Lead officer:	Glyn Pritchard				
Decision maker:	Council				
People involved:	Private Sector Housing, Staying Put				
Decision:	Housing Assistance Policy				
Policy, project, service, contractReview, change, new, stop	The policy is being amended				
Date of decision: The date when the final decision	Cabinet – 30 May 2018				
is made. The CIA must be complete before this point and inform the final decision.					
 Summary of the decision: Aims and objectives Key actions Expected outcomes Who will be affected and how? How many people will be affected? 	 To enable any increase in funding from the Better Care Fund(BCF)(Disabled Facilities Grant DFG) to be used effectively and is awarded appropriately To help people to maintain independence by continuing to live safely in their own homes. To assist in hospital discharge process where applicable. Support vulnerable people Improve quality of life 				
	 The key action; Ensuring the policy covers all areas of the community who may require assistance to live independently and safely. Reviewing and recommending how best to deliver the available funding 				
	Expected outcomes; The policy should ensure that the DFG meets the requirements of the BCF aims to deliver to those most in need of extra help towards their housing adaptions and hospital discharge. It should also help people on low incomes with required adaptations				
	Any Disabled and vulnerable resident of Swale who meets the eligible criteria will be effected.				
	How many people will be affected? Any person who meets the eligible criteria. It is difficult to predict but based on previous dropout rates possibly 50 additional people. Hospital discharge and prevention will be limited to available funding.				
 Information and research: Outline the information and research that has informed the decision. Include sources and key findings. Include information on how the decision will affect people with different protected characteristics. 	Other LA policies, Government Guidance and Consulting with KCC Occupational Health, The Staying Put service has also been consulted as they have direct experience of dealing with the vulnerable, older persons and disabled in tackling issues within their homes. As they will benefit from the proposed changes. The Council's Corporate Equality Scheme 2016 -2020 incorporates an Equality Objective on supporting vulnerable residents as more Swale residents class themselves as having a limiting long term illness that those in other Kent Districts, in the South East region or in England and Wales. This amended policy should therefore provide more support to Swale's vulnerable residents and therefore deliver the aim of the Council's Equality Scheme.				
Consultation:Has there been specific	The policy has been developed following meetings and discussions with relevant agencies involved in the DFG process Kent Social				

- consultation on this decision?
- What were the results of the consultation?
- Did the consultation analysis reveal any difference in views across the protected characteristics?
- Can any conclusions be drawn from the analysis on how the decision will affect people with different protected characteristics?

characteristic and persons who do not share it

Services OT service, Staying Put Services, Housing Options. It was agreed additional help was needed to assist persons on low income and additional funding where adaptations exceeded the statutory maximum and to assist people to leave hospital and to live independently.

Is the decision relevant to the aims of the equality duty? Guidance on the aims can be found in the EHRC's PSED Technical Guidance. Aim Yes/No 1) Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation C) Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it 3) Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected No

Assess the relevance of the decision to people with different protected characteristics and assess the impact of the decision on people with different protected characteristics.

When assessing relevance and impact, make it clear who the assessment applies to within the protected characteristic category. For example, a decision may have high relevance for young people but low relevance for older people; it may have a positive impact on women but a neutral impact on men.

Characteristic	Relevance to decision	Impact of decision	
	High/Medium/Low/None	Positive/Negative/Neutral	
Age	High	Positive	
Disability	High	Positive	
Gender reassignment	None	Neutral	
Marriage and civil partnership	None	Neutral	
Pregnancy and maternity	None	Neutral	
Race	None	Neutral	
Religion or belief	None	Neutral	
Sex	None	Neutral	
Sexual orientation	None	Neutral	
Other socially excluded groups ¹	None	Neutral	

Conclusion:

- Consider how due regard has been had to the equality duty, from start to finish.
- There should be no unlawful discrimination arising from the decision (see <u>PSED</u> Technical Guidance).

Advise on the overall equality implications that should be taken into account in the final decision, considering relevance and impact.

The proposed changes will have a high positive impact on older people and disabled people with no negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic.

The proposed service enhancements relating to the use of DFG funding reflects government guidance and will benefit older and physically disabled persons.

¹ Other socially excluded groups could include those with literacy issues, people living in poverty or on low incomes or people who are geographically isolated from services