



Extra Care Housing

A Hull LINK Consultation

May 2010



	Page
Background	3
Our Consultation	5
Our Survey: Facilities	6
Our Survey: Living Accommodation & Space	8
Our Survey: Other Preferences	14
Conclusions	18
Appendix 1: Age Analysis	19

What is Hull LINK (Local Involvement Network)?

Hull LINK is an independent network of local people and groups which has legal powers to examine health and social care services. Since 2008 LINKs have been set up across the country to give people more say in how these services are planned and run.

Our role is to find out what people think of local health and care services and enable them to suggest improvements. We can investigate areas of concern, make recommendations to services and get a response. We can also carry out spot checks, when necessary and under safeguards, to see if services are working well.

Background – What is Extra Care Housing

Extra Care housing is a type of housing designed to meet the needs of older people and also working age people with physical, sensory and learning disabilities or mental health problems. The aim of this type of housing is to enable people to remain living independently for as long as possible. This is achieved by designing housing that can be adapted to meet both the current and future support needs of the resident, and includes features such as adjustable height kitchens, adaptable bathrooms and installations ready for the addition of telecare facilities when required. Unlike sheltered housing, care and support that meets the varying needs of individuals is accessible to residents 24 hours a day, either on site or by call. However residents are encouraged to remain as independent as possible, with additional support being available for use on the occasions when it is most needed.

Often the housing is in the form of flats or bungalows and is situated on purpose built 'village' style developments. Each development comes with a range of other services available either on site or nearby, and includes facilities such as restaurants, shops and fitness facilities. The addition of such facilities aims to assist independent living and help people to enjoy social networks and remain part of the wider community.

Extra Care housing can provide people with an alternative option to moving into residential care, and unlike residential care homes, it provides people with their own individual home which they may rent or own. In addition, such housing can accommodate a person's partner or carer, and so combined with adaptable nature of the houses, there should be minimal need for a resident to move home due to changes in health or mobility.



Extra Care Housing in Hull

In Hull, there is currently only one Extra Care housing scheme, this being Grove House which is located on Beverley Road. Grove House opened in 2002 and provides accommodation of 40 flats which have all been occupied since the scheme opened. Flats at this development rarely become vacant as, due to the nature of Extra Care, people tend to only choose to move out when they need 24 hour nursing care. As a result, there is a waiting list that exceeds the number of places at this scheme and therefore there is significant demand for further schemes to be developed.

Hull City Council's Extra Care Strategy sets out a programme for the next 10 years to increase the number of places of Extra Care housing from 40 to an overall figure of 2000 in the longer term, and 650 in the medium term. This will be through the combination of building new housing as well as adapting existing housing. The initial 220 new homes will be built across three sites, with the inclusion of a centre of excellence that will consist of 100 units focussing on dementia care.

Our Consultation

Hull City Council's Extra Care Strategy presents some exciting prospects for the development of housing available to local residents for later in life. The Council were aware however that if Extra Care housing is to be successful, it must meet the needs and aspirations of the people who are going to live in it. It was therefore for this reason that in December 2009, Hull City Council invited the LINK, along with service users and other members from the local community and voluntary sector that represent service user views, to join a working group to gather local people's views on what the local schemes could look like. The information gathered from this working group would then inform the final specifications for the first 220 houses.

What we did

A small task and finish group was set up to join the Council's working group. This consisted of two members of the Steering Group, Ali Lovelock and Karen Stretton, and Helen Blanchard of the Hull LINK staff team.

Following initial meetings with the Council to explain the concept of Extra Care housing and the intentions for further developments in Hull, the working group were taken to visit two Extra Care schemes in the local area. These were the Grove House development on Beverley Road, and Holderness Grange, a privately operated scheme located in Hedon. These visits presented the opportunity to view first hand how such schemes are operated on a daily basis and to see the type of accommodation, facilities and services that can be offered. The working group also attended a workshop with the Council's technical advisors to the scheme, who presented a number of design proposals along with possible alternatives to certain design elements. This, along with the visits to existing developments demonstrated the possibilities for the new schemes, and also highlighted the areas that would require further public input to determine the most appropriate solution to particular aspects of the schemes' design.

From these meetings, the task and finish group decided that the best approach to gather people's views on the unresolved areas of design would be via a survey whereby respondents could state the facilities they would like to have available as well as select their most favoured choice from a list of options. As Extra Care housing is still a relatively unheard of concept to most people, the task and finish group also decided that further information should be supplied with the survey. The group therefore devised an easy-read leaflet that was distributed with each survey.

This report presents the findings from this survey and provides an indication of what local people think about Extra Care housing and the kind of things that could put them off this type of living option. The report also aims to draw some conclusions on the design aspects that residents of Hull would like to see in the final specification for the local schemes.

Who Completed the Survey?

A total of 62 people responded. The majority of respondents were female (35), compared to 18 male responses and 9 respondents that did not state their gender. 90% of respondents were of white background and 3% of a BME background (the remaining 7% did not state their ethnicity). There was representation in each of the age categories with most of the respondents being in the aged 60-69 and 70 plus age brackets. With regards to disability there was an almost equal split between those having and not having a disability. Finally in terms of area, there was representation from across the entire city, with a significant number of responses coming from the HU5 area.

The Facilities Available on Site

Following visits to existing Extra Care housing developments and the discussions held at Council led workshops, the task and finish group devised a list of facilities that could potentially be available on future developments. As some existing schemes include the cost of such facilities within ground rents, and other schemes provide these as optional extras, the question of people's willingness to pay for extra facilities was also asked.

The following table details the number of responses for each option:

Facility	Would like on site?			Willing to Pay extra for this provision?	
	Yes	No	No Response	Yes	No
Communal seating area	49	4	8	4	24
Transport service	48	8	6	32	4
Laundry service	44	10	8	28	7
Café/coffee shop	44	5	12	35	2
Meeting room	43	8	10	4	21
Function room	43	7	11	12	15
Organised day time activities	42	11	8	24	0
Cleaning service	40	10	12	33	2
Chiropodist	38	10	14	31	4
Shops	37	12	13	17	8
Organised night time activities	37	12	11	21	6
Hairdressers	36	11	15	34	1
Meal delivery service	35	13	13	24	5
Library	33	14	15	10	13
Night/day classes	33	12	16	25	2
IT facilities	28	19	15	16	8
Restaurant	27	19	15	21	4
Fitness facilities	26	19	16	13	5
Games room	25	19	17	3	13
Bar	25	20	16	16	6
Gym	24	17	20	19	7
Beauty salon	16	27	19	13	4
Children's play area	15	27	20	4	9
Translator services	10	30	22	1	4

We also asked whether these facilities should be open to the general public:

Response	Total responses
Yes	23
No	30
Don't know	2
Only some facilities	2
Only via invitation	1
No response	4

Analysis – what did we learn about facilities from this survey?

- The most favoured facilities include the communal areas, a transport service, a laundry service, a café and organised day time activities (day time activities were favoured higher than night time activities).
- The only facilities that received more ‘no’ responses than ‘yes’ responses when asked if they would like the facility on site were a play area, a translator service and a beauty salon.
- Generally, if it is a facility that you would ordinarily have to pay for if living in the community in private accommodation (e.g. hairdressers, restaurant), the majority of people responded they would be happy to pay for such facilities if they were available on site. Some people however have stated that they would not be willing to pay for such facilities. This suggests that some people may fear they could be made to pay for services which they never use. Therefore it needs to be made clear to residents which facilities would be covered in ground rents and which would be optional extras.
- The facilities that people would like to have available but would not be willing to pay for are those that you would generally not expect to pay extra for. These include a games room, a meeting room and a communal seating area. Again it would need highlighting to residents that there would not be a charge for the usage of these facilities, however a small cost could be included in the ground rent for the maintenance and upkeep of such facilities.
- In terms of age analysis (see appendix 1), there is a greater desire for some facilities in certain age brackets than there is in others. Generally as expected, the desire for the more physical activities (i.e. fitness facilities, games room) diminishes as the person gets older. Additionally some of the more social activities (bar, night/day classes) also diminishes as the person gets older. The desire for transport services, hairdressers and chiropodists increases as the person gets older, whereas a café, a communal seating area and a laundry services is strongly desired in all age brackets. This fluctuation across age brackets suggests that some people may not yet realise the benefit of having some facilities available to them for later in life, whilst others may not realise the importance of having the more social facilities available in helping to prevent feelings of isolation.

The Size of the Accommodation, Outdoor Space and Access

One of the aims of Extra Care housing is to provide a home that the residents will be happy to remain in and that can be easily adapted to cater for any changes in health or mobility. Having the right design in place at the initial build stage is therefore imperative in allowing for these changes to be made, whilst also making the living option appealing to local residents.

Existing schemes have demonstrated that there are a number of options available in terms of the design of the individual properties and the overall development, and what is regarded as the most popular option is largely a matter of preference. We therefore asked a number of questions about the actual accommodation and overall site to determine if local residents favoured any specific options.

Living Accommodation

Respondents were asked what would be their preferred type of accommodation:

Property Type	No. of Respondents	%
Bungalow	34	55
Flat	5	8
Apartment	6	10
Town House	2	3
No response	1	2
No preference (ticked all)	5	8
Bungalow or flat/apartment	6	10
Bungalow or Town House	3	5

No. of Bedrooms	No. of Respondents	%
1 bedroom	6	10
2 bedroom	56	90

We also asked, if only one bedroom accommodation was available, would this substantially put people off Extra Care housing. Of the 56 people that favoured a 2 bedroom property, the responses were as follows:

Response	No. of Respondents	%
Would be put off	21	38
Would not be put off	33	59
Not sure	1	2
No response	1	2

In some existing schemes, properties can either be openly accessed by direct access to each property's individual front door (like on a typical residential street), or via a shared entrance with an intercom that services a number of properties. As the following chart demonstrates, respondents largely favoured having their own front door:

Entrance Type	No. of Respondents	%
Own front door	48	77
Shared entrance with intercom	8	13
No preference	4	6
No response	1	2

Respondents were also asked if they would rather choose their own décor. Again there was a clear indication that people would like this choice:

Choice of Décor	No. of Respondents	%
Yes	58	94
No	2	3
No response	2	3

In some existing schemes, the kitchen and living space has been made open plan specifically for homes that house two people (either a married couple or a carer and caree) where one person is either suffering from dementia or has a learning disability or a physical disability. This is so that it can allow for the two people to be able to see each other even when in different rooms, making it easier for the carer and minimising distress for the cared for person. This option may not however suit all people and some may prefer the traditional separate living room - kitchen arrangement they are accustomed to. Therefore to determine if it would be viable to create all properties as open plan or just some of them, we asked if people had a particular preference. As these results show, respondents largely favoured having separate rooms:

Kitchen/living room design	No. of Respondents	%
Open Plan	14	23
Separate Room	46	74
No response	2	3

In terms of having kitchens in place that could be altered in height, this was also largely regarded as a favourable option:

Adjustable kitchen heights	No. of Respondents	%
Yes	51	82
No	7	11
No response	4	6

In some Extra Care housing schemes where the property design has been a series of flats leading off a corridor, there has been mixed feeling as to whether there should be a kitchen window looking out on to the corridor to enable residents to see and feel connected with the outside world. When asked if they would prefer this option or not, people responded as follows:

Kitchen window looking on to corridor	No. of Respondents	%
Yes	17	27
No	38	61
Don't mind	1	2
Don't understand	1	2
No response	5	8

'Would not like to be looking into other residents windows'

Comment from a prospective tenant

In the bathroom design of many existing schemes, only showers are fitted as standard, but with the option and space being in place for a bath to be added if the resident wishes. The response to our survey demonstrates that this design would largely be supported:

Bath/Shower	No. of Respondents	%
Bath	11	18
Shower	39	63
Both	8	13
No response	4	6

We also asked if there were any other bathroom facilities people would like in place. Among the responses included; a hoist, a shower with a seat, an adult changing table, a bath board and a raised toilet seat. Other respondents purely asked for the option be available for further facilities to be added at a later date if need be.

In previous schemes there have been questions around whether individual properties are provided with their own washing machines, which may prohibit the opportunity for adjustable height kitchens, or whether a laundrette is provided on site instead, which can raise its own problems in terms of demand and the resident's ability to transport laundry to and from their property. Interestingly, when asked in the facilities section of this survey if people would like a laundry service on site, 71% of respondents stated that they would. However, when presented with the option of having their own washing facilities only 24% favoured an on-site laundrette:

Laundry Options	No. of Respondents	%
Laundrette	15	24
Own washing machine with dryer	32	52
Own washing machine no dryer	8	13
All	1	2
No response	2	3
Laundrette/own washing machine with dryer	2	3
Laundrette/own washing machine no dryer	2	3

As residents potentially have a need for a wheelchair or electric scooter, we asked how people would prefer these to be stored:

Wheelchair Storage Location	No. of Respondents	%
Within accommodation	35	56
Secure area outside accommodation	14	23
Both	5	8
No Response	7	11

'I would like there to be a facility for parking and charging up a mobility scooter'

Comment from a prospective tenant

Outdoor Space

We also wanted to know how important it was to people having their own outdoor space and storage. The following sets of results demonstrate that this is clearly important to people:

Garden	No. of Respondents	%
Communal garden	40	65
Own garden	20	32
Both	2	3

Outdoor Storage Available	No. of Respondents	%
Yes	46	74
No	12	19
No Response	4	6

When asked about transport in the facilities section of this survey, 77% responded that they would like a transport service on site. However when presented with the option of having on-site car parking, 84% were in favour of this:

Parking Available	No. of Respondents	%
Yes	52	84
No	9	15
No response	1	2



General Site Management

The operation of current schemes varies and mostly depends on whether the facilities on the site are open to the general public. The following sets of results show how people responded when asked how they would like to see the site accessed and managed, which may help to determine what extent the facilities are open to the public.

Site Access	No. of Respondents	%
Open site access	9	15
Fenced and gated site	49	79
No Response	4	6

Security	No. of Respondents	%
On call service when needed	18	29
On site security	32	52
Both	9	15
No Response	3	5

Reception	No. of Respondents	%
Working day (9am – 5pm)	33	53
24 Hour	22	35
No Response	7	11

Other Considerations

Pets can play a huge part in people's lives and having to give up a pet could significantly put people off choosing such a living option. Likewise however, there are people who do not like having animals around and they could also be deterred. We therefore asked what people's preference would be on this:



Pets Allowed	No. of Respondents	%
Yes	27	44
No	13	21
Don't Mind	14	23
No Response	2	3

Analysis – what did we learn about living accommodation and space from this survey?

- The most favoured property type would be a bungalow. Residents would rather have two bedrooms however not all would be put off if only a one bedroom property was available to them.
- Having their own front door was rated significantly higher than having a shared entrance with intercom with only 13% of respondents favouring a shared entrance. Having their own choice of décor was also favoured extremely highly. Both of these may demonstrate the importance of a feeling of independence and ownership by the resident.
- In terms of the kitchen/living room design, a separate room arrangement was more favoured however there was support for an open plan design also. As there is the capability for demountable partition walls, this may be one of the adjustable features that is included in initial designs. There is also significant support for adjustable height kitchen facilities to be fitted as standard along with the inclusion of residents own washing machine.
- More people were in favour of not having a kitchen window that overlooked a corridor. With such schemes there has been the concern in the past that residents may lose a significant opportunity to connect with fellow residents as they walk past. However as this feature is so personal preference biased, it may be in the best interest to provide properties both with and without the option. Alternatively, windows could be provided with a shutter so that it is at the resident's discretion if they choose to look out on to the corridor, or a structural opening could be incorporated into the wall to allow easy fitment of the window if required.
- The results support the bathroom design of a shower as standard with the option of a bath to be added if desired. However the request for adaptable facilities by some respondents suggests the need for further education to the public as to what such schemes incorporate.
- Outdoor space is another important consideration with a large proportion of respondents wanting garden areas, outdoor storage and parking facilities.
- Security appears to be a huge concern amongst respondents with many wanting a fenced and gated site with on site security.
- Pets are clearly important to some people; however there are others that would not like to see pets on site. Therefore options could be, restricting pet owners to a specific area of the site, or considering it on a case by case basis taking into account the property available and the views expressed by the neighbouring residents.

Financial Arrangements

Purchasing or renting a property at any time of life can be a significant investment. As Extra Care housing schemes are a relatively new scheme and still not completely understood by most people, any prospective residents would need to feel confident with their purchasing arrangements and that any investment made was secure. For this reason we wanted to know whether buying or renting would be most appealing to local residents.

Payment Type	No. of Respondents	%
Buy out right	14	23
Shared ownership	5	8
Rent (bills included)	25	40
Rent (bills separate)	8	13
Don't know	2	3
Buy out right/shared ownership	2	3
Buy out right/rent	2	3
No response	3	5
Other comments ("Government should pay")	1	2

Would anything put people off?

We asked people if there is anything that would significantly put them off opting for this kind of living arrangement. A number of people reported that they didn't have any reservations and were quite excited by the prospect:

"It's the way forward"

"Can't wait!"

"I think it's an excellent way forward for future care"

"If most of the facilities listed in section 2 were provided it would be a good place to live"

Some people however did express a number of reservations relating to the effect that this kind of living arrangement would have on independent living:

"Could stop you going out and may stop families doing things"

"(if everything is provided) it would make me like a zombie and would not encourage you to go out and keep your brain going"

"(I would be put off) if things are too regimented. People need to live their own lives"

"I would like independent living but not communal living"

The need for independence was further expressed via concerns about location:

“Location – would need to be near local facilities”

“Would not like to be in an isolated area or where there’s poor public transport”

“Location of the site would need to be on a bus route and near local shops”

“(I would be put off) if it is too segregated or too far from the community”

Some financial concerns were also raised about the schemes:

“(being) able to afford”

“I could envisage that some people on a low income could have reservations”

“raising service charges above the raise in pension/income”

Location of Developments

Many residents of Hull have lived within a particular area of their city for a number of years and so would clearly have reservations about having to move to another area. Also as suspected and as the previous questions shows, many people would not like to be located too far from local communities or facilities. It was for this reason therefore that we also asked, *“if sufficient services and facilities are provided within the community of the housing complex would the geographical location be an issue?”* The breakdown of responses is as follows:

Yes	55%
No	41%
Possibly	5%

Despite the prospect of sufficient facilities being provided on site, a significant number still stated that the geographical location would be an issue. Many specified a particular area of the city they would like to live in as it is where they have always lived and would like to remain close to family, whereas others again highlighted a strong desire to remain close to local communities:

“don’t like to be unable to access local services”

“would be nice to be near town”

“would like to be near local shops and facilities – more choice”

“Should be near shops for those able to go out. People like to be near family and friends in areas they know”

Other Comments and Thoughts about Extra Care Housing

When asked if people had any other comments about Extra Care housing, most responded very positively:

“A splendid idea, cannot come soon enough”

“brilliant idea with the potential to enhance the life of many people enabling them to have quality of life and feel independent”

“Just hope it happens”

“We need more complexes built in the future”

Some comments also supported the need to have options in place that can house those with carer needs:

“This kind of project is needed for older people and young people with disabilities”

“Support needs to be re-organised as older carers worry about loved ones if they become ill or too old to care for them”

Again, some people expressed concerns about the potential for isolation and also the financial implications of such a scheme:

“important not to isolate from the rest of the community whilst still retaining a 'feel safe' environment”

“Should be possible for residents to be as independent as they want to be”

“Looking after finances would be a problem”

“Would it cost more, e.g. rent, if you lived in this type of housing?”

“sounds like a good idea if it doesn't end up as expensive as it sounds!”

‘It sounds like an excellent idea that deserves every support’

Comment from a prospective tenant

Analysis – what did we learn about people’s other general preferences from this survey?

- The most favoured buying option would be rental with bills included within the rent. For those that opted for buy out-right or shared ownership, some commented that they would prefer this option to guarantee security for their partner or the person they care for. Interestingly, the greatest amount of people that opted for the buy out-right option were the 50-59 age group which is the youngest group that could look to move into such a development (schemes are currently open to the over 55’s, except for residents with learning disabilities). This may suggest that those that could be potentially living in the development the longest will naturally have a different financial outlook on the scheme.
- Generally people feel positive about the scheme and see the benefits it has to offer. However the comments highlighted the importance for schemes to be located in close proximity to the wider community and outside facilities, regardless of how many facilities are provided on site. Additionally, there needs to be an equal spread of schemes across the city so that people are able to remain in the areas where they have always lived.
- The number of concerns raised about potentially losing independence and having too much done for you demonstrates that more needs to be done to convey to the public the concept of independent living.
- As Extra Care housing are relatively new schemes and still not largely understood by the public, financial information needs to be given to prospective residents with clear guidance of what is and isn’t included in their periodic payments, and also reassurances need to be made with regards to any potential future changes in costs and provision.

‘People like to be near family and friends in areas they know’

Comment from a prospective tenant

What did we learn from producing this report?

- On the whole people welcome the development of more Extra Care housing schemes in Hull. Some respondents were also grateful for being given the opportunity to share their thoughts on the scheme, as was highlighted by one person's response, "Good you are seeking views prior to making decisions."
- Many people are still quite unsure what the difference is between Extra Care housing, sheltered housing and residential care, and so more information, particularly with regards to the independent living element of Extra Care, needs to be provided to the public when presenting them with the various living arrangements that are available.
- Some people also commented on the need for care assessments and telecare provisions;
"need internal communication systems to call for help in emergencies, i.e. falls."
This highlights that more also needs to be done to inform the public that such services are included within Extra Care housing.
- The desire to have certain facilities available on site fluctuates across different age groups, demonstrating the changing needs as a person ages and suggests that some people may not immediately see the benefit of having some facilities in place. The appropriateness of having particular facilities needs to be re-assessed as different residents move into the schemes and trends change.
- A fear of feeling isolated was a concern among many respondents, highlighting that location is of high importance, so too is being part of the wider community. The number of comments in this area suggests also that, no matter how many facilities are provided on the schemes and how much of a community feel there is within the development, there is no substitute for being able to access outside facilities and communities in order to truly feel independent.
- Clear financial guidance will be needed for a resident, particularly in terms of whether a facility or service is free, included within ground rent or is paid for as and when it is needed. Some residents may require more guidance than others and may warrant the need for an accessible service to be located on site where residents can any queries residents may have.
- Security, and having the development open to non-residents is a concern among potential residents, however some facilities will only be financially viable if they are opened up to the wider public. By segmenting the facilities away from the residential areas so that the general public can only access the facilities should help minimise such concerns.
- Having more opportunities to view such developments, be it open days to existing schemes, architectural models or virtual walk through DVDs, will help overcome any concerns or questions the public have about Extra Care housing.

Appendix 1 – Age Analysis



Under 30		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		Over 70	
Facility	Ranking	Facility	Ranking	Facility	Ranking	Facility	Ranking	Facility	Ranking	Facility	Ranking
Bar	1	Café	1	Café	1	Day Activities	1	Communal Seating	1	Transport	1
Communal Seating	1	Communal Seating	1	Communal Seating	1	Meal Delivery	1	Laundry	2	Chiropodist	2
Day Activities	1	Day Activities	1	Cleaning	2	Café	2	Transport	2	Hairdressers	3
Fitness Facilities	1	Function Room	1	Laundry	2	Communal Seating	2	Café	3	Communal Seating	4
Function Room	1	Laundry	1	Transport Service	2	Meeting Room	2	Cleaning	3	Function Room	4
Games Room	1	Night Activities	1	Meal Delivery	3	Transport	2	Day Activities	3	Meeting Room	5
IT	1	Bar	2	Meeting Room	3	Chiropodist	3	Function Room	3	Shops	5
Laundry	1	Cleaning	2	Restaurant	3	Cleaning	3	Meeting Room	4	Laundry	6
Library	1	Games Room	2	Shops	3	Function Room	3	Night Activities	4	Library	6
Meeting Room	1	Gym	2	Bar	4	Hairdressers	3	Shops	5	Café	7
Night Activities	1	Hairdressers	2	Chiropodist	4	Laundry	3	Chiropodist	6	Cleaning	7
Night/Day Classes	1	IT	2	Day Activities	4	Library	3	Night/Day Classes	6	Day Activities	7
Translator	1	Night/Day Classes	2	Fitness Facilities	4	Night Activities	3	Fitness Facilities	7	Restaurant	7
Beauty Salon	2	Beauty Salon	3	Function Room	4	Night/Day Classes	3	Meal Delivery	7	Meal Delivery	8
Café	2	Chiropodist	3	Gym	4	Shops	3	Hairdressers	8	IT	9
Chiropodist	2	Fitness Facilities	3	Nigh/Day Classes	4	Bar	4	Library	8	Night Activities	9
Cleaning	2	Library	3	Night Activities	4	IT	4	IT	9	Night/Day Classes	9
Gym	2	Meal Delivery Service	3	Beauty Salon	5	Games Room	5	Restaurant	9	Bar	10
Hairdressers	2	Shops	3	Games Room	5	Gym	5	Gym	10	Games Room	10
Meal Delivery	2	Play Area	4	Hairdresser	5	Play Area	5	Games Room	11	Fitness Facilities	11
Play Area	2	Restaurant	4	IT	5	Fitness Facilities	6	Bar	12	Gym	12
Restaurant	2	Translator	4	Library	5	Restaurant	6	Beauty Salon	12	Beauty Salon	13
Shops	2	Meeting Room	5	Play Area	6	Translator	6	Play Area	13	Play Area	13
Transport	2	Transport	6	Translator	6	Beauty Salon	7	Translator	14	Translator	14



Centre 88
Saner Street
Anlaby Road
Hull
HU3 2TR

tel: 01482 221372
fax: 01482 221537
email: link@hull-cvs.co.uk
website: www.hull-link.org.uk

Hull CVS Ltd is the host organisation for the Hull LINK



Hull CVS

Hull Community and Voluntary Services Ltd.

Registered in England No. 1570120 Registered Charity No. 514211