preferable. A hub and spoke scheme would provide accommodation in several relatively close locations such as adjoining villages. Support and/or care would be delivered in a larger village or town from a central point such as a larger specialist housing scheme for older people or a broader cluster of buildings and services including a care home.

This type of model “can provide a more accessible route for people to connect to opportunities to find social connections, activities and support... Adding local transport to the picture to support connectivity, this is a model that could be flexible to rural and urban areas, based on community or service based geographies”\textsuperscript{116}.

\textit{New Approaches for Older People}\textsuperscript{117} outlines how one private provider drew on a range of skills and services within its organisation to create a hub and spoke approach providing a range of specialist housing and community services and achieving economies of scale.

This model appears well suited to the proliferation of smaller rural settlements across Northamptonshire.

(It should be noted that in the literature the term hub and spoke is interpreted in several different ways. Here, the definition and the following examples are confined to the approach described above.)

\textsuperscript{116} New Approaches for Older People, Chartered Institute of Housing, 2014
\textsuperscript{117} P10, New Approaches for Older People, CIH, 2014
CASE STUDIES: HUB AND SPOKE

*More Than Just a Few Kind Words*\(^1\) describes how *Flourish Housing*, a provider of housing across rural, central Somerset, reorganised its homes and services to ensure that older people living in the area could access the right support at the right time in their lives. It now provides a range of services to:
- 21 sheltered housing schemes
- Four extra care schemes
- Floating support to people within their own homes.

1.1
The support provided is based on individual needs assessments and encompasses a banded system of support for sheltered housing and a similar range of support services to those living in the community. These include a helpline service, assistive technology devices, daily telephone contact and regular support visits.

Flourish introduced two particularly innovative services to meet identified needs:
- A road to recovery short term service, which provides housing support on a temporary basis to assist people being discharged from hospital
- A smooth move service assisting older people living in large family houses to move to supported housing.

Page 19 of the same report\(^1\) describes a similar approach taken by Pennine Housing 2000 which has also enabled them to improve cost effectiveness by taking on the management of an isolated sheltered scheme on behalf of another provider.

*Nobody’s Listening*\(^1\), describes a year-long pilot by *Mendip Housing* - again working in an extended rural area - to test hypotheses and options which culminated in the introduction of a hub and spoke service model. This involves area teams working across specialist housing and in the community to deliver an integrated range of tasks:
- daily intercom calls as required
- support visits as identified on support plans
- installation of helpline units
- ‘road to recovery’ visits
- managing communal rooms and enabling activities
- assessment for minor adaptations
- organising and co-ordinating shopping trips
- liaison with local community and other groups.

The *Models of Hub and Spoke Toolkit*\(^1\) describes the service models above as community hub models. The Toolkit goes on to propose a “super hub” which would “provide a wide range of services from a range of statutory and voluntary agencies, with a core team of social care staff working 24/7 based at an existing Housing with Care or large sheltered scheme” (i.e. supported or retirement housing ...
providing intensive personal care and support to residents at the scheme and tenants in the immediate community”. It is envisaged that there would be close integration with GP and other health services with continuity of care being a benefit for people moving from independent to specialist housing. While current financial constraints may suggest that developing a new super hub facility is uneconomic, the drive to integrate health and care services, the more local focus of CCGs and a willingness to re-use buildings vacated by other public services may mean that, as services are redesigned, there is scope to relocate them closer to the communities they serve.
5. Implications for NHS/Social Care budgets of providing specialist housing for older people

5.1 Preventive value of specialist housing

Specialist housing for older people is widely recognised as a less costly form of provision than care/nursing homes.

Numerous research reports have found the provision of specialist housing to have resulted in reduced use of public services, particularly health and social care\(^\text{119}\). In many cases, further moves to residential or nursing care were not required at all, representing a saving (at 2011 values) for the individual or the public purse of around £26,000 per person per year\(^\text{120}\). More recently, the annual cost saving of delayed admission to residential care was estimated at £28,080 per person.

Research comparing living in supported (Extra Care) housing with residential care has found that supported housing achieves both financial and health and wellbeing advantages:

“Costs in extra care housing were slightly lower for the matched sample, compared with care homes (£374 and £409 per week respectively). There was a slight improvement in physical functioning and the level of cognitive functioning was stable in the extra care housing sub-sample. This contrasted with slight declines in both physical and cognitive functioning in the matched care home sample.”\(^\text{121}\)

A presentation by Essex County Council to the All Party Parliamentary Group on housing and care for older people in November 2016 reported a projected annual net revenue saving per unit of £4,475 through increased use of “Extra Care” (i.e. supported) accommodation in preference to residential care.

Reducing or preventing ill health in older age through provision of specialist housing also offers substantial potential savings for the National Health Service. As indicated above, the health of older people places very significant demands on NHS services. Falls and resultant fractures in people aged 65 and over account for over 4 million bed days each year in England. The estimated cost to the NHS of treating falls is £2.3 billion per year\(^\text{122}\). More accessible and easily managed accommodation clearly has the potential to make inroads on these figures by reducing the risk of falls and other housing-related causes of ill health and injury.

Some organisations have identified the provision of care in supported housing as more cost effective than domiciliary care in the community due to the ability to provide care responsively to a group of people living in the same development, generating savings on travel costs and reduced time spent travelling. On a slightly larger geographical scale, the hub and spoke examples described above (see pp 17-18) show how providers have moved to providing a needs-based service with economies of scale being achieved through combining accommodation-based and floating support.

Housing providers are well placed to relieve pressure on hospital beds and reduce NHS costs through re-ablement, respite and earlier discharge. Due to the shorter-term nature of such needs, this may be

\(^{119}\) Financial Benefits of Investment in Specialist Housing for Vulnerable and Older People, Frontier Economics for the Homes and Communities Agency, 2010

\(^{120}\) Downsizing for older people into Specialist Accommodation Janet Sutherland Viewpoint 19 Housing LIN 2011

\(^{121}\) Pp 16-17, Improving housing with care choices for older people: an evaluation of extra care housing, Ann Netten, Robin Darton, Theresia Bäumker and Lisa Callaghan, Personal Social Services Research Unit, University of Kent, December 2011

\(^{122}\) Clinical Guidance on Falls 2013, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
more achievable through a separate service rather than through provision of specialist housing for older people. A number of housing providers have already entered this market.

**CASE STUDIES: ENABLING INTERMEDIATE CARE AND RE-ABLEMENT**

**One Housing** runs a re-ablement extra care service in the London Borough of Camden to enable hospital discharge and reduce repeat hospital admissions. An evaluation of the first 10 months of operation showed that supporting 41 individuals for six weeks re-ablement as an alternative to staying in hospital resulted in real savings to the NHS of £288,695. Savings to social care per person per annum were estimated at £42,900.

**Cedarwood**, a Midland Heart re-ablement project in Birmingham, involved conversion of an unused hospital ward into a separate unit where patients could complete their recovery, receiving non-clinical intervention and support to prepare them to return home to independent living. Initial evaluation of the project found hospital stays reduced by an average of 6.1 days at a cost saving of £1,338 per person.

A scheme in Stoke-on-Trent has enabled patients to access services and to get maximum benefit from post-hospital treatment without providing accommodation. Housing provider Brighter Futures initiated a floating support scheme called ‘**Safe and Sound**’ in Stoke-on-Trent in 2009. It began in 2009 and could support up to 102 people aged 55+ and living in any tenure. The service receives referrals from hospital discharge teams and community rehabilitation staff. Support staff work with the individual to generally improve health and well-being, help them with finances, and signpost on to other health and care services and social activities. When requested staff accompany customers to hospital for consultation and treatment, enabling them to feel more confident in asking questions about their diagnosis and plans for their treatment and care.

**Havebury Housing Association**, working in partnership with the NHS, provided transitional housing for people leaving hospital or waiting for adaptations to their home by converting an unused sheltered scheme manager’s flat. The remodelling was part-funded by the local authority adult social care division. Rent and service charges of £155 a week in 2011 were eligible for housing benefit. Compared with a longer stay in hospital this represented a saving to the NHS of £2,800 a week.

As a general principle, supported housing costs more to develop and operate than retirement housing. This is because a larger site is required and more on-site facilities and larger units with sufficient space for care provision and equipment are provided. These additional costs feed through into higher selling prices and service charges and mean that although there is a market for leasehold supported accommodation, some older people will be able afford to buy retirement housing but not supported housing or would need a shared ownership option.

We have been unable to identify any research evidence of differences in potential public cost savings between retirement and supported housing. In terms of facilities available, it would be reasonable to say that supported housing, with care staff on site, is better equipped to support early return from
hospital with corresponding savings to the NHS. Care packages can be put in place for residents of retirement housing and it may be possible to negotiate specific support arrangements with the landlord or manager. The value of modern, accessible retirement housing could be said to be more preventive and better suited to people with lower care and support needs.

It is not easy to directly compare the cost of living in different types of specialist housing for older people with that of residential care are charges are not expressed in comparable categories. The table below attempts a simplified comparison by showing rent and service charges (where relevant) for local specialist housing options with an assumed fee for ten and a half hours’ care per week charged at the County Council rate alongside residential care fees which include care and accommodation (see note 5). The choice of 10.5 hours’ care was made to reflect the data held by NCC but it should be borne in mind that that the amount of care will vary according to individual needs. The number of hours of care delivered to each person placed in residential care is difficult to quantify as places are commissioned on the basis of need for that type of accommodation rather than the amount of care required.

Table 2. Comparative weekly cost of different types of 1 bedroom accommodation for older people in Northamptonshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social rented retirement housing (1)</th>
<th>Private leasehold retirement housing (2) (4)</th>
<th>Social rented supported housing (1)</th>
<th>Private leasehold supported housing (4)</th>
<th>Residential care (single room) (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly accommodation charges</td>
<td>£146</td>
<td>£54</td>
<td>Range £170 - £240</td>
<td>£135 (3)</td>
<td>£435 - £1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5 hours Care pw</td>
<td>£202</td>
<td>£202</td>
<td>£202</td>
<td>£202</td>
<td>Care charge already included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total pw</td>
<td>£348</td>
<td>£256</td>
<td>£372 - £442</td>
<td>£337</td>
<td>£435 - £1,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
1: Range of combined figures for rent and service charge reported by local providers. Most or all of this will qualify for housing benefit under current rules
2: Typical service charge and ground rent for a comparable market area
3: Service charge and ground rent for a development in Northamptonshire opened in 2016
4: A small number of residents may be paying a mortgage in addition to the service charges. However, the majority will have funded their property purchase from the sale of their previous home. In addition, an "event fee" is chargeable when the property is sold or sub-let. The fee can vary from 1% to 30% of the open market value depending on provider. When the property is sold, the event fee can be taken from the proceeds of sale.
5: Range of fees reported in NCC briefing note on comparative costs and client contributions. Fees cover the combined cost of accommodation, housekeeping, meals and care. (All figures are rounded.)

NCC advise that the wide range of residential home fees arises from factors including the cost of development and borrowing, the size of home, the number of placements made by the local authority, staffing levels and skills and market rate variation across the county.
People living in social rented accommodation may be eligible for Housing Benefit to meet the cost of some or all their rent and service charge. People living in private leasehold accommodation (including shared owners) may qualify for Pension Credit and/or Attendance Allowance to boost their income and ability to afford housing costs. Event fees raised by the scheme owner/manager when a property is sold or sub-let are used to boost a Contingency Fund which pays for major maintenance and the upkeep of communal facilities.

Depending on income level, the service user and ASC may both contribute to paying for care, regardless of where it is delivered. The Minimum Income Guarantee (MIG), an income protection mechanism with which the ASC must comply must ensure that individuals are left with a minimum amount of disposable income.

Housing affordability issues are discussed further in section 8 (pp 37-39).

Northamptonshire County Council has undertaken internal analysis comparing the costs of paying for care in “Extra Care” (supported) social rented housing and residential homes. This has concluded that in most cases supported social rented housing is more cost effective for the Council and for service users. However, for people with the highest levels of care needs the MIG requirement means that there is no financial advantage to the Council in placing them in supported social rented housing.

It can be concluded that residential homes are the most economic option for some people with the highest care needs. However, the development of specialist housing for sale and shared ownership can divert a proportion of people with care needs to supported housing for sale and will increase the possibility for more able older people to choose retirement housing for sale as a preventive option. Any resulting reduction in demand for social rented specialist housing will be to the advantage of people who have lesser needs and the most limited funds.
6. Planning policy considerations

6.1 Current and emerging national policy and guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework\(^{123}\) (NPPF) refers specifically to the needs of older people, requiring local planning authorities to “plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes) and identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand.”

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) emphasises the importance of assessing and planning for the housing needs of older people and the wider policy benefits of downsizing: “The need to provide housing for older people is critical given the projected increase in the number of households aged 65 and over accounts for over half of the new households ... Plan makers will need to consider the size, location and quality of dwellings needed in the future for older people in order to allow them to move.”\(^{124}\) The guidance requires the full range of need, i.e. “types of general housing, such as bungalows”, “sheltered”, “extra care” and residential care to be assessed and broken down by tenure.

The ease of access to and within the home is critical for older people as they become less physically mobile. Historically the value of building new homes designed to be accessible or easily adapted to meet future needs was recognised but was challenging to implement due to the additional costs involved. This has now been addressed by the introduction of national access standards which are set out in Part M of the Building Regulations. These replace Lifetime Homes and previous wheelchair access standards.

Access requirements relating to new dwellings are set out three categories as follows:

- **M4(1)** Category 1: **Visitable Dwellings** – this is the minimum standard and requires ‘reasonable provision to be made for most people, including wheelchair users, to approach and enter a dwelling and to access habitable rooms and sanitary facilities on the entrance storey’\(^{125}\).
- **M4(2)** Category 2: **Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings** – this is an optional standard and when applied ‘requires reasonable provision for most people to access the dwelling and incorporates features that make it potentially suitable for a wide range of occupants, including older people, those with reduced mobility and some wheelchair users’.
- **M4(3)** Category 3: **Wheelchair User Dwellings** – this is an optional standard and when applied ‘requires reasonable provision, either at completion or at a point following completion, for a wheelchair user to live in the dwelling and use any associated private outdoor space, parking and communal facilities that may be provided for the use of the occupants’. Wheelchair user dwellings can be either fully wheelchair accessible (ie ready for immediate occupation) or wheelchair adaptable (ie they are large enough to accommodate a wheelchair but supportive (and personalised) fitments such as grab rails and hoists will need to be installed at a later date.

Thus, all new homes must now meet the Category 1 Visitable Dwelling requirement. Local Planning Authorities can draw on local evidence to inform policy decisions regarding requirements for the optional Category 2 and 3 standard dwellings. They will need to take account of the costs of providing

\(^{123}\) National Planning Policy Framework, Department for Communities and Local Government, March 2012

\(^{124}\) How should the needs for all types of housing be addressed? Paragraph: 021 Reference ID: 2a-021-20140306 , NPPG, March 2014

\(^{125}\) Building Regulations Part M4(1) Performance
accessible housing at the same time as they appraise other local plan policies when setting affordable housing and CIL targets and preparing for local plan examination.

The latest Housing White Paper proposes further changes to the housing and planning systems which will affect the approach to assessing housing requirements and how the needs of older people are reflected in local policy, including expectations regarding use of the Optional Building Regulations access categories. Key proposals are:

1. Introducing a standardised approach to assessing housing requirements to be consulted upon in 2017, with the outcome reflected in changes to the NPPF. Councils will be incentivised to use the new standardised approach as they produce their plans. Where there is no up-to-date local or strategic plan it is proposed that by April 2018 the new methodology for calculating objectively assessed requirement would apply as the baseline for assessing five-year housing land supply and housing delivery.\(^{126}\)

2. To reflect the increased longevity of the population, the White Paper also proposes to strengthen national policy so that local planning authorities are expected to have clear policies for addressing the housing requirements of groups with particular needs, such as older and disabled people.

3. Guidance to be produced on how local development documents should meet the housing needs of older and disabled people\(^{127}\) which “will place clearer expectations about planning to meet the needs of older people, including supporting the development of such homes near local services. It will also set a clear expectation that all planning authorities should set policies using the Optional Building Regulations to bring forward an adequate supply of accessible housing to meet local need. In addition, we will explore ways to stimulate the market to deliver new homes for older people\(^{128}\)”.

4. 10% of delivery on all housing sites will be for ‘affordable home ownership’. “Proposals for dedicated supported housing, such as residential care homes, which provide specialist accommodation for a particular group of people and which include an element of support” are listed as one of four exemptions to the affordable home ownership requirement\(^{129}\)

5. Recognition of the value of helping older people to move and that there are a number of interrelated barriers for individual households to downsizing including, but not limited to, cost. It also commits “to fund and develop supported housing, including sheltered, step down and extra care housing, ensuring that the new supported housing funding model continues to provide the means for older people to live independently for longer while relieving pressure on the adult social care system”.\(^ {130}\)

\(^{126}\) Paras 1.12 – 1.15, Fixing our Broken Housing Market (Housing White Paper, February 2017

\(^{127}\) See PT I 7 (2) (b) Neighbourhood Planning Bill February 2017

\(^{128}\) Para 4.42, Fixing our Broken Housing Market Housing White Paper, February 2017

\(^{129}\) Para A128, Fixing our Broken Housing Market Housing White Paper, February 2017

\(^{130}\) Para 4.44, Fixing our Broken Housing Market Housing White Paper, February 2017
6.2 Downsizing

Housing our Ageing Population: Positive Ideas (HAPPI 3)\textsuperscript{131} explores how older people can be given more control over the management and delivery of services and access to a wider range of housing choices. The report calls on local authorities to recognise the social and economic benefits of “right-sizing” in their local plans and planning policies. It also argues that measures to make moving easier, to build specialist “care ready” housing where people want it and to address the sector’s lingering negative image will encourage more people to move at a time of their choosing rather than at a point of crisis.

Designing with Downsizers\textsuperscript{132} reports on a design project (DWELL) with a group of “third agers” which sought to identify characteristics for attractive housing that would be an alternative to family housing and specialist housing for older people. The following themes sum up what older people aspire to in their accommodation:

- There is a demand for accessible single and two storey property types including bungalows
- People are prepared to consider apartment living provided it is secure and spacious, in a good location with the possibility of extra facilities such as allotments, shared space for social events
- There is a willingness to accept fewer bedrooms provided space can be used flexibly e.g. during visits from friends or family
- Manageable outside space is important for gardening and relaxation
- Dedicated resident and visitor parking are needed in all but the most centrally located areas
- The home should allow people to continue to follow their current interests and activities while feeling secure that the home can adapt to future needs.

The report includes a series of designs which show how interior layouts could be adapted to work better for downsizer households.

In addition to the examples given in section 2 (pp 8-9), several local authorities have successfully encouraged downsizing through the development of prototype designs for bungalows. The challenge for councils has been to look at creative ways of developing bungalows for social housing in a way that is cost effective and makes prudent use of land.

CASE STUDIES: DEVELOPING BUNGALOWS TO ENCOURAGE DOWNSIZING

The Royal Borough of Greenwich worked with Bell Phillips Architects to create a bungalow that is roomy (90 sqm), meets wheelchair standards, complements local architecture and is suitable for small sites. The design is a prototype that can be repeated across the borough and is therefore cost effective to construct. The bungalows incorporate a ‘funnel roof’ which lets light in and allows the building to appear as 2-storey in an area where 2 – 4 storey housing is the norm. At the end of 2015, 22 bungalows had been developed for social rent for people aged over 60 across six garage sites in the borough\textsuperscript{1}. A garage site (area 0.6 net hectares\textsuperscript{1}) development of six bungalows at Ravens Way won a HAPPI award in 2014\textsuperscript{1}.

\textsuperscript{131} Housing our Ageing Population: Positive Ideas- Making retirement living a positive choice, All Party Parliamentary Group on Housing and Care, 2016

\textsuperscript{132} Designing with Downsizers, University of Sheffield, 2016
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6.3 Use Classes and Specialist Housing for Older People

The planning system treats different models and tenures of specialist housing for older people in different ways which have financial implications for developers - sometimes positive, sometimes negative - and will influence scheme viability, mix and tenure.

Developing specialist housing for older people for sale differs from general affordable housing development in that the type of scheme (retirement or supported) will have a bearing on the Planning Use Class and the costs of development. The Use Class has implications for local authority requirements for a developer to make an affordable housing contribution and for payment of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Development of retirement housing is usually regarded by the local planning authority (LPA) as Use Class C3 “residential” (i.e. each unit of accommodation is a separate, independent dwelling). Under local planning policy it can be expected that an affordable housing contribution will be required from C3 developments. The LPA will seek either an on-site contribution of a negotiated number of units provided as affordable housing (either for social/affordable rent or shared ownership/equity depending on local policy and evidence of need) or a financial contribution to enable affordable housing to be provided elsewhere.

In the case of mixed tenure development, the proportion of units proposed for social/affordable rent and/or shared ownership can be designed to satisfy the affordable housing requirement.

Supported housing development is something of a hybrid model which can be classified either as Use Class C3 or C2 “institutional”. There is some variation in interpretation depending on whether the development is considered (from a planning perspective) to be a form of housing or a form of care: one of the fundamental principles of the Extra Care concept for supported housing is that residents have self-contained accommodation with “their own front door” but with 24-hour on-site care and support available.

A C2 supported housing development could potentially consist exclusively of leasehold apartments for sale and/or shared ownership/equity without any need to make an affordable housing contribution.
6.4 Wider policy and consultation

Planning officers can usefully be aware of the following:

- the Planning Advisory Service recommends that local authorities identify a single point of contact for older people’s housing\(^{133}\)
- the ASC authority, a statutory consultee to relevant planning applications, can give a valuable opinion as to the value of a proposed scheme in meeting local care and support need
- registration with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) is a requirement for regulated activities which are listed in Schedule 1 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. The CQC should also consult the ASC authority regarding support for any new development.
- The ASC Market Position Statement and strategy can provide advice to providers regarding local needs.

6.5 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

The CIL is a locally set charge on development levied at a fixed rate per square metre. It is not chargeable on affordable housing. Some local authorities have excluded some or all forms of specialist housing for older people from their CIL charging schedules\(^{134}\).

The various authorities in North Northamptonshire decided to adopt different approaches and potential timescales for bringing forward the CIL. To date none have progressed beyond the Draft Charging Schedule stage. CIL Charging Schedules in West Northamptonshire continued to be prepared jointly and for all three authorities these have been submitted and examined, although not all have decided to bring a regime of CIL Charging into force at the same time.

The following table summarises the dates of key consultations, Examination dates and whether CIL Charging Schedules have been implemented within the constituent authorities.

---


\(^{134}\) Housing an Ageing Population, Savills, 2015
Table 3. CIL Preparation by Northamptonshire Districts and Boroughs as at November 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIL Preparation / Area:</th>
<th>Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule Consultation</th>
<th>Draft Charging Schedule Consultation</th>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Examination</th>
<th>CIL Charging Schedule Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Northamptonshire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corby</td>
<td>Dec 2012</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Dec 2012</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northamptonshire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>Dec 2012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td>Dec 2012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Northamptonshire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CIL Viability Studies in West Northamptonshire and North Northamptonshire did not recommend CIL Charging for residential accommodation for older people for developments outside of Use Class C3. Care Home developments or other institutional or specialist accommodation (i.e. principally those falling under Use Class C2) falling outside the classification for general dwellings was not considered sufficiently viable to robustly justify a CIL Charge.

The following charging rates were recommended:
### Table 4. Northamptonshire recommended CIL charging rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIL Preparation / Area:</th>
<th>North Northamptonshire</th>
<th>East Northamptonshire</th>
<th>Kettering</th>
<th>Wellingborough</th>
<th>Daventry</th>
<th>Northampton</th>
<th>South Northamptonshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corby</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>West Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Daventry</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>South Northamptonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Residential*’ : High Value</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>£112.50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C3: Rural Areas Below AH Threshold</td>
<td>£200 (below AH threshold)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£200 (below AH threshold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Residential*’ : Mid Value</td>
<td>£75</td>
<td>£75</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C3: Rural Areas Above AH Threshold</td>
<td>£65 (above AH threshold)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>£100 (above AH threshold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Residential*’ : Low Value</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C3: Urban Areas (all dwellings including those with care falling into this class)</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Residential*’ : SUEs</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C3: SUEs</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 CIL Charging Schedules not progressed past rates proposed in Draft Charging Schedules
2 CIL Charging Schedules Adopted
There is some doubt as to whether CIL viability studies across North Northamptonshire considered Extra Care (supported) or sheltered (retirement) housing for market as part of testing. Equally, there does not appear to have been any testing of affordable housing contributions at any level from specialist accommodation falling under Use Class C3. If CIL charging is taken forward this would be an area where further clarification would be helpful.

6.6 Site size and location

These have been discussed in detail in section 4. In summary, requirements for a viable site include:

- A minimum area of 0.5 hectares
- Level site (or with a slope of up to 1:20)
- Level, safe route to local shops
- Public transport and ‘indispensable’ services (food shop, cash dispenser, doctor, pharmacy) within 400 metres
- Demand from people in the local area.

It should be noted that development economics play an important part and that one approach to making a scheme viable is to seek a larger site where a higher number of units (possibly more than 100) can be provided. This is particularly true of supported housing. Retirement housing, with lower running costs and service charges, is less likely to be provided as a very large development and therefore has more choice of sites. While the actual costs of development will be influenced by a wide range of factors, viability calculations indicate that a minimum site size of half a hectare is generally required for development of a specialist housing scheme for older people to be financially viable. This is illustrated in a publication135 which has been generally accepted as good practice by CIL viability practitioners in England. The publication uses the traditional descriptions of sheltered (retirement housing) and Extra Care (supported housing).

6.7 CIL viability modelling

Specimen sheltered and Extra Care developments modelled on a half hectare site in high, medium and low value locations (Tunbridge Wells, Tewkesbury and Coventry respectively) were compared with the most viable form of general needs housing which could have been provided on the same site, family housing at 35 dwellings per hectare (dph). (This compares with typical densities of 100 - 120 dph for sheltered accommodation and 80 - 100 dph for Extra Care.) Affordable housing provision at the local target level and CIL of £100 per square metre were taken into consideration. The output was a residual land value per hectare for each form of development. In all locations, general needs housing was more viable than sheltered or Extra Care housing, sheltered housing was more viable than Extra Care housing:

- In Tunbridge Wells (high value area) all three schemes produced a positive land value at the local authority affordable housing target even with CIL at £100 per sq m, but residual land value was higher for general needs housing than for retirement housing.
- In Tewkesbury (medium value area) retirement housing produced a negative land value at the local authority affordable housing target both with and without CIL
- In Coventry, all three schemes produced a negative land value at the local authority affordable housing target both with and without CIL.

135 Community Infrastructure Levy and Sheltered Housing/Extra Care Developments, A Briefing Note On Viability, Retirement Housing Group, May 2013
6.8 Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs)

SUEs have some disadvantages relating to the provision of specialist housing for older people in that they are areas with limited established community or services and so are neither familiar to new residents nor well connected with family and social networks and may provide initially limited access to goods and services. However, the allocation of a site central to new shops and facilities and clarity regarding the phasing of development after initial infrastructure has been provided can make an SUE site more suitable for specialist accommodation and can make opportunities more attractive to providers.

Initial parcels of land are often initially marketed towards major housebuilders and may reflect different levels of viability at the early stages of development e.g. with lower levels of affordable housing provision. Another issue, given the long lead-in times for urban extensions is that the indicative schemes often change and any Outline consent can be subject to a number of revisions. This limits the ability of promoter to market sites and would be likely to reduce the certainty amongst the providers of specialist accommodation about which if any parts of a site represent a suitable opportunity.

Masterplanning offers one opportunity to ensure that providing specialist accommodation is considered and the most appropriate parts of the site are identified. Such parcels could potentially be identified for such uses and incorporated within any Marketing Strategy. At the same time they could be fully considered by the LPA in terms of the potential to provide affordable housing or other planning obligations along with other implications for overall delivery.

6.9 Building Design

The ten design components recommended by HAPPI set the accepted standard for scheme and individual apartment design. The overall aim is to encourage take up of retirement housing by creating an environment conducive to good mental and physical health, independence, a fulfilled life with the ability to pursue or take up interests and activities within and beyond the home and a home for life where care can be provided when needed.

In summary, HAPPI recommends:
- Generous internal space standards
- Plenty of natural light in the home and in circulation spaces
- Balconies and outdoor space, avoiding internal corridors and single-aspect flats
- Adaptability and ‘care aware’ design which is ready for emerging telecare and tele-healthcare technologies
- Circulation spaces that encourage interaction and avoid an ‘institutional feel’
- Shared facilities and community ‘hubs’ where these are lacking in the neighbourhood
- Plants, trees, and the natural environment
- High levels of energy efficiency, with good ventilation to avoid overheating
- Extra (external) storage for belongings and bicycles
- Shared external areas such as ‘home zones’ that give priority to pedestrians.

6.10 Car parking

Specialist housing for older people will generally have a lower level of parking provision than general needs housing. However, it should be noted that, as people continue to drive into older age, developers have recognised that provision closer to one space per household is required. Wherever possible, parking spaces should generally be not more than 15 metres from the main entrance door. Typical provision for a supported housing scheme would be:
• Individual units - minimum one space for every two dwellings. This can vary, with town/city centre being ‘car-free’ schemes to semi-rural locations requiring 1:1 ratios.
• Disabled spaces - 5–10 per cent of total spaces close to entrance.
• Staff - 5–6 spaces.
• Visitor parking - 2–3 spaces.
• Ambulances - drop off point immediately adjacent to entrance.\(^\text{136}\)

6.11 Gardens

The active and passive use of gardens can offer older people physiological, psychological and social benefits\(^\text{137}\). Research has explored in more detail how people can use gardens in specialist housing schemes and gives advice on the design input and support required for residents to get maximum benefit from them\(^\text{138}\).

People living with dementia can have problems navigating round their homes and external areas, even when they have lived in the same area for some years. This can deter them from leaving their homes and deprive them of the pleasure of access to green space. Some people with dementia who are still physically able may have a strong will to walk or ‘wander’ for substantial amounts of time and can get lost. Specialist housing design has tried to enable safe environments for this group by creating secure gardens that can only be accessed from within the building, circular layouts with paths that lead back into a central point with no confusing dead ends and the use of landmarks to mark points along a route.

Schemes with limited space at ground floor level have designed roof gardens that can be accessed from within the building and provide a safe place to enjoy sunshine, fresh air and greenery.

Other key design points relate to the provision of comfortable seating in sheltered positions to encourage people to remain outside for longer periods, scented, soft planting at an accessible height to attract attention and provide sensory interest without risk of injury, use of suitable paving materials and colours, barrier-free access to the garden. Chapter 7 of Improving the design of housing to assist people with dementia\(^\text{139}\) also examines these factors, advising on how good design can be achieved in new build and when refurbishing existing buildings.

Additional information regarding the benefits and design of gardens and outdoor environment includes:

• The Steepleton development by Pegasus Life at Tetbury Gloucestershire was a HAPPI award winner in 2015. The plan on the website shows how each cluster of homes on the site surrounds a courtyard garden: http://www.hdawards.org/archive/2015/winning_schemes/happi_winner/steepleton.php

---

\(^{136}\) Advice compiled by Carterwood Chartered Surveyors, 2015

\(^{137}\) York and Wiseman 2012

\(^{138}\) Garden Design and Planning in Sheltered Housing Accommodation for Older People, O’Meara and Wiseman

\(^{139}\) Improving the design of housing to assist people with dementia, The Dementia Services Development Centre, University of Stirling, 2013

www.cih.org/resources/PDF/Scotland%20general/Improving%20the%20design%20of%20housing%20to%20assist%20people%20with%20dementia%20-%20FINAL.pdf
• The Alzheimer’s Society book Taking part: activities for people with dementia looks in detail at a range of meaningful activity beneficial to people with dementia with chapters on a range of topics including gardening, reflecting examples of recent best practice and innovation: https://www.alzheimers.org.uk/site/scripts/documents_info.php?documentID=219
• Checklist of characteristics of dementia-friendly neighbourhoods: http://www.idgo.ac.uk/about_idgo/docs/NfL-FL.pdf

CASE STUDIES: BENEFITS OF INTERACTION WITH ANIMALS

There are few well documented examples of how garden space has been used to manage the effects of or treat dementia but there is some evidence of the associated benefits of interaction with animals.

Henpower is an organisation that works in dementia care settings and aims to empower older people to build positive relationships through hen-keeping to improve wellbeing, reduced loneliness and reduced depression. Providers report seeing benefits including reduced agitation in residents and reduced use of anti-psychotic medication.

Churchill Retirement Living promote the benefits of keeping a pet in retirement on their website and encourage “well behaved cats and dogs and caged birds” in their apartments: https://www.churchillretirement.co.uk/news/five-benefits-of-keeping-a-pet-in-your-retirement/

Pets as Therapy is a therapeutic visiting service by volunteers and their pets in hospitals, hospices, nursing and care homes, special needs schools and other venues across the UK. The interaction provides companionship and friendship and helps to tackle loneliness: http://petsastherapy.org/about-us/

---

140 Designing dementia-friendly outdoor environments, Oxford Institute for Sustainable Development, Oxford Brookes University
141 https://equalarts.org.uk/our-work/henpower/
7. Financing development

Affordable and mixed tenure

Traditionally, registered providers of affordable housing (RPs) have developed specialist housing schemes for older people using a combination of borrowing on the private market and affordable housing grant from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA). For the past ten years, this has been boosted by capital funding made available for supported housing by the Department of Health. This funding stream is often referred to as the CaSSH Fund.

RPs with appropriate financial strength can also access funds via the bond market. During the past five years, this has in some cases proved more attractive than borrowing from more traditional lenders.

In the past, RPs have subsidised the development of social rented units through selling shared ownership and market sale properties in mixed tenure schemes on the same site. Recent changes in Government priorities for funding and restrictions on social rent levels mean that this cross-subsidy has become increasingly difficult. The links between capital and revenue funding also need to be considered when making decisions about an appropriate tenure mix.\textsuperscript{142}

HCA funding will be made available in line with Government policy. The current investment programme initially favoured shared ownership, making very limited grant available for rented accommodation. However, the Government’s 2016 Autumn Statement made a commitment to more homes of all types and it has been confirmed that funding will be available for a wider range of affordable housing including homes for rent. On 5 January 2017, the Communities Secretary announced increased funding for the affordable housing programme and expanding the variety of tenures available to include Affordable Rent (i.e. up to 80\% of market rent level), Shared Ownership and Rent to Buy.\textsuperscript{143} The main emphasis of housing policy is still on helping younger households purchase their first home.

Specialist shared ownership housing for older people has been provided for several years but on a very small scale. This HCA-supported Older People Shared Ownership scheme allows people to buy up to 75\% of the equity and where they opt for the full 75\% they pay no rent on the remaining 25\%. This shortfall of income to the provider has implications for the level of financial risk they can take and hence the volume of shared ownership they can offer under this scheme.

Shared ownership is a product which is less familiar to prospective purchasers and to mortgage lenders. A high-profile marketing campaign and dialogue with potential lenders are therefore advisable to support the success of shared ownership. Sanctuary Housing promote shared ownership retirement property throughout England alongside their market sale operation with a webpage devoted specifically to this product\textsuperscript{144}.

People who would require a mortgage to take on shared ownership in older age would include:

- People whose existing property is not worth enough to pay for their share of equity
- People who want to realise some cash when they sell their existing home and so do not want to put it all into their next home

\textsuperscript{142} Page 16, Funding ExtraCare Housing Technical Brief, Housing Learning Improvement Network, 2013
http://www.housinglin.org.uk/asset.cfm?aid=7633

\textsuperscript{143} https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-money-for-affordable-homes-released

\textsuperscript{144} https://www.sanctuary-homeownership.co.uk/retirement-living-properties
• People without housing equity but who have sufficient savings/income to pay interest and capital on a loan.

For the first time since the early 1980s, local authorities are now encouraged to develop housing. Their capacity and willingness to do so will be influenced by political and financial considerations.

In 2015, the Government introduced measures placing additional pressure on social housing businesses and impacting on their ability to raise funds for development. Principal measures being taken forward (as at January 2017) are:

• the reduction of rents for social housing by 1% pa from 2016-2020
• voluntary right to buy for housing association homes
• a cap on the amount of Housing Benefit that can be paid towards the rent of tenants living in “supported” housing. Benefit will be capped at the maximum Local Housing Allowance (LHA) rate for the local area. (Supported housing is defined more widely than the definition used in this report. It refers to a range of housing where services are provided to support vulnerable and older people.)

The LHA cap would apply to all affordable specialist housing for older people where rents and (eligible) service charges exceed the local maximum allowance. Government has recognised that this risks the closure of some schemes and a potential reduction in the level of new development. It has therefore announced that the introduction of the LHA cap will not take effect until 2019/20. Consultation published on 21 November 2016 proposes that Government funding will be distributed to local authorities for use to top up Housing Benefit. This approach does not guarantee that Councils or RPs will have sufficient confidence to develop specialist housing but it does give local authorities an element of control in funding services they value and wish to support - something they may wish to consider in their housing strategies.

Responses to the survey of providers conducted for this project did not show enthusiasm for developing new specialist housing. It is anticipated that this will not change in the short term while providers consider the implications of the currently fluid policy situation and wider issues relating to land supply, evidence of local demand and the national economy.

Private development

The main capital funding sources available for supported housing for private development are group banking facilities, own name bond issues, social finance, scheme specific banking facilities, construction contractor finance, private equity partners, high net worth individuals, institutional investors, Real Estate Investment Trusts and property investment trusts, property unit trusts and OIECs, public pension funds, consortia of pension holders145.

More stringent banking requirements since 2008 have required schemes to reach higher levels of forecast surplus/gross profit/internal rate of return (IRR) as a safeguard against shortfalls in actual financial outcomes146. A gross profit of at least 25% is needed to ensure a viable commercial proposition for the builder. This would be subject to a deduction of around 12% for overheads and funding costs, leaving a typical target net profit of 13%.

145 Funding ExtraCare Housing Technical Brief, Housing Learning Improvement Network, 2013

146 Pages 21-41 and page 44, Funding ExtraCare Housing Technical Brief, Housing Learning Improvement Network, 2013
8. Ability to afford the cost of living in specialist housing for older people

**Affordable rented housing**

Social housing tenants will be charged for rent, the cost of any housing-related support provided and service charges which relate to services provided on site such as heating of communal areas, grounds maintenance, cleaning and caretaking. Tenants on low incomes can apply for housing benefit which may cover some or all the rent and service charges depending on the level of income and savings. As shown above (p21), service charges will generally be higher in supported housing due to the greater range of facilities and services provided. Support or care services will be commissioned separately and charged for by the provider, which may be the landlord.

Many housing-related support services previously funded by Supporting People are now being redesigned with a greater focus on the needs of individual residents rather than providing a universal service for everyone living in specialist housing for older people. In many cases the nature of support is changing to fall within the definition of “Enhanced Housing Management”. This enables service users who are on low incomes to claim Housing Benefit to cover the cost of that service.

It should be noted that eligibility criteria differ for housing and care:

- Access to social rented retirement housing is based purely on housing need; eligibility criteria for shared ownership for older people can, in some cases, also include an element of housing need.
- Social rented supported housing will be available to people with both housing and care needs, with negotiated nomination rights for ASC clients. Many providers will aim to maintain a balance of residents with high, medium and low care needs in their schemes in order to sustain a sense of community. This can mean that the person with the greatest care need may not be suitable for a vacancy which arises.
- Private accommodation is available to anyone who can afford it and whose needs are not assessed as being beyond the scope of the services available.

**Private leasehold accommodation**

Properties tend to be purchased outright using equity from the sale of the previous home. Mortgages are not generally available to the older age group, although this is an issue currently being reviewed by the Council of Mortgage Lenders. Service charges will be payable to the manager or agent and support or care fees payable at an agreed rate to the service provider. Moving to smaller accommodation which is in better condition and easier to heat may mean reduced costs for items such as heating, maintenance, council tax and insurance. The combined impact of some lower costs and access to welfare benefits can mean leave people with as much or more disposable income than prior to moving.

Subject to eligibility, the income of people in receipt of state retirement pension can be boosted by Pension Credit and Attendance Allowance. Table 5 below (page 39) provides income and expenditure examples gathered by a private provider in 2011. Although the value of pensions and outgoings will have changed slightly in the interim it does demonstrate how costs can reduce after moving and where welfare benefit entitlement can be maximised to meet service charge costs.

Residents who qualify for help and support with their care through the local adult social care authority do not have access to welfare benefits and have to make a “client contribution” towards the costs incurred, leaving them with the guaranteed minimum of £25 a week for all other expenses. In specific circumstances a person with care needs may be eligible for NHS Continuing Healthcare: a package
of care arranged and funded solely by the NHS for individuals who are not in hospital and have been assessed as having a "primary health need" i.e. they have substantial and ongoing care needs and the main or primary need for care must relate to their health. NHS Continuing Healthcare can be provided in a person’s own home or a care home.
Table 5. Comparison of household expenses for older households before and after moving to private retirement housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly Income:</th>
<th>Figures correct in 2011</th>
<th>Couple: 1 bed apartment</th>
<th>Single person: 1 bed apartment</th>
<th>Single person: 1 bed apartment</th>
<th>Couple moving: 2 bed apartment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before moving</td>
<td>After moving</td>
<td>Before moving</td>
<td>After moving</td>
<td>Before moving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State retirement pension*</td>
<td>222.05</td>
<td>222.05</td>
<td>145.40</td>
<td>145.40</td>
<td>110.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Pension Credit to cover **</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (private pension, savings)</td>
<td>222.05</td>
<td>242.05</td>
<td>145.40</td>
<td>165.40</td>
<td>190.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/sewerage</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/toiletries</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building/contents insurance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window cleaning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Licence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundries***</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax (Exempt if receive Pension Credit)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking (if car owner)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service charge &amp; ground rent</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure £</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposable income £</td>
<td>72.05</td>
<td>74.05</td>
<td>30.40</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>56.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

117
NOTES:
* topped up by Pension Credit Guarantee where eligible;
** can cover eligible housing costs including some service charges; full ground rent
***includes property and appliance repair/replacement
9. Specialist housing for older people and Starter Homes

The Housing and Planning Act 2015 redefined affordable housing to include Starter Homes and requires that a proportion of new housing development should consist of Starter Homes. These are to be made available to first time buyers under the age of 40 for a discount of at least 20% below the open market value of the property.

During the passage of the legislation through the House of Lords considerable controversy arose regarding the inappropriateness of requiring Starter Homes on development sites for specialist housing for older people. The focus on housing for younger people rather than for all sections of the population was also highlighted.

While no final decision has yet been made regarding exemptions from the Starter Homes requirement, the unsuitability of Starter Homes on sites to be developed for specialist housing for older people has been acknowledged and some form of exemption may be forthcoming. Technical consultation on Starter Homes Regulations proposed that “dedicated supported housing which provides specialist accommodation for a particular group and which includes an element of support, such as residential care homes” be exempted from the requirement to provide Starter Homes.147 The technical consultation also proposed that “housing designed specifically with older people in mind (but with no additional support required) would be subject to an off-site contribution to starter homes”148 rather than on-site provision. These proposed approaches are broadly in line with the distinction made between Use Class C2 and C3 developments for older people.

The Housing White Paper recognises the value of “helping older people to move at the right time and in the right way”149 It broadens the definition of starter homes to refer to “affordable home ownership” and proposes changes to the Starter Home arrangements including exemption from affordable housing contributions for “Proposals for dedicated supported housing, such as residential care homes, which provide specialist accommodation for a particular group of people and which include an element of support” (152).

10. Consumer protection

Affordable rented housing provided by RPs is required to meet clearly specified regulatory standards set out by the HCA: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/regulatory-standards.

The reputation of leasehold (privately owned) specialist housing has suffered due to the practices of a minority of providers leading to some leaseholders experiencing unfair treatment or being faced with large and unexpected bills for maintenance or when sub-letting or selling their property.

Issues regarding the management, maintenance and administration of leasehold accommodation have been addressed by the newly updated ARHM Code of Practice150 with which all providers must comply.

147 p14, Starter Homes Regulations Technical consultation, Department for Communities and Local Government, March 2016
148 p16, ibid
149 Para 4.43, Fixing our Broken Housing Market Housing White Paper, February 2017
150 http://www.arhm.org/publication-category/code-of-practice/
The question of ensuring that prospective purchasers have clear and full information about their financial commitments is in the process of being addressed. Recent investigation by the Law Commission reviewed practice in relation to event fees (i.e. charges levied when certain events occur such as sale or sub-letting of a leasehold property) and put forward proposals to establish a fairer approach. The report\textsuperscript{151} recognises the benefits of retirement housing and sees the removal of uncertainty around event fees as removing an obstacle to increased demand for and development of “leasehold retirement housing”. The Law Commission has recently consulted on proposals for implementation.

\textsuperscript{151} Residential Leases: Fees On Transfer Of Title, Change Of Occupancy And Other Events (“Event Fees”) Progress Report, Law Commission, June 2016
ANNEX 5 KEY FINDINGS FROM PROVIDER SURVEY

Surveys of demand for and condition of social rented specialised housing for older people in Northamptonshire

Introduction
Two surveys were designed to gather information regarding the long-term contribution that the existing supply of social rented specialised housing for older people can make to the overall requirement. Both surveys were circulated in September and October 2016.

The first survey explored the popularity of the existing stock by looking at the level of demand for vacant (void) properties broken down by property type, size, service model and location as expressed in the allocations and lettings records of the District and Borough Councils (or their agents).

The second survey, which was sent to over 30 social landlords operating in Northamptonshire, asked for details of the specialised housing schemes which they own or manage. The aim was to identify fitness for the future based on condition, accessibility, location and range of facilities. To give an indication of affordability we also gathered information about the current range of rent and service charge levels for different service models. Social landlords were also asked to comment on their intentions regarding future development of accommodation for older people. The affordability information and development intentions (currently minimal) were used to inform the demand modelling and more information on these points is included in the main report.

Picture of demand
A review of the demand survey responses showed that they did not include sufficient common factors to produce a consistent picture across the county. Reasons for this include responses being received in a range of formats; varying levels of completeness depending on the data held by the provider; several different systems used to select tenants for void properties are not directly comparable; in some cases, lack of standardisation of the original data input prevented use of some entries as it could not be assumed that they applied to the same property or time period.

It is clear that service models have developed in different ways in different council areas and therefore should not be compared directly. In some areas, the predominant service type is described as sheltered accommodation while in others it is Independent Living where the traditional level of support provided has been redesigned. Findings from the survey are therefore presented below for each individual District and Borough council.

CORBY
175 properties were reported as void between 2013 and 2016, with information provided relating exclusively to sheltered properties. Due to the absence of offer and refusal data no scheme specific issues can be determined, only popularity. Of the 175 properties, 115 were flats and 60 bungalows, with 72% of all property types on the ground floor. More than 70% of properties had 1 bedroom, with a small number of bedsit and 2 bedroom properties.
Figure S1. Corby voids by type, size and floor level

Corby - voids by property type 2013-2016 (sheltered)

- Flat: 66%
- Bungalow: 34%

Corby - voids by number of bedrooms 2013-2016 (sheltered)

- Bedsit: 72%
- 1bd: 15%
- 2bd: 13%
Popularity – scheme-specific

Popularity of schemes in Corby is based on number of bids per property. There is a stark contrast between the high numbers of bids for bungalows (Figure S2 below) compared with flatted schemes. Mixed flat and bungalow schemes have similar popularity to flats. More in-depth investigation would be required to establish whether popularity varies according to property type on those schemes.

The six least popular schemes were:
- Ernest Wright House, Willowbrook Road, Corby, NN17 2TU
- Bamburg Close, Corby, NN18 9PA
- Marlow Court, Farmstead Road, NN18 0AF
- Rankine House, Studfall Avenue, Corby, NN17 1LL
- Wollongong House, 11 Cannock Road, Corby, NN17 1YQ
- Donald Greaves House, Wordsworth Avenue, Corby, NN17 2LU

The six most popular schemes were:
- Eyebrook Court, Corby, NN17 2TY
- Cedar Court, Corby, NN17 2EY
- Mackintosh Court, Corby, NN18 0ST
- Borrowdale Road, Corby, NN17 2DQ
- Cannock Road, Corby, NN17 1YQ
- St Peters Way, Corby NN17 1UL
Although the number of bedsits in the sample is too small to draw firm conclusions, it is generally regarded as good practice to move away from providing bedsit accommodation for older people. It is therefore suggested that any option appraisal of the existing stock takes the long-term suitability of bedsits as its starting point.
DAVENTRY
There were 218 properties with void periods during 2013-2016. Popularity of schemes was determined through bids made and offers/refusals. There were 4 properties for which the types were not stated but were designated ‘Sheltered accommodation’. Independent living properties appear to have the highest proportion of void periods, perhaps indicating a high turnover in such schemes. Two bedroom bungalows dominate Daventry stock, in contrast to other councils.

Figure S3. Daventry voids by service, property type and size
Popularity

Properties accepted on first offer were around 86% for bungalows and 92% for flats (Figure S4). This is more likely to reflect the high proportion of bungalows on offer within the council stock, rather than a lesser popularity of bungalows. There is no real difference in acceptance rate between service types, suggesting that the service types are well understood or that other factors such as location drive bidding decisions. In general, Daventry’s first offer acceptance rates are high compared to the other councils, which are around 70-80%.

NB. The one Extra Care property in the void data was accepted first offer. It has been omitted from the following charts.

Figure S4. Daventry offer and refusal rate by property and service type
**Scheme specific popularity**

As the vast majority of Daventry’s stock is accepted on first offer, we have used average bids per property/scheme to distinguish between more or less popular schemes. Figure S5 below uses schemes with 3 or more properties void during 2013-2016, as schemes with single voids can appear artificially more popular than they are.

Flatted schemes were the least popular, with only two bungalow schemes being equally unpopular (with more than 3 bids per property). Those two least popular bungalow schemes were Saxon House and Brampton Way. Crabtree House flats are the exception to the rule; these are among the 6 most popular schemes.

The most popular schemes are predominantly bungalows. In order, they are:
- Oak Row, Brixworth, NN6 9WQ (16 bids per property). Independent living.
- Furnace Drive, Daventry, NN11 9FU (15 bids per property). Independent living.
- The Severn, Daventry, NN11 4QR (14 bids per property). Independent living.
- Crabtree House (FLATS), Brook Street, Daventry, NN11 9YA (13 bids per property). Independent living (1 and 2 bed, over two floors).
- Station Road, Long Buckby, NN6 (13 bids per property). Sheltered.

The few refusal data available state ‘not able to proceed’, ‘health’, and ‘not interested’, with no specific reference to property particulars. Given that refusals were made in a bid-based system where bidders have prior information about property details, this could be an area where more detailed recording of customer responses would be helpful in identifying how schemes could be improved.
Figure S5. Daventry scheme specific popularity

Daventry - average bids per property in schemes where 3 or more properties have been void during 2013-2016

- Windsor Close
- Warwick Court
- The Severn
- The Doubles
- Stephenson Court
- Station Road
- Station Gardens
- Station Court
- Saxon House
- Riverside Court
- Pells Close
- Oak Row
- Newcroft
- Neneside Close
- Manor Road
- Kennedy Close
- Jellicoe Close
- Henry Smith House
- Greenhill Court
- Grasscroft
- Furnace Drive
- Fraser Close
- Devon Ox Road
- Crabtree House
- Brampton Way
- Archer Avenue

Average bids per property

- Bungalows
- Flats
EAST NORTHAMPTONSHIRE

The data received for East Northamptonshire was extensive at over 1800 entries. Due to variations and contradictions found in some entries (e.g. slightly different details for the same address, contradictory property types given in same data line entry) some data had to be discarded and assumptions made. For example, the service type has been assumed to be independent living (IL) if not otherwise stated, and units categorised as 60+ have been regarded as sheltered.

After applying these assumptions, a total of 760 voids were recorded between 2013-2016.

Most of the schemes were IL with voids evenly split between flats and houses (it should be noted that 3 and 4-bedroom properties have been removed from the data at council’s request). Of the bungalow properties, most were sheltered, while most flats and houses were IL properties. Two bed properties are most prevalent in this demand data, and the few studio/bedsits included all have refusals.

Figure S6. Voids by service type, property type and size in E Northants
**Popularity**

The lowest demand was for Harpers Court, The Shrubberies, Stronglands and Cordwainers where no bids were recorded for void properties for periods of up to 12 weeks. As with other landlords with bedsit properties, good practice suggests that any option appraisal of retirement stock should include bedsits as well as schemes where demand appears to be low.
KETTERING
Information was available for 160 properties void between 2013-2016, including five properties with incomplete information. (Unfortunately, constraints at Kettering Borough Council prevented data for the final five properties being provided.) Properties were designated as sheltered flats or sheltered bungalows; no independent living or Extra Care schemes were reported.

Figure S7. Kettering voids by type, size and floor level
Popularity - property type
Between 2013 and 2016, 142 sheltered flats were void compared with only 18 sheltered bungalows. Data on refusals should considered in the context of the relative numbers of each type of property. Flats had a 73% acceptance of first offer rate, while bungalows had a 53% uptake of first offers made. The lower popularity of bungalows is somewhat surprising and goes against the common perception that bungalows are more popular. Many of the sheltered bungalows that proved less popular are those in the rural areas: 13 of the 17 bungalows refused were in the villages of Geddington and Broughton. Bungalows in the towns generally received more bids and fewer refusals. However, it should be remembered that the number of bungalows in the sample is small and may not be representative.

Figure S8. Kettering offer and refusal rate by property type

Any future review undertaken by the Council could usefully look more closely at the factors (possibly location) which may be influencing bungalow popularity.
Popularity - scheme specific refusals
Offer and refusal data have been used to gain some insight into scheme popularity. For all schemes, the number of offers exceeded the number of properties, indicating that all schemes are affected by some refusals (some of which may be due to personal circumstances rather than issues with the scheme). However, there are some schemes with common reasons given for refusals (Table S8).

Table S9. Most frequent refusal reasons for schemes in Kettering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Refusal reason (given 2+ times)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harry Potter House</td>
<td>Property unsuitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews (bungalows and flats)</td>
<td>Area unsuitable, lack of facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lawns</td>
<td>Property unsuitable (too small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudor Court</td>
<td>Wrong floor level, property unsuitable (too small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor Gardens (bungalows and flats)</td>
<td>Wrong floor level, change of circumstances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure S10. Comparing popularity of property types and schemes in Kettering

The most popular addresses were:
- Saxon Close (0% refusals, 7 properties) - this is part of Hazeland House, Desborough
- Hall Close (bungalows) (0% refusals, 5 properties) - part of Castle Gardens, Geddington
A single void at Wood St (also at Castle Gardens) was also let at first offer. Those schemes with the lowest levels of refusal were:
- Hazeland House (6% refusals, 14 properties, note: flatted scheme)
- Castle Gardens (6% refusals, 16 properties).

A range of schemes were in the mid-range refusal rate. This includes The Lawns, which had the highest number of void properties (30) with a 37% refusal rate.

The least popular schemes, at >45% refusal rates, were:
- Burton House (47% refusals, 10 properties void)
- Madams Garden (47% refusals, 8 properties void)
NORTHAMPTON
Out of 1000 data entries received, 688 included offer and refusal data. Around 300 incomplete records were removed from analysis. Refusals have been used to define popularity. The predominant service type is IL, with only 1% of properties designated as “Very Sheltered”, indicating an enhanced level of support.

Figure S11. Northampton voids by type and size

Figure S12. Northampton refusal rates by property and service type

Popularity
The type of property appears to make little difference to refusal rates, with bungalows and flats both having approximately 70% acceptance of first offer. Service types do have very different acceptance of first offer rates: Very Sheltered properties have no refusals over 2013-2016, IL have a 71% acceptance rate, and general mobility needs accommodation has the lowest acceptance rate at 29%.

Figure S12. Northampton refusal rates by property and service type
Popularity – scheme specific

There were 55 schemes with more than five void properties during 2013-2016 (Fig S13 below), and a further 97 schemes with fewer than five voids. The most popular schemes were bungalows. Those with no refusals, in order of number of properties, are: Fieldmill Road (8), Leicester Street (8), Vernon Walk (7), George Nutt Court (5), Gloucester Avenue (5), and Viscount Road (5).

The least popular schemes had a refusal rate higher than 60%, with Newnham Road (flats) as the least popular (13 properties, 33 offers, 22 refusals).
Figure S13. Most frequent refusal reasons for schemes in Northampton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least popular schemes</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Offers</th>
<th>Refusals</th>
<th>Common refusal reasons (given 2+ times, and non-personal e.g. medical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newnham Road (bungalows and flats, refusals on flats)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Dislike location (11), property unsuitable (2), dislike property (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmdon Crescent (bungalows)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Unsuitable access (floor level) (3), dislike property (3), dislike location (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Close (flats)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dislike location (3), dislike property (2), property unsuitable (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinton Road (bungalows and flats)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dislike location (4), dislike property (3), property unsuitable (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Oval (bungalows)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dislike location (3), dislike property (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Street (bungalows and flats, refusals on 1 bungalow)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dislike property (2), dislike location (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are aware, from discussions with Northampton Partnership Homes, that a review of older persons’ accommodation has already led to decisions regarding changes in property designations and some decommissioning. It is suggested that the information above is used to further inform that review and planning process.
Figure S14. Comparing popularity of property types and schemes in Northampton

Northampton - % refusals based on number of offers in schemes where 5 or more properties have been void (2013-2016)
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SOUTH NORTHAMPTONSHIRE
This local authority provided data for 245 void properties during 2013-2016, with the number of void properties in each of those years being similar. Data on popularity are based on offers and refusals. There are some 3 bedroom bungalows within the stock.

Figure S15. South Northants voids by service and property type and size
Popularity – service type
Sheltered schemes have the highest refusal rate.

Popularity – property type
Of the 159 void bungalows, 117 were accepted on first offer (74%). Flat acceptance rates were not far behind at 67% (58 of the 86 properties).

Figure S16. Comparing refusal rates by service type in South Northants

Popularity – scheme specific refusals
Most schemes within South Northants had only 1 or 2 properties which became void in 2013-2016. Refusal rates are therefore unrepresentative. Schemes where 5 or more properties have been void can give a clearer picture of the popularity. Of the 13 schemes that fit this criterion, Leeson Court and Candleford Court had more than 20 voids and a refusal rate above 30%. Figure S16 below shows the highest number of refusals were at Jubilee House (Sh) with a 58% refusal rate.
The most popular schemes are Hesketh Crescent (IL and Sh, 7 properties, 0 refusals) and Home Close (Sh, 5 properties, 0 refusals).
Any more detailed review of the existing stock could helpfully include further investigation into the factors causing high refusal rates in certain schemes. The apparently low refusal rate in smaller schemes may also provide some useful learning for future service design.

**Figure S17. Comparing popularity of property types and schemes in South Northants**

The six most popular schemes based on % refusals (from those with more than 3 voids (figure not shown) were:

- Hesketh Crescent (7 offers 0 refusals)
- Home Close (5 offers 0 refusals)
- Middlethorpe (4 offers 0 refusals)
- Roberson Close (3 offers 0 refusals)
- Mansfield Court (3 offers 0 refusals)
- Grafton Close (3 offers 0 refusals).
The six least popular schemes were:
- Jubilee House (12 offers 5 refusals)
- Arbury Banks (6 offers 3 refusals)
- Nene Way (6 offers 3 refusals)
- Castle Ashby (6 offers 3 refusals)
- Bridgewater House (9 offers 3 refusals)
- Candleford Court (27 offers 8 refusals).

Figure S18. Most frequent refusal reasons for schemes in South Northants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Common refusal reasons (given 2+ times, non-personal e.g. medical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arbury Banks</td>
<td>Too far from facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeson Court</td>
<td>Property unsuitable (too small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow Court</td>
<td>Property unsuitable (too small)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WELLINGBOROUGH

Information from Wellingborough Council relates to sheltered properties only and included data on bids but not on offers or refusals. 695 properties were void between 2013 and 2016, with the overwhelming majority (95%) being flats. Of these, nearly all had 1 bedroom.

Figure S19. Wellingborough voids by type, size and floor level

Popularity – scheme-specific
The popularity of bungalow schemes is easily discernible from flatted schemes: the number of void bungalows was lower and the average number of bids for the tenancy of a bungalow was higher. In Figure S19 below, bungalow properties (blue) all have average bids per property of more than 3, whereas most flat properties (orange) have fewer than 2 bids. The number of properties void for flatted schemes is much higher; most schemes had more than 6 properties void during 2013-2016. All bungalow schemes had 5 or fewer void properties.
Stock condition

Fewer than 30% of social landlords approached submitted a response. In addition to the local authority landlords, some or all of the information requested was received from EMH, Orbit, Aragon and Anchor. This was despite repeated requests and reminders by ourselves and the local authority representatives.

One provider (NCHA) responded to confirm that they have no older persons’ stock in Northamptonshire. Some others (notably Derwent Living) indicated that they were unable to give priority to the task, despite an extended timescale, and so could not assist. This may be due to provider reaction to Government announcements made early in the research process regarding future restrictions on the eligibility of supported housing rents for housing benefit or other reasons for being unable to give priority to older persons’ issues.

Despite the limited response rate, data was received relating to more than 60% coverage of sheltered social rented stock in the County, which was sufficiently robust at County level to inform the demand modelling undertaken for this project. The overall average level of fitness for purpose was 90% - higher than the level reported in London when similar work was conducted.

Measures of fitness for purpose used were: meeting the Decent Home Standard, lifts available for flats above the ground floor, level access into the scheme; scheme built or upgraded in the past ten years; and shops and other local services in the vicinity. The response was not sufficient to act as a cross-check on the overall number of specialised homes available for older people.
Only one local authority reported future development intentions. While the position of the providers which did not respond is not known, the general mood of the sector is risk averse pending the outcome of the Government’s proposed capping of housing benefit for supported housing at Local Housing Allowance levels. This sense of caution will have an impact of the speed of future development and reflects individual discussions held between the consultants and providers and as reported in Inside Housing on several occasions during February and March 2017.

Undertaking this exercise did reveal that dialogue between District and Borough Councils and Registered Providers regarding specialised housing for older people has declined as organisational changes have taken place. Indeed, in some cases contact details were out of date as providers had merged with other associations or joined larger groups. This has implications for the effectiveness of nomination arrangements and for inclusion of the right partners in county-wide partnerships, development and management forums.

Finally, in discussion with most of the local authorities on 9 February, it was noted that while the extensive supply of bungalows for social rent across Northamptonshire represents an additional resource, some of these will be unsuitable for older households due to the size of the garden, steps leading to the main entrance or location. It is suggested that where allocations data does not already identify suitability for older people this should be brought up to date to improve the rate of acceptance and void turnover.

Conclusions and suggested actions

- Taken together the surveys have shown that most of the existing social rented stock is in good condition and can continue to provide a valuable resource for older people who cannot access home ownership.
- Some local issues have been identified with the quality of data recording and with low demand for some schemes or types of property. It is suggested that any option appraisal of the existing stock takes the long-term suitability of bedsits and schemes identified as less popular as its starting point.
- It is hoped that this provides a starting point for local work to improve record keeping and more in-depth investigation of reasons for low demand. These will enable more effective monitoring of demand to inform future asset management decisions.
- It has also become apparent that councils and social landlords do not work closely in relation to the provision of housing for older people. It is suggested that the District and Borough Councils take the lead in engaging with RPs to identify those which wish to be active partners in establishing a more integrated approach across the county to meeting the housing needs of older people and creating a specialised housing development pipeline to deliver the required types and tenures.