

**REVIEW OF REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL'S
HOUSING STOCK FURTHER TO COMMUNITY
CONSULTATION**

Appendix 2

**PROPOSED REVISED CATEGORIES FOR
OLDER PERSONS ACCOMMODATION**

and supporting information

CONTENTS

	Page:
1. Introduction	3
2. Consultation	4
3. Main cause of concern (highlighted during consultation)	8
4. Reasoning	9
5. Proposed Categories	11
6. Recommendations for properties not deemed suitable as Older Persons accommodation	12
7. “My Home, My Future, My Choice” Residents Group	19
8. Conclusion	20
9. Lists of properties proposed for inclusion in each of the Categories	
9.1 List of properties proposed for inclusion in Category A	21
9.2 List of properties proposed for inclusion in Category B	22
9.3 List of properties proposed for inclusion in Category C	23
9.4 List of properties not deemed suitable as older persons’ accommodation	24

1. INTRODUCTION

The “My Home, My Future, My Choice consultation which started in 2007 formed the basis for the Older Persons Housing and Support Strategy which was approved by the Executive Committee on 26th August, 2009. Its action plan was approved subject to further community consultation. That consultation has now taken place which has allowed the Council to make informed proposals based on the thoughts and feelings of residents and balanced with the formalities of practicality, feasibility and forward planning.

Invitations to consultation events and a newsletter were sent to all scheme tenants, all councillors and all over 50's on the Council's housing waiting list. All councillors were invited to visit any schemes and to take part in the property inspections.

When forming these proposals the Council has listened to what residents feel to be the most important features in older persons' accommodation and have drawn on the findings of both sets of consultation.

Further detail in this document surrounds the following:

Section 2 - Summary of the consultation process and comments received.

Section 3 - The main causes for concern that have been highlighted throughout the consultation process.

Section 4 - The reasoning and thought processes considered when determining potential categories.

Section 5 - The proposed categories and criteria

Section 6 - About those properties that have not been deemed suitable as Older Persons accommodation and options available.

Section 7 - The “My Home, My Future, My Choice Residents Group”

Section 8 - Conclusion drawing on benefits of accepting proposals

Section 9 - Lists of properties in their respective proposed category, including a list of those properties not deemed suitable as Older Persons' accommodation

2. Consultation

The Council have fully appreciated the time and efforts afforded by residents, councillors and officers during the consultation process. There is no doubt that their thoughts, views and opinions have strongly influenced the outcome of these proposals.

Feedback has been encouraged and we have responded accordingly. Details of the consultation held can be found at **Appendix 1**, feedback forms and minutes can be found in the background papers as can details of the prior period of consultation held in 2007.

Below is just a sample of the feedback we have received recently and which was analysed prior to proposals being made.

Staff Conference – 7th September, 2009

- (I now have a) much clearer idea of what the council intend to do
- Be sensitive to (tenants) perceptions and expectations
- Keep staff involved, they know the residents
- Should consider safety
- Be honest when informing of changes, do not give higher expectations which can't be delivered
- Involve Home Support Officers
- (This has) given planning (department) some ideas when considering what is necessary in new builds
- Use different methods to approach tenants who won't attend meetings
- Keep us up to date with all ideas and developments
- Very interesting and informative
- Update front line staff and offer one to one consultations
- Involve other agencies

Public Conference – 25th September, 2009

- Very enjoyable few hours

- A very interesting meeting, lots of information
- Worried that decisions have already been made
- Excellent balance of jargon to plain English
- We will actively contest this
- Interesting and most helpful but we do not agree with the letting procedure it is unfair
- Should also consider private home owners
- Very positive and encouraging for the future
- Would be useful to go and visit other towns
- Encouraged by time and effort from officers, please don't let it go to waste and create a happy, safe and pleasant environment for older people to live in (and for those younger to look forward to)

Scheme Visits – October, 2009

Individual sets of minutes from each scheme visit are available in the background papers. The following comments are from residents who completed a feedback form.

- Only allow over 50's in older persons if they are disabled
- Sheltered label is most important
- Would rather not be called 'sheltered' housing
- I do not feel reassured
- Very well put across, pleased to hear we will be kept informed
- Should have carefully considered lettings plans
- Decision making should be made carefully taking into account vulnerable people
- The standards cover most of what elderly people need for comfortable living
- We feel very strongly that the scheme should remain over 60's

- Introductory tenancies are a good idea, long overdue
- Just enough information, too much would be confusing
- Attention should be given to sound proofing
- Do not allow groups of properties to become ghettos
- The information given about the priorities (in the action plan) helps people understand more

Consultation Feedback conference – 31st March, 2010

- Enough consultation has been carried out but public involvement has been low
- Continuance of the residents group is essential even after the decisions are made
- Initiative (to be involved) was firmly placed on tenants – no attempt (was made by the Council) to contact all tenants individually
- There is ample opportunity to ask questions but could also have a box in the One Stop Shop
- Some people used the event to air their own personal grievances
- Could use 'peer' interviewers
- Excellent layout and presentations
- There has been enough consultation but can always think of more ways
- Apathy prevents enough people attending these events
- People think decisions already made because of the amount of information you are giving, they are not used to it.

End of consultation questionnaire – March 2010

Further to comments made at the feedback conference that perhaps more vulnerable people had not been given enough opportunity to air their views a questionnaire was taken by the Home Support Officers to gauge awareness and capture any concerns and questions from our more vulnerable residents that may not have attended any of the advertised events.

Approximately 800 were issued and we received over 300 responses. The Home Support Officers were able to reassure many residents and others have been sent information as requested. Fortunately, most were already aware of the consultation but it was indeed worthwhile to be able to address those who did have concerns.

3. Main causes for concern

The standards (see appendix 7) were set following the initial consultation with residents during the “My Home, My Future, My Choice” consultation in 2007. These standards were explored again with scheme residents in October, 2009. The main causes for concern related to:

- **The size of properties** – a particular concern were bedsits which are no longer desirable as older persons accommodation except for a minority who appreciate a smaller, more manageable environment.
- **The layout of the properties** - in particular to the problems relating to the use of wheelchairs indoors.
- **Internal access** – some schemes are not suitable for wheelchair use in communal areas in particular where there is no lift or where there were internal steps to properties, slopes and narrow corridors.
- **External access** – there were some issues with hills and steps outside some properties.
- **Poor location** - taking into account distance to shops, public transport, hills etc.
- **Inadequate parking** – in some cases causing neighbour disputes
- **Safety and security** – in particular fire safety and door entry systems
- **Age mix** – we talked to many residents where schemes had already had the age limit reduced to 50 and there were mixed opinions about whether this worked. Generally, this seemed to work well but in some instances it did not work at all due to the differing lifestyle of the tenants causing anti-social behaviour.
- **Support needs** – during the recent consultation many residents expressed concern regarding the change in the supporting people contract. It was felt that as many residents now did not need the service that the Home Support Officer would not be around as much as they were used to and this compromised a feeling of security.
- **“Sheltered”** – There were mixed views on the importance of using this term. The majority of residents felt it was important and provided a sense of security and urgency when dealing with service providers. Others felt it was derogatory, dated and as there was no legal definition as such, a meaningless term.

4. Reasoning

4.1 Category A

When considering which properties should be placed in Category A we were looking for those properties which were able to meet the main concerns raised by the standards that were set or at least were reasonably expected to be able to be brought up to those standards within a reasonable period of time. It was essential that any property considered for this category meant that the Council complied with the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 which requires that we “overcome physical barriers to access”. It was therefore essential that all properties and communal areas were level access and could accommodate the use of a wheelchair. Equally essential was that there was lift access to upper floors. Bedsit accommodation was considered unsuitable for this category.

During consultation there was also strong concern about the introduction of floating support. Many residents were worried that the Home Support Officer may not be around as much as they were used to and this would compromise security. It was felt, therefore, that where all the standards were met or could be met that criteria should include a requirement for the need of the Home Support Officer, that way every resident would have an assessed need for the service and the Home Support Officer would spend more time on the Scheme.

A major concern during consultation was that older people, especially those over 70 or 80 expected a much quieter lifestyle. An ageing population has meant that the lifestyles enjoyed by 50/60 year olds are very different from what they were 20 years ago. Whilst there are many examples where these age groups can get along reasonably well it was felt that increasing the age limit on allocation to this category would improve the lifestyle for older residents. To balance demand with lifestyle we are recommending an entry age for this category of 65 years of age and over.

The preferred choice of accommodation lifestyle for older persons was either bungalows or communal living and these, where they met the standards, have been placed in Category A.

4.2 Category B

There were some schemes that did not reach all the standards, or could not reasonably be expected to reach the standards within a reasonable period of time, if at all. However, there were still many attributes that meant they were suitable as older persons' accommodation. Where we could be satisfied that all the following qualities applied we have placed the properties in Category B.

- Acceptable safety and security standards
- Where there is a communal lounge nearby

- Strong levels of communal activity
- Medium to high dependency on the Home Support Service
- None or low amount of bedsits
- Good local facilities within walking distance
- Good, regular transport links
- No more than one upper floor
- Level access to lower floors
- High demand from over 60's or potential to increase demand.

Because a high number of these properties do not have a lift to upper floors or level access in some places it would be more suited to persons who are mobile due to some of these access barriers. However there is still a lot of accommodation in this category which would be suitable for people with mobility issues. Because of the mixed type of accommodation within this category there would be no requirement to need the Home Support Service but this would be available to those with an assessed need.

Importantly, we have not underestimated the strength of feeling and insecurity that the magnitude and timescales of this project has caused residents. Research into demography and good practice, future changes in assistive technology and peoples aspirations will always be a vital element of strategic planning. Therefore, if there are any steps we can take now to minimise the effects that inevitable future change will bring then it makes sense to do so.

By introducing this category to our Older Persons Housing portfolio we can, should the need arise in the future, review Older Persons Housing on a much smaller scale.

4.3 Category C

The schemes (or part of) that did not meet the criteria for Category A or B have been placed in this category unless:

- There is more than one upper floor and no lift
- High risk that safety or security standards cannot be reached.
- High volume of bed sit accommodation
- Mixed tenancy types (e.g. general let and over 50's in the same building)

Giving reference to the amount of over 50's on the current waiting list (**See appendix 11**) it was felt that there was sufficient demand, at the moment, to retain as much of the stock as met the needs of this category of applicant.

Where a scheme has been identified as having any of the above points is has been deemed not suitable as older persons' accommodation.

5. PROPOSED CATEGORIES

Older Persons Supported Housing – Category A

(see Section 9.1 for properties proposed for inclusion in this category)

- suitable for persons aged **65** years old and over **and** who have an assessed support need.
- acceptable safety and security standards
- in a suitable, desirable location
- suitable internal and external access, including a lift to upper floors
- suitable communal facilities
- eligible to join in communal activities at other schemes

Older Persons Housing – Category A Bungalows

(see Section 9.1 for properties proposed for inclusion in this category)

- suitable for persons aged **60** years old and over with preference to be given where there is an assessed support need or to a wheelchair user
- also suitable for adults aged 18 years old and over with severe mobility issues or wheelchair users
- suitable internal and external access
- eligible to join in communal activities at other schemes

Older Persons Housing for Over 60's– Category B

(see Section 9.2 for properties proposed for inclusion in this category)

- suitable for persons aged **60** years old and over with or without an assessed support need
- priority would be given to wheelchair users in level access units
- priority would be given to those with an assessed support need
- upper floors (where appropriate) only suitable for mobile persons
- priority to move to lower floors would be given to current upper floor residents if criteria met
- suitable internal and external access
- eligible to join in communal activities at other schemes

Over 50's Housing – Category C

(see Section 9.3 for properties proposed for inclusion in this category)

- suitable for persons aged 50 years old and over with or without an assessed support need
- upper floors (where appropriate) only suitable for mobile persons
- priority on lower floors would be given those with mobility issues
- priority to move to lower floors would be given to current upper floor residents if criteria met

- eligible to join in communal activities at other schemes

6. Properties Not Deemed Suitable As Older Persons' Accommodation

Our research and consultation has informed us that the following headings are unacceptable in older persons' accommodation:

Bedsits

Bed sit accommodation is no longer accepted as suitable accommodation for older people. A very small minority are happy with it but in general it is not appropriate to maintain large amounts in our stock. Because there is a low demand for this type of accommodation it also causes loss of revenue for the Council due to lengthy void periods.

Difficult access

The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 requires that we 'overcome physical barriers to access'. Aspirations and needs of tenants are also changing and expectations are that once a move into older persons' accommodation is made that this should be for life. There will be exceptions where tenants choose to move for personal reasons or care needs increase substantially. Our stock should not prevent tenants being able to stay in a scheme because of mobility issues. Upper floor accommodation, where lift access is not feasible has meant that much of our stock does not meet acceptable standards for Category A. Where stock is placed in other categories it was felt that there should be some potential to improve access in the future or no more than one upper floor.

Mixed age

Whilst there were many examples of over 50's mixing well with older people there were strong concerns that younger people and in particular families do not compliment older persons' lifestyles. Therefore, it was felt that where schemes were partly for older people and partly for general let they were not suitable. As the demand for general let accommodation is far greater it was more feasible to change its full usage accordingly or explore other options where demand is high.

Inadequate Safety precautions

Where our inspections have highlighted a cause for concern with regard to safety further investigations have been carried out. Where adequate measures cannot be put in place then this cannot be deemed as acceptable accommodation.

We are proposing that the following schemes will not meet the future needs of older people. Where appropriate we have given details of options that could be considered.

6.1 CHILTERN HOUSE

Chiltern House is currently enjoyed as older persons' accommodation by several residents. It is already part general let and some tenants have already exercised their right to buy. It has a communal lounge (use not permitted to those in the general let and privately owned accommodation) but this is not often used. It is made up of 9 blocks of flats, 7 blocks of 6 flats and 2 blocks of 5 flats, a communal lounge and an office (formerly bedsit guest accommodation). There is therefore a total of 52 units of accommodation. Of these, 34 units allocated to over 50's, 8 of which are bedsits. 9 units in different blocks are now privately owned and the remainder are general let.).

(see floor plan – Appendix 12)

The combination of general let and older persons' accommodation has worked well but tenants are concerned that a return to general let would increase the risk of anti social behaviour. The current residents over 50 do not want anything to change and some have actively contributed to the consultation period throughout.

However, there are several sets of steps to negotiate to reach the higher floors and even steps to access the lower ground floors (alternative access to lower ground floors can be obtained at the back of the building). A lift is not feasible as it would not serve enough flats. It is not conducive to lifetime accommodation as in the event of mobility issues there are considered to be too many steps and turns to negotiate to some floors. The lower floor also has 50% bedsit accommodation.

(see scheme report for more information - Appendix 13)

RECOMMENDATION: CHILTERN HOUSE

The Council recommends that the following options are considered:

Option A

- That the current older persons' accommodation is returned to general let and that officer's should meet with residents to discuss a sensitive approach to allocations.
- Any current tenants affected would be offered an appointment with a dedicated officer to discuss any concerns and all relevant options would be explored.

- If this option is approved Officers could give further consideration to converting the communal lounge into a disabled flat or into other rentable accommodation to increase revenue.
- That further consideration be given to converting the bedsit which is currently used as an office for the Home Support Officer into rentable accommodation to increase revenue.

Option B

Consideration could be given to retaining some of the accommodation for Over 50's. Points to note are that; much of the lower floor units are bedsits and all the blocks are of mixed tenure. In addition consideration should be given to the fact that an extension to the pathways from the fire exit of the bottom block of flats would be advisable.

6.1.1 Financial implications of conversion options

It will be possible to effect option A or B and option C

Option 1

Cost of converting the lounge into a disabled flat	= £12,500
Estimated potential rental income 2011-2026	= £57,600

Option 2

Cost of converting the lounge into 2 bed sits	= £13,600
Estimated potential rental income 2011-2026	= £81,432

Option 3

Cost of converting the office into a bedsit	= £1,750.00
Estimated potential rental income 2011-2026	= £35,337.60

A report will be brought back to Members after consultation about the usage of communal areas.

6.2 AUXERRE HOUSE

Auxerre House is currently divided into two halves. Half being older persons' accommodation for over 50's and the other half is general let. There is a high volume of bedsit accommodation. Although there is a lift to upper floors and adequate parking there have been some problems with the 'division' of the building and internal access and security has been compromised. In addition, the foyer and lift is communal and shared by both sides.

RECOMMENDATION: AUXERRE HOUSE

The Council recommends that the following options are considered:

Option A

- Opportunity for first time buyers under the Homebuy Scheme. HomeBuy enables social tenants, key workers and first time buyers to buy a share of a home and get a first step on the housing ladder.

(Appendix 14)

Option B

- Consideration could be given to changing this scheme to general let as the bed sit accommodation is not considered suitable for older people and the rest of the building is already general let. Officers should meet with residents to discuss a sensitive approach to allocations if this option is approved.
- Any current tenants affected would be offered an appointment with a dedicated officer to discuss any concerns and all relevant options would be explored.
- There is potential to convert the communal lounge into a 2 bedroom flat and officers could consider this further when consulting with residents regarding the use of communal areas.

6.3 ROXBORO HOUSE

A scheme visit was made to Roxboro House in October, 2009 and it was reasonably well attended by tenants. Generally, everybody was pleased with their accommodation and concerned that there could be changes. The damp problem was evident at that time as there was a strong odour on entry to the building, in the lounge and communal kitchen.

Roxboro House has a high volume of bedsit accommodation and although there is a lift in the property access to the building is poor and parking is a major problem.

There is a good sized communal lounge and kitchen which is used occasionally with excellent, panoramic views.

Access is by a very steep hill, there is inadequate bin storage and parking provision.

Subsequently, in November 2009 the annual fire drill took place and this did not go very well with several tenants refusing to co-operate making it impossible to fully assess the situation.

The Council would like to be able to improve its evacuation procedure but unfortunately the layout and access in and out of the building do not lend themselves to this. It is of major concern that whilst the Fire Service accept the current arrangement that this will present problems in the future. A risk assessment of the fire evacuation has been carried out see Appendix 17.

An assessment by the contractor has determined that the cost of providing a ramp for evacuation would cost approximately £44,180. However, this involves installation of the external ramp at such a gradient that would require

major works. The works would intrude on neighbouring properties and access for plant machinery would be extremely difficult.

A further ramp required at the back door would encroach on parking and bin storage which is already an issue.

Attention to the roof, fascia's and gutters is also essential and would cost £73,535 over the next 5 years. Further cost relating to emergency lighting, upgrading smoke and fire detection will total £6,500.

Retention of the scheme would cost £181,749.00 on the planned kitchen and bathroom programme.

RECOMMENDATION: ROXBORO HOUSE

That Officers are granted permission to investigate the options available and to pursue a market valuation for the reasons given below:

- This scheme could not meet adequate health and safety standards without substantial redevelopment. The amount of redevelopment required would be extremely difficult because of the poor access for plant machinery (single track) from the Evesham Road and this would be difficult to extend because of neighbouring properties.

Consideration could be given to the following options:

Option A - Disposal

- The Council could close and demolish the site and put on the open market for sale to a market developer, who could provide affordable housing via a S106 Agreement, which would be the Council's best capital receipt generator, which could fund improvements to other older persons' housing stock. A possible outcome here would be that we could insist via the S106 that as part of the new development, there are bungalows provided on part of the land for the elderly (we could ask tenants if they want to come back on a new scheme)
- Dispose for market housing ONLY which would generate the greatest capital receipt but which would present the borough with a problem in meeting its housing need.

Option B - Other Affordable Provider Options

(RSL – registered social landlord)

- RSL could take over the scheme as an older persons housing facility, but massive investment required to upgrade, scheme problems caused by design will remain – RSLs will probably not be interested as they

were with the Frederick Eary House scheme (Anchor) which is similar and for sale at present.

- RSL demolish and rebuild as a new sheltered complex or elderly persons bungalows.
- RSL demolish and rebuild as mixed tenure 100% AH site (subject to availability of HCA grant to pump prime the development and private finance on their part). May need to put some for sale units to cross sub. Some of the scheme could be conditioned as being bungalows and some could go to existing residents if required (pre-let)
- RSL conversion of building to alternative use. Possible but may not be popular.

Option C - Council retention (General Let)

- As the standards do not meet the needs of older people it could become a general let complex. However, this will need a massive investment to get up to standard and possible sensitive lets policy.
- Scheme could be remodelled to create 1 bed flats. This would be very costly.
- Council could demolish and use HCA Council House Building Grant (subject to 22 June budget and application and finding a partner with the skills to engineer a scheme) to replace with Council owned family houses/flats or mix to be determined. – Going to be hard to achieve and dependent on member commitment to fund part outside of grant with prudential borrowing, dependant on the review of the Housing Revenues Account.
- Council looking to build a mixed tenure for sale and shared ownership scheme to cross subs rented units.

Option D - Council retention (Over 50's housing)

- Standards at this scheme do not meet those identified as desirable for the future needs of older people, especially the high level of bedsit accommodation, inadequate parking, hilly location, restricted vehicular access and safety standards.
- Substantial funding would have to be secured to improve the scheme and ongoing maintenance costs on a building of this age and condition would be high. We also need to be prepared for the strong possibility that tighter Health & Safety regulations will come into place in the future and whether the scheme could accommodate further change structurally or financially.

- The major improvement works that would be required would cause disruption to residents and neighbours and would worsen the already critical vehicular access and parking problems.
- Consideration must also be given to the increased risk that older people may require attendance from emergency services. Essential works to provide external ramps to enable evacuation will impede access in the future.

6.4 Blocks of flats

The consultation carried out in 2007 and recently has shown that blocks of flats, especially those without communal facilities are not conducive to older persons' accommodation. This type of accommodation is more suitable for general let for which the demand is exceptionally high.

When considering our proposals we have taken the measured standards into account. We have also considered whether there is alternative proposals for older persons' accommodation nearby.

The Council would like to be able to explore the possibilities of assessing the following properties for suitability for alternative use. For example as training flats or adapted for those with sensory impairments.

Where these options are not feasible then the recommendation would be to allow them to be allocated for general let needs.

Flats not considered suitable as Older Persons' accommodation

Mount Pleasant, Southcrest
 Paddock Lane, Oakenshaw
 Leacroft Road, Crabbs Cross
 St Georges Road, St. Georges, Town Centre
 Grange Road, St. Georges, Town Centre
 Feckenham Road, Headless Cross
 Manor House, Astwood Bank
 Loxley Close, Church Hill South
 Sandhurst Close, Church Hill North

7. “My Home, My Future, My Choice Residents Group”

The group was set up following feedback received during the consultation events held in September and October, 2009. Several requests were made for closer working between Officers and residents. As feedback was collated during the consultation period residents were asked to express an interest in being more closely involved in consultation and then contacted in January, 2010 and invited to a meeting to discuss forming the group.

The group have agreed to abide by ‘terms of reference’ (see **Appendix 15**). Meetings have enjoyed regular monthly attendance since January, 2010 and members are a mixture of current tenants, potential tenants, owner occupiers, Older Persons Forum, councillors and Officers. The agenda has been flexible and generally set mutually between all members of the group.

The Council has appreciated the time devoted by the group members. Their contributions continue to be invaluable.

8. CONCLUSION

The Council feel that by adopting these proposals and the revised action plan we will achieve the following:

- Be fully compliant with the Disability Discrimination Act 1995
- Improve the lifestyles of wheelchair users and over 65's with support needs
- Provide accommodation for older people who do not necessarily need support but appreciate a different lifestyle
- Show that we have listened to our tenants needs and aspirations as far as is practicably possible
- Invested in improvements to properties and services
- Afforded a commitment to reviewing the allocation process into older persons accommodation
- Provided more accommodation for general let needs
- A commitment to investigating options for first time buyers, temporary respite care and other types of specialist accommodation
- A commitment to working closer with our tenants to improve our service and communication.
- Minimised the need for large scale reviews in the future

9.1 Proposals for schemes to be placed in:

Older Persons Housing – Category A

Communal accommodation suitable for persons aged 65+ with an assessed support need, priority will be given to wheelchair users. (Bungalows are deemed suitable for persons aged 60+ and are also suitable for adults over 18 with severe mobility issues or wheelchair users)

Arthur Jobson House
Ibstock House
Harry Taylor House

Bungalow accommodation at:

Ashton Close
Ashorne Close
Banners Lane
Blythe Close
Brinklow Close
Cedar Road
Cedar View
Chedworth Close
Clifton Close
Coupass Cottages
Deans Close
Drayton Close
Eathorpe Close
Fearnings Cottages
Fladbury Close
Flanders Close
Fordbridge Close
Frankton Close
Fulbrook Close
Gorse Close
Grendon Close
Holloway Park

Ibstock Close
Ilmington Close
Johnson Close
Kenilworth Close
Lightoak Close
Lyndenwood
Mickleton Close
Pitcheroak Cottages
Sandhurst Close
St Georges Gardens
St Lukes Cotts
Treville Close
Upperfield Close
Western Hill Close
Willow Way
Winslow Close
Yardley Close
Yew Tree Close

9.2 Proposals for schemes to be placed in:

Older Persons Housing for Over 60's– Category B
(Suitable for persons aged 60+, mobile, with or without a support need)

Bentley Close

Evesham Road – Property numbers 170A - 190B

Keats House

Malvern House

Mendip House

9.3 Proposals for schemes to be placed in:

Over 50's Housing – Category C
(Suitable for persons aged 50+, mobile, with or without a support need)

Beoley Road

Bredon House

Downsell House

Evesham Road Property numbers -124, 130, 134, 144 - 156a

Gorse Close flats

Phillips Terrace

Retreat Street

Bungalows:

Crabbs Cross Lane

Paddock Lane

Patch Lane

Sycamore Avenue

Whitchurch Close

Yarningale Close

9.4 Dwellings not considered suitable as Older Persons Accommodation Category D

Auxerre House

Chiltern House

Roxboro House

Flats at:

Feckenham Road

Grange Road

Leacroft Road

Loxley Close

Manor House

Mount Pleasant

Paddock Lane

Sandhurst Close

St Georges