

EXECUTIVE MEMBER: Councillor Clements
LEAD OFFICER: Julie Betteridge
REPORT AUTHOR: Laurie Priebe

Summary and Recommendation:

Attached as Appendix A is a paper written for the Cumbria Housing Executive Group and presented to their meeting on 20 April 2012. It is for Councillors' information and discussion only at this stage.

The one recommendation is that the Members agree to give it further consideration at future meetings of the Panel and to consult stakeholders.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The hardy perennial issues around the provision of statutory Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) are providing sufficient and sustainable capital funding and ensuring that service users have access to the support they need to help them through the process to completion.

2. APPENDIX A

- 2.1 The document written by the DFG Coordinator, Cumbria, is intended to address both those issues by recommending that District Council's apply for accreditation as Home Improvement Agencies.
- 2.2 The paper comprises only two pages of text plus a copy of an application form for accreditation with Foundations, the national body representing Home Improvement Agencies.

3 NEXT STEPS

- 3.1 Your officers' comment is that the recommendation has far too many implications to be determined at just one meeting. It needs to be considered very carefully and with attention to detail. There should also be consultation with service users, their representatives and other stakeholders prior to any recommendations being made to the Council's cycle of meetings.
- 3.2 It is suggested that the next step would be to invite the author of the paper and a representative of Foundations to the next (or a future) meeting of this Panel together with stakeholding organisations in the Borough.

- 3.3 Members also need to become aware of any further implications arising from the new Health & Social Care Act, which received Royal Assent earlier this year, and a forthcoming government white paper on adult social care. The Act is best known to the public for its reform of the National Health Service but it goes further than that.
- 3.4 The Act's headline issues include the creation of Clinical Commissioning Groups for groups of between 200,000 and 500,000 residents. But it also introduces Health & Wellbeing Boards to lead integrated commissioning and provision of health services. It abolishes Primary Care Trusts and transfers responsibility for public health to the local government sector.
- 3.5 Typical DFGs are mostly (but not exclusively) for stairlifts and/or level access showers. They help prevent or avoid accidents at home often described as "slips, trips and broken hips." They also save lives by preventing tragic accidents. But the cost to health and social care services of broken hips is estimated at many times more than the average of £3,500 - £4000 to install a level access shower.
- 3.6 Commissioners of health and social care services will therefore regard DFGs as providing cost effective prevention services which will be part of their concern in promoting community health and wellbeing. This is not limited to adult services because DFGs include children. There is, therefore, a wider context of which we should be aware while planning the development of the Borough Council's primary statutory duty to provide DFGs.

Strategic Housing Panel: 19 June 2012: Appendix A, agenda item 9

Cumbria Housing Executive Group Progress Update – DFG Integration Project

April 2012

Executive Summary

This report sets out the progress to date of the DFG Integration Project. The report contains a recommendation that all District Council apply for accreditation with Foundations, the national body for Home Improvement Agencies. This will provide access to further funding for clients and access to affordable warmth schemes as well as support to improve the service to clients.

Background

- 1.0 In Nov 2011 the NHS Joint Commissioning Board agreed funding for the DFG Integration Project. Additional Funding for Districts of £500k in 2011-12 and £500k in 2012-13 was agreed. The purpose of the project is to create a more sustainable model for delivery of support to help keep older and disabled people as independent as possible in their own homes; improving the way DFGs are delivered.

Progress to date

- 2.0 The Project Working Group met first in January and is currently looking at alternative models and best practice, whilst mapping the DFG process and people's experience. This process has involved contact with Blackpool Care and Repair, who are also building a more integrated approach. We are also looking at other models such as Newcastle New Homes in the social housing sector. The Group has representation from the GP Consortia, Locality Social Care teams and Housing.

Discussions with Foundations

- 3.0 We have also met with Roy McNally of Foundations, the national body for the Home Improvement Agency network. Foundations are funded principally by DCLG and are the main source of support in this area. The purpose of the meeting is to look at what support they could make available to District Councils to help develop a new model of delivery. At this meeting, the benefits of being accredited as an HIA and the services Foundations could provide to the Districts were discussed. The feasibility of District Councils being accredited as HIAs was also covered and the range of services they would need to offer to meet the criteria for accreditation.

- 3.1 It was agreed that most if not all of the District Councils already offer the range of services expected of an HIA. Foundations have proposed that Districts apply for accreditation and confirmed that this would be at no cost. The benefits of accreditation would initially give Districts access to the Foundations Independent Living Trust and to other schemes such help to provide affordable warmth, which are to be launched in partnership with the utility companies targeted at hard to reach groups. We would also gain access to the range of support that Foundations provide for Home Improvement Agencies and help in developing a more holistic approach to our service.

Benefits of Accreditation

- 4.0 The initial benefits of accreditation are access to 2 further streams of funding. It is likely that Foundations will negotiate further funding for the sector and being accredited will provide access to this funding. The additional services and support will help Districts develop a more sustainable approach to the delivery of adaptations and other services to support individuals to remain independent at home. It will provide recognition for our partners and future clients of the quality and range of services we have available.
- 4.1 Further development and help will enable us to be prepared for the changes that will come from the Social Care white paper. We have been lobbying for DFGs to be included as part of the range of options available to people under any proposed new scheme. The Government is also proposing to introduce equity release schemes to help owner occupiers do work to their homes and this work is likely to increase the opportunities for developing income streams. Developing a recognized trusted brand will help authorities build a range of services that are attractive to commissioners and private sector clients.

Recommendation

- 5.0 It is recommended that Districts apply for accreditation to gain access to additional funding and to gain access to the support to develop a more integrated model of delivery of DFGs and wider support for older and disabled people in their own homes. I have attached a copy of the Foundations application for accreditation.

Robert Cornwall
DFG Coordinator Cumbria
April 2012

Home Improvement Agency Accreditation Profile

We would like to understand how you deliver your housing support services to vulnerable people in your local authority area. The details you provide will help us do this and we will treat this information as confidential and not shared with 3rd parties. If you have any queries with regards to completing this form please consult your regional operational support manager:

North of England	Roy McNally - rmcnally@cel.co.uk
Central England	Francis Philippa - fphilippa@cel.co.uk
South of England	Doug Stem - dstem@cel.co.uk

1. Agency details	
Agency Name	
Local Authority Area/s Covered	
Agency Address	
Telephone	
Agency Contact Name	
Contact Email Address	
Web Site Address	

2. Please indicate how your service is funded, and detail any funding you receive from statutory bodies:

	Yes	No
3. Do you provide a telephone helpline to callers between the hours of 9am - 5pm?		
<i>If not available between 9am - 5pm please state times available</i>		

	Yes	No
4. Do you provide a home visit when required?		

	Provided directly	Provided by 3rd party	Not provided
5. Do you provide a handyperson service?			
<i>If so please indicate if it is provided directly with employed handypersons or by a 3rd party</i>			

6. Please indicate which of the following services are provided by your agency to clients and non-clients:	Yes	No	Occasionally
• Telephone Advice			
• Technical Support			
• Handyperson Service			

7. Home Visits - Are you able to provide information when visiting clients on the following:	Yes	No
• Grant eligibility		
• Means testing for eligibility		
• Charitable Funding Searches		
• Subsidised loan schemes		
• Other loans schemes		

• Benefit entitlement / income maximisation		
• Housing options / Moving-on services		
• Other (please state)		

8. Customer Service - Do you have a leaflet for clients detailing the following:	Yes	No
• The range of services available		
• Eligibility for each service		
• The cost of any service		
• How to complain		

9. Customer Feedback:	Yes	No
• Do you give customers a feedback form to complete on completion of work?		
• Do you monitor these feedback forms?		
• Do you have an advisory group in place?		

10. Signposting:	Yes	No
If you are not able to assist a customer, do you refer them to any 3 rd party organisations? If so – please list which agencies you commonly refer to:		
•		
•		
•		
•		

11. Capacity:	
Please indicate the number of your current directly employed staff (full time equivalents)	
• Manager	
• Caseworker	
• Technical Officer	
• Administration	
• Volunteer	

12. Monitoring:	
Do you have a computerised case monitoring system? If so, please indicate:	
• FEMIS	
• Charity Log	
• FLARE	
• Bespoke system	
• Other	

13. Activity:	
• Number of enquiries in the last full year	
• Number of core jobs completed in the last full year	
• Number of handyperson jobs completed in the last full year	
• Average time in weeks between initial enquiry and first visit (core jobs)	
• Average time in weeks from date of first visit to practical completion date (core jobs)	
• Value of core work done (excluding VAT and fees)	
• Current caseload – number of cases as at: (date)	
• Number of complaints received	
• Level of income derived – Grant sourced	

• Level of income derived - Private sourced	
---	--

Allocations to statutorily homelessness from start of Cumbria Choice (May 11) to 31 March 12

District	Housing association	Owed a full homelessness duty	All allocations made in district	approx % to homeless (does not take account of allocations to homeless outside district)
Allerdale Borough Council	Derwent & Solway Housing	23		
	Home Group	8		
	Impact Housing	2		
	Total	33	494	6.68
Barrow Borough Council	Accent Foundation	1		
	Barrow Borough Council	19		
	Total	20	250	8.00
Carlisle City Council	Eden Housing	2		
	Home Group	3		
	Impact Housing	11		
	Riverside	69		
	Two Castles Housing	3		
	Total	88	455	19.34
Copeland Borough Council	Home Group	43		
	Impact Housing	1		
	Riverside	1		
	Two Castles Housing	6		
	Total	51	354	14.41
Eden District Council	Eden Housing	6		
	Impact Housing	4		
	Two Castles Housing	1		
	Total	11	136	8.09
South Lakeland District Council	Impact Housing	1		
	South Lakes Housing	24		
	Total	25	176	14.20
Total of all Local Authority (household)		228	1865	12.23

Allocations to homeless by HA	homeless	all allocations	% to homeless
Home	54	454	11.894
Accent	1	38	2.632
Barrow	19	193	9.845
Impact	19	188	10.106
Riverside	70	323	21.672
Two Castles	10	148	6.757
Eden	8	111	7.207
South Lakeland	24	120	20.000
Derwent and Solway	23	290	7.931
All	228	1865	12.225

All Allocations by Local authority May 2011 to 31 March 12							
q1 2011-12 (part)	A	B	C	D	D+	E	
Allerdale Borough Council	13	11	27	10	6	0	67
Barrow Borough Council	10	8	17	1	0	0	36
Carlisle City Council	21	3	29	3	11	2	69
Copeland Borough Council	10	6	20	4	4	0	44
Eden District Council	4	2	9	3	4	1	23
South Lakeland District Council	5	2	6	0	2	2	17
Whole partnership	63	32	108	21	27	5	256
Q2 2011-12							
	A	B	C	D	D+	E	
Allerdale Borough Council	27	14	80	16	21	2	160
Barrow Borough Council	19	13	32	6	3	0	73
Carlisle City Council	44	11	76	17	23	1	172
Copeland Borough Council	33	11	55	11	15	1	126
Eden District Council	9	5	15	5	6	1	41
South Lakeland District Council	4	7	20	6	8	2	47
Whole partnership	136	61	278	61	76	7	619

Q3 2011-12							
	A	B	C	D	D+	E	
Allerdale Borough Council	26	17	67	17	27	7	161
Barrow Borough Council	15	10	31	6	4	2	68
Carlisle City Council	25	16	43	12	13	1	110
Copeland Borough Council	16	6	54	7	9	2	94
Eden District Council	1	7	15	7	8	2	40
South Lakeland District Council	15	16	24	3	9	0	67
Whole partnership	98	72	234	52	70	14	540
Q4 2011-12							
	A	B	C	D	D+	E	
Allerdale Borough Council	10	4	58	11	19	4	106
Barrow Borough Council	17	22	30	1	2	1	73
Carlisle City Council	18	16	53	7	8	2	104
Copeland Borough Council	13	8	47	11	10	1	90
Eden District Council	2	4	14	4	7	1	32
South Lakeland District Council	12	5	19	3	6	0	45
Whole partnership	72	59	221	37	52	9	450
2011-12 WHOLE YEAR FROM START OF CBL							
	A	B	C	D	D+	E	
Allerdale Borough Council	76	46	232	54	73	13	494
Barrow Borough Council	61	53	110	14	9	3	250
Carlisle City Council	108	46	201	39	55	6	455
Copeland Borough Council	72	31	176	33	38	4	354
Eden District Council	16	18	53	19	25	5	136
South Lakeland District Council	36	30	69	12	25	4	176
Whole partnership	369	224	841	171	225	35	1865
PERCENTAGES WHOLE YEAR							
	A	B	C	D	D+	E	
Allerdale Borough Council	15.4	9.3	47.0	10.9	14.8	2.6	26.5
Barrow Borough Council	24.4	21.2	44.0	5.6	3.6	1.2	13.4
Carlisle City Council	23.7	10.1	44.2	8.6	12.1	1.3	24.4
Copeland Borough Council	20.3	8.8	49.7	9.3	10.7	1.1	19.0
Eden District Council	11.8	13.2	39.0	14.0	18.4	3.7	7.3
South Lakeland District Council	20.5	17.0	39.2	6.8	14.2	2.3	9.4
Whole partnership	19.8	12.0	45.1	9.2	12.1	1.9	100.0

Table showing applicants registered in each authority on 18/4/12

Numbers							
	ALLERDALE	BARROW	CARLISLE	COPELAND	EDEN	S LAKELAND	
UNBANDED?	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A	54	45	70	64	5	38	276
B	83	46	73	33	20	60	315
C	606	478	908	626	219	646	3483
D	651	598	1211	618	234	766	4078
D+	734	336	1300	497	416	1068	4351
E	489	257	475	221	169	342	1953
	2618	1760	4037	2059	1063	2920	14457
Percentages							
	ALLERDALE	BARROW	CARLISLE	COPELAND	EDEN	S LAKELAND	
A	2.1	2.6	1.7	3.1	0.5	1.3	1.9
B	3.2	2.6	1.8	1.6	1.9	2.1	2.2
C	23.1	27.2	22.5	30.4	20.6	22.1	24.1
D	24.9	34.0	30.0	30.0	22.0	26.2	28.2
D+	28.0	19.1	32.2	24.1	39.1	36.6	30.1
E	18.7	14.6	11.8	10.7	15.9	11.7	13.5
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0