

SECTION 1: CIA SUMMARY
Community Impact Assessment: Summary

1. Name of service, policy, function or criteria being assessed: Amendments to the Private Sector Housing Assistance Policy and specifically the removal of the means test for low value work and broadening the scope of the discretionary assistance

2. What are the main objectives or aims of the service/policy/function/criteria? To ensure that the increased DFG funding allocation is used effectively and offers a prompt and streamlined service which aims to preventive, reduce and delay need for NHS commissioned and Social Care services.

3. Name and Job Title of person completing assessment: Ruth Abbott Housing Standards and Adaptations Manager

4. Have any impacts been Identified? (Yes/No)

Yes

Community of Identity affected:

Age, Disability

Summary of impact:

To help a wider range of customers access help and maintain independence in their home

5. Date CIA completed: 30th May 2017

6. Signed off by: Tom Brittain

7. I am satisfied that this service/policy/function has been successfully impact assessed.

Name:

Position:

Date:

8. Decision-making body:

Executive Member for Housing and Safer Neighbourhoods

Date:

19th June 2017

Decision Details:

Send the completed signed off document to ciasubmission@york.gov.uk It will be published on the intranet, as well as on the council website.

Actions arising from the Assessments will be logged on Verto and progress updates will be required

Community Impact Assessment (CIA)

Community Impact Assessment Title:
Amendments to the Private Sector Housing Assistance Policy

What evidence is available **to suggest that the proposed service, policy, function or criteria could have a negative (N), positive (P) or no (None) effect** on quality of life outcomes? (Refer to guidance for further details)

Can negative impacts be justified? **For example: improving community cohesion; complying with other legislation or enforcement duties; taking positive action to address imbalances or under-representation; needing to target a particular community or group e.g. older people.** NB. Lack of financial resources alone is NOT justification!

Community of Identity: Age

| Evidence | Quality of Life Indicators | Customer Impact (N/P/None) | Staff Impact (N/P/None) |
|---|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Data from the Business Intelligence Hub Joint strategic Needs Assessment BRE research 2015 Making a House a Home: Local Authorities and Disabled Adaptations 2016 Internal DFG review | Longevity; Physical Security; Health; Standard of Living; | Positive | None |

Appendix B

| Details of Impact | <i>Can negative impacts be justified?</i> | Reason/Action | Lead Officer | Completion Date |
|---|---|---|--|-----------------|
| <p>Positive</p> <p>Most DFG customers are 60 years or over. By scrapping the need for means test for all works that have a total value of less than £5000 should greatly speed up the time taken to process DFG applications for the benefit of the customer. In addition, this change shall free up capacity within the housing standards and adaptations team enabling them to deal with the increased volume of work as a result of the increase in the growth levels of funding.</p> <p>Negative</p> <p>Higher value of works will still need to be means tested.</p> | Yes | The service was assessed from end to end from a customer perspective. By introducing these changes we aim to streamline the application and processes to help prevent, reduce and delay the need for NHS and social care services. We acknowledged that some customers with higher value work will still need to pay. However, the means testing process for this type of work will still mean that we are able to help those people who are most vulnerable. | Housing Standard And Adaptations Manager | May 2017 |

Appendix B

Community of Identity: Carers of Older or Disabled People

| Evidence | | Quality of Life Indicators | Customer Impact (N/P/None) | Staff Impact (N/P/None) |
|-------------------|---|----------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | | | |
| Details of Impact | <i>Can negative impacts be justified?</i> | Reason/Action | Lead Officer | Completion Date |
| | | | | |

Community of Identity: Disability

| Evidence | | Quality of Life Indicators | Customer Impact (N/P/None) | Staff Impact (N/P/None) |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Data from the Business Intelligence Hub Joint strategic Needs Assessment BRE research 2015 Making a House a Home: Local Authorities and Disabled Adaptations 2016 Internal DFG review | | Longevity; Physical Security; Health; Standard of Living; | <p>Positive</p> | |

Appendix B

| Details of Impact | <i>Can negative impacts be justified?</i> | Reason/Action | Lead Officer | Completion Date |
|---|---|--|---|----------------------------|
| <p>Positive All customers have been assessed by an Occupational Therapist as having a disability. By scrapping the need for means test for all works that have a total value of less than £5000 should greatly speed up the time taken to process DFG applications for the benefit of the customer. In addition this change shall free up capacity within the housing standards and adaptations team enabling them to deal with the increased volume of work as a result of the increase in the growth levels of funding.</p> <p>Negative Higher value of works will still need to be means tested.</p> | Yes | The service was assessed from end to end from a customer perspective. By introducing these changes, we aim to streamline the application and processes to help prevent, reduce and delay the need for NHS and social care services. We acknowledged that some customers with higher value work will still need to pay. However, the means testing process for this type of work will still mean that we are able to help those people who are most vulnerable. | Housing Standards and Adaptations Manager | 19 th June 2017 |

Community of Identity: Gender

| Community of Identity: Gender | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Evidence | | Quality of Life Indicators | Customer Impact (N/P/None) | Staff Impact (N/P/None) | |
| | | | | | |
| Details of Impact | <i>Can negative impacts be justified?</i> | Reason/Action | Lead Officer | Completion Date | |
| | | | | | |

Community of Identity: Gender Reassignment

| Community of Identity: Gender Reassignment | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Evidence | | Quality of Life Indicators | Customer Impact (N/P/None) | Staff Impact (N/P/None) | |
| | | | | | |
| Details of Impact | <i>Can negative impacts be justified?</i> | Reason/Action | Lead Officer | Completion Date | |
| | | | | | |

Community of Identity: Marriage & Civil Partnership

| Evidence | | Quality of Life Indicators | Customer Impact (N/P/None) | Staff Impact (N/P/None) |
|-------------------|---|----------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | | | |
| Details of Impact | <i>Can negative impacts be justified?</i> | Reason/Action | Lead Officer | Completion Date |
| | | | | |

Community of Identity: Pregnancy / Maternity

| Evidence | | Quality of Life Indicators | Customer Impact (N/P/None) | Staff Impact (N/P/None) |
|-------------------|---|----------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | | | |
| Details of Impact | <i>Can negative impacts be justified?</i> | Reason/Action | Lead Officer | Completion Date |
| | | | | |

Community of Identity: Race

| Community of Identity: Race | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Evidence | | Quality of Life Indicators | Customer Impact (N/P/None) | Staff Impact (N/P/None) | |
| | | | | | |
| Details of Impact | | <i>Can negative impacts be justified?</i> | Reason/Action | Lead Officer | Completion Date |
| | | | | | |

Community of Identity: Religion / Spirituality / Belief

| Community of Identity: Religion / Spirituality / Belief | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Evidence | | Quality of Life Indicators | Customer Impact (N/P/None) | Staff Impact (N/P/None) | |
| | | | | | |
| Details of Impact | | <i>Can negative impacts be justified?</i> | Reason/Action | Lead Officer | Completion Date |
| | | | | | |

Community of Identity: Sexual Orientation

| Community of Identity: Sexual Orientation | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Evidence | | Quality of Life Indicators | Customer Impact (N/P/None) | Staff Impact (N/P/None) | |
| | | | | | |
| Details of Impact | <i>Can negative impacts be justified?</i> | Reason/Action | Lead Officer | Completion Date | |
| | | | | | |