

## Appendix D

### Private Sector Housing Assistance Policy – Outcome of Consultation on the proposed revised Policy

	Name of Respondent	Response Date	Response Details	Changes to Draft Policy Required?
1	(DFG Team / Internal)	15 October 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding ramps was raised, copied below:</p> <p><i>“RAMPS: Modular ramps procedure is excellent. When it comes to OT recommendations though, I have not seen when a modular ramp is specified but only a permanent concrete structure. When the surveyor identifies reasons for a modular over concrete (i.e. drainage reasons etc.) do we advise OTs to review their recommendation? And do OTs know the criteria for when a modular or permanent ramp should be used?”</i></p>	<p>Yes – further clarification provided, as follows:</p> <p>A modular ramp could be recommended by an OT or a surveyor based on the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site constraints.</li> <li>• Feasibility difficult for a permanent ramp.</li> <li>• Blocking route to garage.</li> <li>• Landlord consent.</li> <li>• Short prognosis.</li> <li>• Potential need to reconfigure at a later date.</li> </ul> <p>The above list is not exhaustive, and each case will be determined based on its own merit. If the recommendation for a modular ramp is made by the surveyor, they should inform the OT accordingly and seek their approval.</p>
2	(DFG Team / Internal)	15 October 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding kitchens was raised, copied below:</p> <p><i>“KITCHENS: I could not see what the DFG procedure would be for kitchen adaptations apart from when it relates to HMO’s”.</i></p>	<p>No.</p> <p>Appendix A – Mandatory Disabled Facilities Grants / The Eligible Works / Item 8 confirms that kitchen adaptations are covered by the DFG under the purpose of facilitating the preparation and cooking of food by the disabled occupant. Any procedures on how to treat kitchen adaptations will be covered by a</p>

				separate document on general DFG Procedures rather than the main Private Sector Housing Policy.
3	(DFG Team / Internal)	15 October 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding decorations was raised, copied below:</p> <p><i>“Many clients have indicated that we allow for partial decoration (primarily LAS adaptations) and the remaining areas are covered by a separate agreement between client and contractor. (currently only Greatwell Homes will cover the additional decoration costs for the remaining area) Would we ever change this to cover the whole area under the DFG grant?”</i></p>	<p>Yes – further clarification provided, as follows – under The Eligible Works:</p> <p>Note 2: A DFG aims to provide cost effective adaptations that will meet the applicant’s needs. On this basis, a DFG cannot allow for the cost of full decorations. Room decorations, including tiles, flooring and wall / ceiling painting, will be covered only to those areas affected by the works. The remaining areas can be covered under a separate agreement between the client and the contractor with no further financial involvement from the Council. Also, certain Housing Associations or some private Landlords, may wish to upgrade the work specification and include further decorative works to provide a better finish for their stock.</p>
4	Resident (external)	22 October 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy.</p> <p>Response copied below:</p> <p>“To whom it may concern,</p> <p>In 2018 we had adaptations (bedroom extension and stair-lift) to our property for our daughter which were funded by a Disabled Facilities Grant. We can honestly say that we do not know where we would be now if these had not been done. At the time my wife had given up work and we had used up all our savings trying to make life easier for us/our daughter. However, a</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>When Mr Matthews applied for a DFG, Corby Borough Council did not offer a Discretionary DFG Top-Up Grant. They were only offered the maximum mandatory £30,000 grant and they had to make a financial contribution to meet the cost of works shortfall.</p> <p>North Northamptonshire Council currently offer a Discretionary DFG Top-Up Grant of a maximum value of £10,000 – subject to eligibility. The revised policy has recommended that this discretionary grant is increased to £20,000 – subject to eligibility and land charge.</p>

			<p>stair-lift that I had bought second hand had broken and we had got to a point where we did not know where to go next. Someone mentioned to us that we may be able to get some help from the Council and that is when we met Elina Passari. We originally were just hoping to get help with a new stair-lift, but it was obvious to Elina that my daughter required much more. A new stair-lift was installed very quickly and then plans were made for a downstairs extension to our property with a bedroom and wet room for my daughter. I cannot tell you how grateful we are and how it changed my daughter's life and ours. Please can you ensure that the Council continue to offer this type of help to all the people that need it? It is absolutely vital, and I am sure there are many more people than us that will be forever grateful for it. The only thing I would add is it would be nice if the Council were able to offer a bit more financial assistance as it is still the same figure offered in 2018. However, I am fully aware there is not much money around and there are a lot of people out there needing help.</p> <p>If you would like to contact us regarding any of this, please don't hesitate to get in touch.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			Again, we are forever grateful Scott and Penelope Matthews”.	
5	Grand Union Housing Group (Housing Association / external)	28 October 2024	No objections to the proposed policy.  Response copied below:  <i>“Grand Union Housing Group confirms that the Private Sector Housing Assistance Policy reads well and aligns with our service. We appreciate the consideration of Housing Associations needs reflected in this policy update and the clear alignment with our goals in delivering effective housing assistance and adaptations”.</i>	No.
6	(DFG Team / internal)	28 October 2024	No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding Dementia and MND grants was raised, copied below:  <i>“Dementia &amp; MND Grants – I mentioned this to Elina when she sent the initial presentation over, but I really think this is a stand-out idea. Negating the means test for works up to £5,000 could allow many people to get stairlifts, hoists etc. which could really help support their day to day lives! For clarity, will the means test cover the £5,000 in any case, or just for works that total less than £5,000? For example, if works cost £10,000,</i>	Yes – further clarification added, as follows:  The first £5,000 will be disregarded regardless of the overall cost of works.

			<i>would the initial £5,000 be covered in any case, with only the additional grant cost means tested for funding? I ask as some LAS's are going over £5,000 nowadays anyway".</i>	
7	(DFG Team / internal)	28 October 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding Means Test was raised, copied below:</p> <p><i><b>“Means Test – Parents are now to be means tested for discretionary DFG grant, but not the initial £30,000. I assume this is standard practice that a local authority does not means test the parents for the entire grant. Apologies, I’ve never been informed as to why this is the case. A good policy though!”</b></i></p>	<p>No.</p> <p>This query is covered by the relevant section of the policy found under Appendix A – Mandatory Disabled Facilities Grants / The Means Test, as follows:</p> <p>An application for a Disabled Facilities Grant will be subject to a means test in accordance with the regulations made under the 1996 Act.</p> <p>Where an applicant is in receipt of a recognised, qualifying, means-tested benefit they will not be further means-tested and they will have no calculated contribution to make.</p> <p>Where works are for the benefit of a child or young person up until their 19th birthday or younger at the date of application – they too will be exempt from a means test.</p>
8	(DFG Team / internal)	28 October 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding Limitations was raised, copied below:</p> <p><i><b>“Limitations – The limitations are not quite clear to me, but again this is my first time reading it. If the resident is applying for more than one grant exceeding £30,000, the Council will</b></i></p>	<p>Yes – further clarification provided.</p> <p>If a resident applies for works that exceed the £30,000 mandatory funding and they also receive the £20,000 discretionary grant, the Council will not expect the same applicant to apply for works that exceed the £30,000 mandatory funding and therefore, require a further £20,000 discretionary funding earlier than a 5-year period.</p>

			<p><i>question it. However, the document then it states plainly that only one applicant in a 5-year period can be accepted for a top-up grant, which seems straight-forward. Does questioning it mean it will be decided under the Council's discretion, case by case? Could this ignite debate between client and Council as to what is acceptable and we could spend resources &amp; time justifying NNC's reasoning. Will there be a list of acceptable reasons included, as this appears quite interpretable at first glance. Just something I thought about but again, this is my first read-through".</i></p>	<p>If the applicant and their property have received adaptations that cost, for example, £50,000, and the same applicant applies for more works that exceed the mandatory £30,000 for the same property, the Council will investigate if these works are required, if the client's condition has deteriorated to justify it, why the previous works can no longer meet their needs, whether re-housing is an option etc.</p>
9	(DFG Team / internal)	28 October 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding Client Contribution Support was raised, copied below:</p> <p><b><i>"Client Contribution Support – Excellent idea in my opinion. In limitations, it states a maximum cost of £5,000 but the maximum value is listed at £6,000. Not sure if I have misunderstood or if this needs changing".</i></b></p>	<p>No.</p> <p>The table regarding the Client Contribution Support 11.2 does not mention £5,000 as the maximum cost under limitations.</p> <p>This is relevant to the HomeMove Grants 11.3 below where the maximum grant value is £6,000 but under limitations, £5,000 is the proposed maximum value for any DFG covered adaptations.</p>
10	(DFG Team / internal)	28 October 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding Non-mandatory Works was raised, copied below:</p>	<p>Yes – further clarification added.</p> <p>The original proposal was for all non-mandatory works – regardless of their value – to be assessed and</p>

			<p><b><i>“Non-Mandatory Works – This includes a hard standing/dropped kerb. In my experience these always cost more than £1,000. Would a feasibility visit be required with all hard standings under the new policy, or would this be decided by management prior to allocation? Furthermore, if all non-mandatory work that does not stand alone but is part of a more extensive design proposal requires a feasibility visit, this could create significant workload for a Surveyor should this includes hard standings, walkways etc. Perhaps this could often be estimated without a visit?”</i></b></p>	<p>decided by the PSH Managers. However, following internal discussion of the policy it has been proposed that any work estimated to cost below £1,000 will be decided by the PSH Managers and anything above by the member/officer Independent Panel.</p> <p>For example, when a sensory room or a safe space is recommended for a child with ADHD or autism, a feasibility visit could be required to assess the property, proposed works, all options available and associated costs. However, for dropped kerbs and hard standings, a feasibility visit to estimate the cost of works may not be necessary, as based on previous experience, this cost will be in excess of £1,000.</p>
11	(DFG Team / internal)	28 October 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding Modular Ramps was raised, copied below:</p> <p><i>“I do not agree with the section of Modular Ramps. The policy reads, ‘the grant can only fund capital expenditure whilst the benefits from the work must last for more than one accounting period (i.e. longer than one year)’ – but modular ramp companies often provide warranties for the actual ramp that are over 1 year. They have many benefits, are much more time efficient &amp; the cost difference is relatively minimal. I think these should</i></p>	<p>Yes – further clarification added.</p> <p>The policy content on modular ramps has been misunderstood. Modular ramps will be covered by Disabled Facilities Grants. The relevant section / text has been altered to include further clarification on portable, modular and permanent ramps to avoid the same incorrect interpretation in the future.</p>

			<i>be incorporated into the policy outside of an OT recommendation”.</i>	
12	(DFG Team / internal)	28 October 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding Call-out Fees was raised, copied below:</p> <p><i>“I think if call out fees up to £500.00 are to be considered, it should be made clear whether this is just callout fees for the contractor that completed the works, and that the call-out is warranted. Often, call-outs can be made whereby the contractor charges for appearance and little more. Not sure if this needs to be covered or not, but again just reading through and making notes...”</i></p>	<p>No.</p> <p>The call-out fees will be paid to the original contractor / equipment installer. The cost of £500 will cover both call-out fees and repairs to equipment. Call-out fees are normally in the region of £160-£200 and the repairs can cover a new battery with an estimated cost of £80-£100 (Figures based on recent cases). If the repairs are estimated by the equipment contractor to cost more, then the DFG will cover only the call-out fee (less than £500).</p> <p>Stair-lifts only. Any other equipment will be decided on case-by-case basis depending on the overall call out and repair cost versus saving to the budget if a new OT recommendation was to be received. Evaluate cost savings.</p>
13	Yasmeen Hussein (Foundations Regional Advisor / external)	30 October 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy.</p> <p>Response copied below:</p> <p>“... this is an excellent housing assistance policy that covers pretty much all of the things that Foundations would hope to see in a robust policy, with the process really well explained. I have made suggestions in the comments section of the document attached - please note that these are simply suggestions</p>	<p>No.</p>



			& feel free to incorporate or exclude these as you see fit.”	
14	(PSH Standards Team / Internal)	7 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the Home Repair Grant, HRGs and land charges was raised, copied below:</p> <p><i>“Just relating to the Housing renovation grant, when it mentions the full amount being registered as a local land charge, maybe it should say for 30 years? May not need that level of details but thought it may as well be there.</i></p> <p><i>Also something that came up recently with land charges and HRG’s is that they will only register them as a local land charge if successive owners are tied to the grant conditions – so if someone sells the property and the grant isn’t repaid, the new owner is liable to pay it back. If it’s not stated in our policy, we may struggle to get them registered. Shall I put a line together regarding this?</i></p>	<p>Yes – the following has been added under the relevant policy section: Appendix D – Home Repair Grants / Terms &amp; Conditions.</p> <p>A local land charge will be registered against the property as the grant is repayable in full if the property is sold within 30 years. Successive owners will be liable to repay the grant if it is not repaid during the sale process.</p>
15	(DFG Team / internal)	7 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the Discretionary Top-Up Grant was raised, copied below:</p> <p><i>“Under Section 11.1 is the following:</i></p>	<p>No – further clarification provided, as follows:</p> <p>Applicants eligible for a Discretionary Top-Up Grant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Those applicants eligible for a DFG, subject to no means tested contributions.</li> </ul>

			<p>Eligible Applicants: If an applicant has been informed of a financial contribution that they need to make towards the cost of works, then they will not be eligible for the Discretionary Top-Up Grant.</p> <p><i>So, these people are not eligible for the £20k Top-Up Grant.</i></p> <p><i>So, if they have say, £900 assessed contribution and &lt;£6k savings; they can get support under Section 11.2 to pay the £900. But would not be eligible for Discretionary Top-Up Grant under 11.1 if their adaptation costs say, £50k?</i></p> <p><i>Therefore, in this example. The facts are, that the means test has assessed that they can only afford to pay £900. (which we pay under 11.2) But we are expecting them to pay the remaining £19.1k because of the highlighted text above?</i></p> <p><i>1. How is this policy fair when you consider that someone with an assessed means test contribution of £0.00 can get a £50k adaptation fully paid for, but somebody who has a contribution (which could possibly only be a few £s) can only get £30k (minus their contribution) of their £50k</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If an applicant has been informed of a financial contribution that they need to make towards the cost of works, then they will not be eligible for the Discretionary Top-Up Grant.</li> <li>• Applicants with a client's contribution of up to £1,000 and savings less than £6,000 – in receipt of client's contribution support, as per Section 11.2 below - will not be eligible for a discretionary grant.</li> </ul> <p>The Discretionary top-up grant will be administered in the same way as per current policy. If an applicant has a client's contribution to make – whether the Council assists with the first £1,000 or the applicant is responsible for the full amount – this negates them from being eligible for the Discretionary top-up grant. Only applicants eligible for the full mandatory grant will be also eligible for the discretionary top-up.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p><i>adaptation funded, leaving them to fund the remaining circa £20k?</i></p> <p><i>Surely if they have an assessed means test contribution then this should be paid towards the £30k mandatory grant, but they should still get the (up to) £20k discretionary. Otherwise, you are just penalising them by saying they have to pay their contribution and the £20k Top-Up if it is required? Which it is likely they will be unable or unwilling to afford, thus preventing them from getting their adaptation.”</i></p>	
16	(DFG Team / internal)	7 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the Home Move Grant was raised, copied below:</p> <p><i>“Now a question about the Home Move Grant (11.3)</i></p> <p><i>How will you stop people getting this grant then applying for a DFG for additional adaptations in future, after they have moved into the new property?</i></p> <p><i>Are there any circumstances under which a LA can deny someone the right to apply for a DFG?”</i></p>	<p>No.</p> <p>A resident who has received a HomeMove Grant, will be entitled to £1,000 to cover any of the specific eligible relocation expenses.</p> <p>They will be also entitled to a £5,000 grant towards DFG adaptations.</p> <p>There is no mechanism in place to prevent people who have received a HomeMove Grant from re-applying for a DFG at a later date, as there is no limit to the number of DFGs one can apply for. However, each such application will be assessed on its own merits.</p>

17	(DFG Team / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy.</p> <p>Response copied below:  <i>"I have read the full policy and feel that is very comprehensive and includes changes that will be both beneficial to the applicants and the team."</i></p>	No.
18	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the Means Test on equipment was raised, copied below:</p> <p>The means test is not applicable for equipment cases up to a maximum cost of £8,000. This is in relation only to the installation of a stair-lift, or a ceiling track hoist (CTH) not associated with any other DFG funded building works.</p> <p><i>"Could this include other item i.e. modular ramps.</i></p> <p><i>How will this impact other works if the application is for several things?"</i></p>	<p>No.</p> <p>A modular ramp is not equipment.</p> <p>The purpose of this proposal is to make the process quicker and easier when it comes to a stand-alone equipment recommendations, so that the works can progress in a speedier manner and the applicant can receive the equipment with no unnecessary delays. If the application is for example, for an extension, including a CTH, the CTH cannot be installed until the extension has been built. Therefore, this proposal will not apply as the installation of the equipment cannot be progressed in a speedier manner.</p>
19	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the MND Grant was raised, copied below:</p> <p>MND applicant's earnings will not be taken into consideration when means testing at an early stage.</p>	<p>Yes – further clarification provided.</p> <p>The purpose of not taking into consideration the applicant's earnings is so that their application can be deemed eligible and potentially have a low client's contribution. Applicants with MND could theoretically continue to work until they are no longer able to do so. If they apply for a DFG whilst still in employment, due</p>

			<p><i>“Is this just for the provisional TOR, or for the actual application? Does the means test then do a predictive TOR based on what pensions, etc would be expected. What about other rapidly deteriorating conditions?”</i></p>	<p>to their earnings, they could be deemed non eligible or eligible with a high contribution. By the time they stop working and apply for a DFG, they may be eligible with no contribution, but the timescales required for a DFG may not be compatible with their deteriorated condition and urgency of adaptations required.</p> <p>This proposal is to cover Dementia and MND Grants specifically. Any other rapidly deteriorating conditions will need to be determined on a case-by-case basis. This review will be in consultation with the Occupational Therapist and other medical professionals involved with the applicant whose condition may be subject to rapid deterioration.</p>
20	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the Dementia and MDN Grants was raised, copied below:</p> <p>Must remain in the property as only or main residence for 5 years.</p> <p><i>“Prognosis for MND likely to be less than 5 years. Ability to remain in property for people with dementia may also be less than 5 years”.</i></p>	<p>Yes – further clarification provided.</p> <p>This is a limitation for all grants. The applicant is asked to confirm their intention to stay at the property for a period of 5 years. It is appreciated that people with Dementia or MND may not be able to stay in their adapted property for this period of time for reasons beyond their control and due to their deteriorated diagnosis. This will be deemed acceptable. However, if a family moves property for reasons not related to their family member’s diagnosis, then this condition will apply.</p>
21	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the eligibility for the Discretionary Top-Up Grant was raised, copied below:</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>If an applicant has a client’s contribution, they will not be eligible for the Discretionary top-up grant of £20,000.</p>

			<p>Means tested applicants with a client's contribution – not eligible for a Discretionary DFG Grant (top-up).</p> <p><i>“Where people find their contribution - should they not be considered for the discretionary element? There are still a lot of people that will fall through the cracks due to outdated eligibility criteria.”</i></p>	<p>Ferret's Renovator software calculates contribution to cost of works for DFGs. The test of resources legislation is complicated and therefore, Ferrett is updated annually and the necessary allowances are programmed, as necessary.</p> <p>The Council has no control or influence over the current means test provided by Ferrett.</p>
22	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the eligibility for the Discretionary Top-Up Grant was raised, copied below:</p> <p>Means tested applicants with a client's contribution – not eligible for a Discretionary DFG Grant (top-up).</p> <p><i>“Until the TOR is updated, this is too restrictive when we are getting feedback that people on only small income/state pension are still resulting in an assessed contribution.”</i></p>	<p>No.</p> <p>Please see comments made under item 15 above.</p>
23	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the eligibility for the Discretionary Top-Up Grant was raised, copied below:</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>The Council will continue using Ferret's Renovator software to calculate contributions to cost of works for DFGs. We are not aware of any details for this</p>

			<p>Parents are means tested for children's applications with regards to the Discretionary DFG Grant (top-up).</p> <p><i>“An alternative means test was used prior to the DFG legislation changing. Can this be considered so people are not excluded as we foresee this having a big impact on Children's cases and will not provide a resolution or support in managing risk”.</i></p>	<p>alternative means test programme but will be happy to review it if provided with the necessary information.</p> <p>The whole policy will be reviewed in 12 months.</p>
24	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the eligibility for the Discretionary Top-Up Grant was raised, copied below:</p> <p>A resident should not apply for works exceeding the maximum mandatory £30,000 grant more than once for the same property. If they do, the Council will need to question this. One application per applicant in any 5-year period is accepted for the Discretionary top-up grant.</p> <p><i>“What if a partner develops needs within the 5-year period at the same property? Or if the solution was poorly delivered and does not meet the needs. Or unpredictable changes in needs requiring additional works.”</i></p>	<p>Yes – Further clarification to be provided.</p> <p>This is in relation to works exceeding the maximum mandatory £30,000 grant and in relation to the same applicant. If one applicant has received a grant and their partner is in need of different adaptations, this is acceptable. If the same applicant has received adaptations with a cost higher than £30,000 and a further OT recommendation is received supporting works that would exceed the maximum mandatory grant, then the Council will question the need and why the previous adaptations no longer meet the applicant's needs.</p>

25	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the eligibility for the Client Contribution Support was raised, copied below:</p> <p>This is a discretionary grant of up to £1,000 to support applicants who are assessed as having a means-tested contribution that is unaffordable.</p> <p><i>“How is it determined that the contribution is not affordable other than savings? Are outgoings, etc taken into consideration. Similar to previous comments about the means test. If it is acknowledged that people under this category cannot afford the £1000 contribution then why is it reasonable to exclude them from the discretionary top up?”</i></p>	<p>No.</p> <p>The Ferret Renovator software, as set by the government, does not take any expenditure into consideration. It is the income of the disabled person, and where applicable their partner, that is taken into account. Additionally, the assumed weekly needs of the household (the “applicable amount”) is calculated taking into account the number of people, their ages and other circumstances.</p> <p>For further details, please see the following link regarding the Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) delivery: Guidance for local authorities in England (published 2022):</p> <p><a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/disabled-facilities-grant-dfg-delivery-guidance-for-local-authorities-in-england/disabled-facilities-grant-dfg-delivery-guidance-for-local-authorities-in-england#appendix-b-the-legislation">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/disabled-facilities-grant-dfg-delivery-guidance-for-local-authorities-in-england/disabled-facilities-grant-dfg-delivery-guidance-for-local-authorities-in-england#appendix-b-the-legislation</a></p>
26	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the HomeMove Grant was raised, copied below:</p> <p>Cost of adaptations at the new property – maximum cost of £5,000.</p> <p><i>“Can this be explored. A move could result in a cost saving - £5k makes this a poor option”.</i></p>	<p>No.</p> <p>The new policy proposes to keep the HomeMove Grant the same as per the previous policy as it is rarely used but can still offer an alternative option.</p> <p>Yes, a HomeMove Grant could provide a saving to the overall DFG budget, but this is the point of a Home Move Grant.</p> <p>Additionally, an applicant who has previously received a Home Move Grant including the DFG adaptations</p>



				<p>(up to a cost of £5,000) can still apply for a further DFG at a later date.</p> <p>The HomeMove Grant will be reviewed in 12 months from approval / implementation date of the revised policy.</p>
27	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding who will sit on the Independent Panel was raised, copied below:</p> <p><i>“And Therapy... CHC representation at panel”.</i></p>	<p>No.</p> <p>This panel is to determine whether additional discretionary funding will be released to enable adaptations. If Therapy were to be part of this panel, their view could be biased as they are working closely with the applicant. The panel needs to be independent and have no relations to the applicant.</p> <p>Further information has been requested from COT regarding Continuing Health Care (CHC) as representation at AD level will be required. Item to be considered further.</p>
28	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the private OTs was raised, copied below:</p> <p>If a private occupational therapist is used, the Council will still consult with the Council’s Occupational Therapy Service to determine which works are required to meet the applicant’s needs and therefore, eligible for Disabled Facilities Grant funding.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>When the Council receives a private OT recommendation, they will consult with COT. COT may wish to liaise with other OTs, outside of NNC, before confirming their feedback back to the Council regarding the content of the privately obtained OT recommendation.</p>

			<i>“Should this include assessments outside of NNC employed OTs. i.e. palliative care OTs, other NHS or Housing Assoc OTs etc.”</i>	
29	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the below was raised:</p> <p>If there are unique situations where individuals genuinely need urgent support but are precluded from accessing assistance due to specific aspects, the Council may consider offering assistance in exceptional circumstances, especially if it helps meet strategic objectives. Such decisions will be made by the relevant officer.</p> <p><i>“Would this relate to Caron’s suggestion of an avenue for urgent assistance grants? Does this need expanding on? If precluded from assistance normally, will this then be an option that is exempt from means testing or formal DFG application if needing to be processed quickly.”</i></p>	<p>No.</p> <p>It is not feasible to mention or cover all unique situations where individuals may need urgent support. Caron has previously suggested to Amy the introduction of Prevention Assistance Grants. However, this is not a grant we can currently include in the revised policy. The specific name of this grant cannot be added in now as it was not included in the document during the public consultation. It will certainly be formally considered when the policy is up for review, subject to funds available and take up of the new measures introduced.</p> <p>The revised policy includes grants for palliative care, terminally ill and hospital discharges. Having looked at what other Councils cover under the Prevention Assistance Grants, their purpose is to enable applicants to return home after a period in hospital, care home, or other similar establishment, or to prevent imminent risk of admission.</p>
30	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the below was raised:</p> <p>If specialised equipment is provided as part of the adaptations, the Council</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>This statement still applies. Any equipment installed under a DFG currently and as covered by this policy, will not be removed by the Council for recycling, re-</p>

			<p>will not reclaim nor remove the equipment when it is no longer needed.</p> <p><i>“Change assistance to adaptations or may read better. If this is undertaken by Millbrook (or alternative ICES contract if this changes), then this statement will not apply as we would seek to reclaim for recycling.”</i></p>	<p>use or any other purpose. The content of this item has been also covered by item 43 below.</p>
31	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the below was raised:</p> <p>All DFG cases are managed via a single North Northamptonshire Council (NNC) Waiting List. On this waiting list, cases are added once deemed valid, including a completed DFG application and all necessary financial / benefit checks. The cases are then prioritised based on the priority grading system set by the Occupational Therapist (OT) - standard, urgent or critical - and the date on the OT recommendation. Critical and urgent cases will be prioritised for action. However, larger and more complex schemes will take longer to complete regardless of priority.</p> <p><i>“Do we want the criteria that we set to be mutually agreed with the grants</i></p>	<p>No.</p> <p>Priorities on OT recommendations should be determined by COT. PSH will have no involvement. They are the medical professional to determine and advise on how rapidly the adaptations are required by the applicant based on the condition, diagnosis etc. This query requires no change to the policy. Nonetheless, if COT deem necessary a meeting with PSH to discuss priority criteria, we will attend.</p>

			<i>team as to what is 'reasonable' to have on a standard priority, so PSH have some ownership of this? OT would like to review priorities jointly.”</i>	
32	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the below was raised:</p> <p>Applications considered as this will be specifically marked by the OT in agreement with the Lead of Disabled Facilities Grants. The latter will ensure any such cases are allocated to a surveyor as soon as practically possible and before any critical or urgent cases - already on the North Northamptonshire Council Waiting List.</p> <p><i>“Before our critical cases? Will there be restrictions on what would be considered to take priority? e.g. just adaptations to facilitate the discharge (i.e. ramping, door widening)”.</i></p>	<p>No.</p> <p>I think this statement has been misunderstood. Any applications which fall within this category of Terminally Ill Applicants and Hospital Discharges will be allocated to a surveyor before any other critical or urgent cases in the standard NNC Waiting List not related to a terminally ill applicant or applicant in need to be discharged home from hospital.</p>
33	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding Landlord Applications was raised, copied below:</p> <p>Whilst landlord applications are typically not subject to means testing by default, the Council wishes to prevent potential misuse of the system</p>	<p>Yes – further clarification added.</p> <p>A Landlord can apply on behalf of their tenant. This has been in the DFG Legislation since 1989 but hardly ever used. A Landlord Application does not have to be covered in a Council’s Housing Assistance Policy. Nevertheless, the purpose of the statement highlighted is to avoid having tenants asking for their landlords to apply on their behalf after they have been</p>

			<p>and ensure fair distribution of funds. For example, if a tenant applies for a DFG and is confirmed to be ineligible or eligible subject to a financial contribution, they will not be allowed to circumvent the test by having their landlord apply on their behalf. The Council has a duty to ensure public money is fairly spent and that those in greater need are provided with the necessary financial assistance.</p> <p><i>“Still not sure I understand how this will be in practice when the norm is always to submit and have the person means tested first.</i></p> <p><i>Conflicts with the plan to try to means test people before our assessment and puts them at a disadvantage.</i></p> <p><i>We will end up with all HA cases just being signposted to apply and change our processes. Or a 2-tier system resulting in different outcomes for people purely dependent on the route they go down”.</i></p>	<p>means tested, as this would be their way to avoid any client’s contributions applicable on them.</p> <p>Since the policy was issued out to consultation, the following text has been added:</p> <p>Nevertheless, the Council will consider each such application on its own merit. The Council understands that if a landlord applies for a DFG grant on behalf of their tenant, it may not be just for the benefit of the current tenant needing the proposed adaptations. It could be about the landlord improving their property and therefore, increasing the accessibility aspect of their stock.</p>
34	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the below was raised:</p> <p>Improving or upgrading the existing heating system in the dwelling to meet the needs of the disabled occupant. If</p>	<p>Yes – further clarification added.</p> <p>A decision will be made subject to a review of all adaptations recommended by the OT.</p> <p>The Council will receive the OT recommendation and decide accordingly. If there are other grants available</p>

			<p>there is no existing heating system in the dwelling or any such system is unsuitable for use by the disabled occupant, providing a heating system suitable to meet their needs.</p> <p><i>“Any restrictions on this? Any criteria? When is it decided on whether it will be funded via DFG or an alternative grant?”</i></p>	<p>and if the heating works will not be associated to any other recommended adaptations, then the works could be covered by an alternative grant. If there are no other grants available and/or if the heating works will be affected by the main building adaptations, then the heating works will be covered by the DFG. The OT will need to include the recommended works in their recommendation and give the relevant justification.</p> <p>The following text has been added to the policy:</p> <p>Note: Subject to the nature of the OT recommendation, any other adaptations included and heating related works, there may be other government grants or schemes that could be assist with the heating aspect of the adaptations. The Council’s Energy Officer will be consulted before a decision can be made.</p>
35	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding Assistive Technology was raised, as below:</p> <p><i>“Have specifics of AT been included anywhere else in the policy?”</i></p>	<p>Yes – a section on Assistive Technology has been added to Appendix A – Mandatory Disabled Facilities Grants.</p> <p>The draft policy issued to consultation did not include any specifics on Assistive Technology. Since then, a meeting has taken place on the 14<sup>th</sup> of November 2024 with Laura Sinclair (COT), Caron Eldeton (COT) and Louise Compton (Longhurst) and further information has been provided. A separate section has been added.</p>
36	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding Safe Space was raised, as below:</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>This section is in relation to all non-mandatory works. Reference is being made to “safe space” as another</p>

			<p>Sensory room / Safe space / Quiet space / Desk space / Education room for young people with conditions such as ADHD, Autism, Developmental Delay etc.</p> <p><i>“re 'safe space' - 'making the home safe for the disabled person and other people living with them - purpose B48' is a mandatory requirement”.</i></p>	<p>term used to describe a sensory room or a quiet space for children with autism or ADHD etc. This is not about making the property safe, which can be covered under a DFG. This is about the provision of a room for a child with a certain type of diagnosis, or often with no confirmed diagnosis.</p>
37	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding Patios was raised, as below:</p> <p>Formation of patios and landscaping of garden.</p> <p><i>“Patios are generally the outcome of a mandatory requirement for 'access to garden'.”</i></p>	<p>No.</p> <p>Access to garden is a mandatory requirement. Formation of patios is down to the Council's discretion, including the full extent of the patio. A patio to accommodate two chairs and a coffee table? A larger patio for access to the bins? This is a discretionary item, including the overall landscaping of the garden as we need to provide the most cost-effective solution that will still meet the applicant's needs.</p>
38	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding Dropped kerbs and hard standings was raised, as below:</p> <p><i>“Do these also not constitute 'access to property'? B47 cites 'access can also include works outside of the curtilage of the dwelling such as a dropped kerb ...”</i></p>	<p>No.</p> <p>Yes, they do fall under the “access to and from the property” purpose. Nonetheless, dropped kerbs and hard standings are deemed non-mandatory works, according to the legislation.</p> <p>Hard standing is a level car parking area with access from the road i.e. it should include a dropped kerb. The housing legislation covering DFGs requires officers to identify that this is a necessary and appropriate need, which relates to the disabled</p>

				person's access to and from the dwelling. All such cases should be reviewed and discussed with the PSH Managers before a decision can be made.
39	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding Splitting Applications was raised, as below:</p> <p>Where possible, the Council will not split an application which has multiple different priorities. On occasions, however, this may be necessary. For example, when an exceptionally high number of critical and urgent applications are received.</p> <p><i>“Clarification required on the process for our recommendations. It has worked well splitting applications to ensure fairness and managing risk.”</i></p>	<p>Yes – Further clarification provided.</p> <p>This section is in relation to how the Council deals with recommendations that include different types of adaptations with different priorities. If an OT recommendation has recommended a LAS with an urgent priority and a Ramp with a standard priority, the Council will aim to deal with the full scope of adaptations at the same time. The surveyor will visit once for the survey. The full works will be tendered at the same time. The same contractor will carry out the works. Nonetheless, the OTs should continue providing their recommendations as per the current arrangement, as there may be situations when all works included in the same recommendation may be treated separately and based on their priority.</p>
40	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding Quotes was raised, as below:</p> <p>North Northamptonshire Council will always aim to obtain four quotes for extension projects, garage conversions and complicated cases and three quotes for all other works. Two quotes will be accepted if the estimated cost of the proposed works is under £10K.</p> <p><i>“Seems a little confusing on the number of quotes required.”</i></p>	<p>No.</p> <p>For all complex projects, including extensions and garage conversions, the Council will aim to obtain 4 quotes. For all other types of works, the Council will aim to obtain 3 quotes.</p> <p>As we cannot often obtain the required amount of quotes, 2 quotes will be accepted if the estimated cost of works is less than £10,000. For specialist equipment, 1 quote will be accepted.</p>



41	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the below was raised:</p> <p>When dealing with modular ramps, the in-house surveyor will contact a modular ramp contractor. The Council's surveyor is not required to survey or produce a design proposal. The appropriate contractor will be provided with the OT recommendation which will include all the requirements/specification for the ramp, as recommended by the OT.</p> <p><i>“Concern that our recommendations are not 'technical' and based on clinical need based on how someone would mobilise and use the ramp, not the design. Recent case discussion regarding steplifts and through lifts which were installed without surveyor oversight flagged issues.”</i></p>	<p>Yes – Further clarification required.</p> <p>When dealing with building works, the Council's surveyor will survey, produce the design and inform all final decisions.</p> <p>When dealing with equipment, the Council's surveyor may end up producing a design that is not compatible with the specific equipment / system. For this reason, and based on previous experience, it is more efficient if the equipment supplier visits site, surveys and produces a scheme design that would meet the OT recommendation and ensure it works with their equipment.</p> <p>It is appreciated the OT recommendation is not technical, but it could not be technical as one modular ramp is different to another. The Council surveyor will receive the equipment supplier's design to assess and approve, whilst ensuring it meets the OT recommendation.</p>
42	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the fees for technical and structural surveys was raised:</p> <p>Technical and structural surveys: The Council's in-house surveyors' team or external architectural consultant - depending on the circumstances – will carry out a</p>	<p>Yes – further clarification added to the policy.</p> <p>A relevant clarification has been added. These fees cannot be paid if the grant does not progress.</p>

			<p>survey of the property at no extra cost to the applicant. The purpose of this survey is to establish feasibility and determine the proposed adaptations. If the applicant wishes to use their own architect, the relevant fee can be covered by the mandatory grant but will be deducted from the maximum £30,000 funding.</p> <p><i>“Is there something that says these costs will not be covered if the adaptation doesn't go ahead for all of these statements where relevant?”</i></p>	
43	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding some of the below bullet points was raised:</p> <p>Additionally, no land charge will be placed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• on tenant’s applications (private Landlords or Housing Associations)</li> <li>• on Through Floor Lift (TFL) cases, including enabling works.</li> <li>• on stair-lifts.</li> <li>• for any amount below £200.</li> <li>• for a child applicant in foster care and the application is associated with a long-term foster placement.</li> </ul>	<p>Yes – further clarification required.</p> <p>It should be made clear that a land charge will not be applied on any stand-alone CTHs and step-lifts. However, if any equipment such as a CTH or a step-lift is part of more extensive adaptations, then a land charge would be applicable to the full scope of works including the cost of the equipment.</p> <p>£200 is not a typographical error. A land charge for a mandatory grant is applicable to any work cost value from £5,000 up to £15,000. For example, if the cost of works is £5,200, then a land charge for £200 has to be registered. However, any amounts below £200 will be waived.</p>

			<p><i>“And Ceiling track hoists, and step lifts?”</i></p> <p><i>“£200? Is this a typo?”</i></p>	
44	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the section called “Recovery of the Equipment” was raised:</p> <p><i>“Should the heading be changed as you are not offering to recover the equipment. If a decision is made re: recycling stairlifts, this may need to stipulate that recovery will not be considered if the adaptation is grant funded or person has contributed towards the cost.”</i></p>	<p>Yes – further clarification added, as follows:</p> <p>In the future, the Council may seek to implement a recycling service for stair-lifts and/or ceiling track hoists. This service may be managed by the Community Occupational Therapy through their Integrated Community Equipment Service contract (ICES). Any such future service will not cover the recovery of the original equipment if the adaptations were grant funded or the applicant contributed towards the cost of work. This type of service is not currently in place.</p>
45	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the call out fees for equipment was raised:</p> <p>The grant will also cover the call out fees, if contacted by the applicant, including any repairs up to £500.</p> <p><i>“Is this referring to the period after the 5-yr warranty expires? This sounds good if that’s the case. Is this usual grant process/means test, etc? Again, does the £500 include call out cost as well as repair cost? Is there any mileage in procuring Millbrook or NNC stairlift provider?”</i></p>	<p>Yes – further clarification added, as follows:</p> <p>The grant will also cover the call out fees, if contacted by the applicant, including any repairs up to £500, after the expiration of the 5-year extended warranty. If the cost of the repairs, including the call out fees exceed the set value of £500, a decision will be made by the Housing Managers in relation to the most cost-effective option to proceed with i.e. pay for the call out fees and repairs or treat this as a new application for a new stair-lift, requiring a new OT recommendation. This payment will be still subject to means testing unless the applicant is on passported benefits.</p>

46	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the HomeMove Grant was raised:</p> <p>The maximum amount payable as a HomeMove Grant (Private Sector) will not exceed £6,000. The total amount payable will be based on the cost of adaptations to the new home up to a maximum of £5,000, together with up to £1,000 to cover other expenses.</p> <p><i>“Comments on this earlier. £1,000 towards moving costs and then a restriction of £5000 on adaptations when they potentially could forego the £1000 and get £50,000 for adaptations. Seems an odd inclusion of no benefit when you can't even get a level access shower for £5000. People needing to consider a house move are likely to be the more complex cases where it is difficult to adapt or there are compromises in what can be achieved in existing properties.”</i></p>	<p>No.</p> <p>The purpose of the HomeMove Grant is to provide an alternative and more cost-effective solution to a DFG. If the applicant's current property cannot be fully adapted to meet their needs or the scope of required adaptations is extensive, then finding an alternative accommodation that has already been adapted and can meet the applicant's needs is an ideal solution.</p> <p>The HomeMove Grant will offer the applicant £1,000 towards the cost of moving and a further £5,000 for any further DFG adaptations required. Please note that the applicant who has received a HomeMove Grant, including a £5K DFG, can apply for further DFGs at a later date.</p>
47	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy raised. A query regarding the HomeMove Grant was raised:</p> <p>The decision shall be made within 6 months of the completed submission (the date at which the case officer confirms they have sufficient</p>	<p>Yes – The approval period has been changed to 1 month.</p>

			<p>information to compile the report) and shall be in writing. In the event of a refusal, the letter shall include the reason for that refusal.</p> <p><i>“6 months seems a long time. Decisions and costings for home moves will be specific to property offers which would not wait 6 months”.</i></p>	
48	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy.</p> <p>Response copied below:</p> <p><i>“Clarity on decision making for adaptations within existing footprint (e.g. downstairs toilet acceptable to put in the dining room). Repurposing of rooms (e.g. building on a lounge so that an existing lounge can be used as a bedroom, or loft conversion to free up bedroom on first/ground floor to avoid extension).”</i></p>	Yes – relevant section added.
49	(COT / internal)	15 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy.</p> <p>Response copied below:</p> <p><i>“Check again on the NRPF. This has cropped up a few times recently so perhaps needs information including.”</i></p>	Yes – a new brief section on NRPF has been added to the policy, including link to NRPF website.
50	(DFG Team / internal)	18 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy.</p> <p>Response copied below:</p>	No.

			<p><i>“Page 11. New policy on DFG support for Dementia and Motor Neuron Disease sufferers. I welcome the policy update to provide better coverage in these areas, and especially the enlightened proposal to disregard paid income for people in the early stages of Motor Neuron Disease”.</i></p>	
51	(DFG Team / internal)	18 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy.</p> <p>Response copied below:  <i>“Page 16. ‘The surveyor’s final decision precedes.’ I’m not sure precedes is the right word, perhaps ‘The surveyor’s final decision takes precedence’ would be better?”</i></p>	Yes – Changed.
52	(DFG Team / internal)	18 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy.</p> <p>Response copied below:  <i>“Page 18. This part seems to be saying that we will have surveyed/produced drawings and spec/obtained client approval/completed the tender process and got the DFG approved within 6 months of the case going onto the waiting list. This is challenging given that some cases have already been on the waiting list 6 months before they are allocated to a</i></p>	<p>No.</p> <p>It is a legal requirement for the Council to provide a decision or approve a DFG application within 6 months of receiving a completed and valid application and any additional information. This includes the DFG application form, financial information, drawings and specifications for the proposal and quotes.</p> <p>The period of 6 months does not pose any challenges to the surveyor. It is appreciated that the surveyor will work on the case as efficiently as possible and produce all necessary information in a timely manner. However, it all depends on the nature of the project. For example, extension cases will take longer due to</p>

			<p><i>surveyor. Although, obviously, we would look to progress cases as quickly as possible, and this might be a timescale to aim for, I wonder if making an explicit commitment to deliver a Grant Approval within a 6-month period is necessary. Also, I don't think we actually send the quotes out to the client, though the process might have changed since I was closely involved with it."</i></p>	<p>the requirement to obtain planning permissions and building control approvals. Nevertheless, there is no legal time limit for this type of work to be completed.</p>
53	(DFG Team / internal)	18 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy.</p> <p>Response copied below:</p> <p><i>"Page 28. Hospital Discharges. 'alternative equipment/construction solutions will be explored.' I think it's very positive that the possibility of using pod-type MMC installations is on the table, though we need to be doing the research in anticipation of the situation arising, rather than at the point when it is actually required".</i></p>	<p>No.</p>
54	(DFG Team / internal)	18 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy.</p> <p>Response copied below:</p> <p><i>"Page 31. Discretionary Works. I would have viewed Dropped Kerbs and Hardstandings as part of our toolkit for providing access to the community. At the moment, I think this</i></p>	<p>No.</p> <p>There will be no need for a surveyor to carry out a feasibility visit, if it is already known, based on previous cases / experience, that a dropped kerb or hard standing case will cost in excess of £1,000.</p> <p>Dropped kerbs and hard standings are deemed as non-mandatory works, according to the legislation.</p>

			<p><i>type of recommendation is treated as more or less as routine. As a case of this type is sure to cost more than £1,000, does this mean that, in future, all dropped kerb OT recs will be subject to a series of meetings and submission to Panel before they can proceed?"</i></p>	<p>Hard standing is a level car parking area with access from the road i.e. it should include a dropped kerb.</p> <p>The housing legislation covering DFGs requires officers to identify that this is a necessary and appropriate need, which relates to the disabled person's access to and from the dwelling. All such cases should be reviewed and discussed with the PSH Managers before a decision can be made.</p>
55	(DFG Team / internal)	18 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy.</p> <p>Response copied below:</p> <p><i>"Page 35. There is a reference to installation of a 'reconditioned stairlift'. Is this something NNC would generally do? I though we only fitted new and unused equipment?"</i></p>	<p>Yes – further clarification provided.</p> <p>The Council aims to install only new equipment. However, there may be an occasion where a reconditioned s/l is the only option due to urgency of timescales or any other reasons.</p>
56	(DFG Team / internal)	18 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy.</p> <p>Response copied below:</p> <p><i>"Page 40 'The Grant will also cover the cost of callout fees'. This seems to contradict the earlier paragraphs stating that the DFG does not cover maintenance going forward? The 5-year warranty should include for callouts?"</i></p>	<p>Yes – further clarification provided.</p> <p>The responsibility for servicing and maintaining the equipment after the 5-year warranty has expired is with the applicant. Call out fees will be considered as an alternative cost-effective solution to receiving a new recommendation. The applicants will be subject to means testing and a decision on whether to fund the call out fees and necessary repairs will be based on the age of the equipment.</p>
57	(DFG Team / internal)	18 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy.</p>	<p>No.</p>



			<p>Response copied below:</p> <p><i>“Page 41. There is a statement that discretionary DFG’s must be approved at the same time as the associated Mandatory Grant. I’m not sure this works with regard to Point 1, the discretionary grant to ‘repair and make good to finishes disturbed by DFG works’. The need for this type of funding would not be known until after the mandatory works were completed?”</i></p>	<p>Making good any works that may be affected by the DFG adaptations should be identified as part of the design proposal not after the works have been completed.</p>
58	Resident (external)	19 November 2024	<p>No objections to the proposed policy.</p> <p>Response copied below:</p> <p><i>“Apologies for the delay in responding to this. I have been abroad and only returned yesterday.</i></p> <p><i>I know I have just missed the deadline for responding but wanted to let you know that my mother has recently had a stairlift installed at her home which was funded by a Disabled Facilities Grant. She is now waiting for a level access shower.</i></p> <p><i>I wanted to let you know that this has been life changing for my mum who is 87, in social housing and has</i></p>	No.

		<p><i>COPD. Without this grant she would not be able to afford this.</i></p> <p><i>The whole process, and ongoing process for the level access shower, has been very good. Those who have been involved have been transparent, available for help and advice, empathetic and very professional.</i></p> <p><i>I hope more people can avail of this grant to help those who need it the most".</i></p>	
--	--	---	--