

Delegated Officer Report

Decision Maker: Mark Warren, (Oldham DASS) Managing Director Health & Adult Social Care Community Services

Date of Decision: 4th March 2019

Subject: Additional Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) allocation 2018/19: spending plans

Report Author: Lynda Megram, Planning and Commissioning Manager

Ward (s): All wards: consultation not required

Reason for the decision: An additional DFG allocation of £219,605 was awarded by Government on 9th January 2019, to be spent by March 2019. Grant paid under this determination may be used to provide DFGs or for any other social care capital projects.

Summary: To request approval to allocate additional capital funds as outlined in the report (Table 1). Spending plans include works to create reablement facilities to accommodate bariatric people (with associated bariatric equipment), plus increasing activity in identified priority areas such as Occupational Therapy assessments and Warm Homes measures.

Use of additional funds: the proposed usage of the additional funds is set out below in Table 1. The options utilise a range of existing contractual / delivery arrangements and no new procurement exercise is required. The spending plans allow for substitution where anticipated spend in an area slips and is unlikely to be achieved. Council officers will monitor spend to

ensure that the funds are utilised.

This additional funding allocation - unlike the main DFG grant award - is not subject to agreement with the CCG about investment, presumably to expedite spend at short notice.

Table 1: spending plans

Scheme	Anticipated Cost
Warm Homes: emergency heating / boilers	£100,000
COTT Locum, 10 weeks: OT assessments facilitate DFGs (capitalise locum salary)	£14,000
Purchase of specialist community equipment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hoverjack & lift kit x1 = £7,866 - Stairclimber x 2 = £11,012 - Accora chairs = £8,805 (3x bariatric & 3x large TIS RRs) 	£27,683
Upgrade facilities at Extra Care Housing, reablement & community assistive bathing / activity areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide reablement facility at Hopwood Court = c£15,000 - Equipment for community areas/bathing = £9,970 	£25,000
Upgrade facilities at Butler Green, specialist equipment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bariatric equipment (beds x 2 chairs x 2, bath aids, specialist chair) = £13,332 - Works: create improved bariatric accessibility – c £15k 	£28,332
Upgrade facilities at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Medlock Ct – community kitchen & bathing areas = c£15k - Ena Hughes – improve disabled access = c £9,590k 	£24,590
cft	£219,605
Substitution plans: purchase additional equipment / increase Warm Homes delivery	

What are the alternative option(s) to be considered? Please give the reason(s) for recommendation(s):

Option A: do not utilise the additional funds offered.

This option is not in the councils' favour as it would result in a lost opportunity to undertake additional measures that can improve the health and wellbeing of people with disabilities.

Option B: to utilise additional capital funding as outlined in the body of the report at table 1. This option utilises additional funding for measures that improve the health and wellbeing of people with disabilities and which address identified gaps in community health and social care provision.

Consultation: including any conflict of interest declared by relevant Cabinet Member consulted.

With council officers in strategic housing and with relevant officers from PCFT & Miocare

Recommendation(s):

Option B: to utilise additional capital funding as outlined in the body of the report at table 1.

Implications:

*What are the **financial** implications?*

In accepting the DFG government grant we can fulfil our intended expenditure which has been outlined in **Table 1** above.

Spend will not exceed what the DFG grant has been allocated for, so no other revenue or capital expenditure will be incurred.

All expenditure will be incurred in the 2018/19 Financial year.

As this grant is ring-fenced it cannot be used for any other purposes other than those mentioned in Table 1 of this report.

All spend will be approved, checked and monitored by both the service and Finance.
(Chris Curran)

*What are the **legal** implications?*

Approving option B would be the sensible choice considering there are no identified risks associated with this option. There would not seem to be any legal reason preventing the implementation of option B and the increase in funding would be a positive outcome that would benefit those in the borough.
Group Solicitor (Alex Bougatef)

*What are the **procurement** implications?*

None: all delivery mechanisms utilise existing arrangements

*What are the **Human Resources** implications?*

N/A

Equality and Diversity Impact Assessment attached or not required because (please give reason)

An EIA has not been completed as the proposals enable additional measures to be undertaken that are specifically targeted to improve the health and wellbeing of people with disabilities

What are the **property** implications?

Minimal: most of the proposals relate to provision for / improvements in the owner-occupied / rented sector. Some of the proposals relate to council-owned provision: e.g. improved facilities at extra-care housing, and to reablement facilities at Medlock Court, Butler Green etc

Risks:

No significant risks identified

Co-operative agenda

The proposals support the Council's co-operative agenda by improving provision that enables disabled people to remain living in their own homes with increased independence, health and well-being. They support the boroughs Thriving Communities aim i.e. *We want local people and communities to be healthy, happy and able to make positive choices as well offering and accessing support when needed. #result – Services work better together meaning residents have access to the correct support quickly and easily. This also supports the GM strategic priority of 'Healthy lives, with quality care available for those that need it'*

Has the relevant Legal Officer confirmed that the recommendations within this report are lawful and comply with the Council's Constitution? Yes

Has the relevant Finance Officer confirmed that any expenditure referred to within this report is consistent with the Council's budget? Yes

Are any of the recommendations within this report contrary to the Policy Framework of the Council? No

Reason(s) for exemption from publication: N/A

There are no background papers for this report

Report Author Sign-off:	
Lynda Megram	
Date: 25th February 2019	

Please list and attach any appendices: -

Appendix number or letter	Description
N/A	

In consultation with Director/Executive Director



Signed: _____ Date: ____ 18th March 2019 _____