

To: Executive Board Member for Housing Needs

Date: 18 August 2011

Report of: Head of Corporate Assets

Title of Report: Extension, 20 Aldrich Road, Oxford

Summary and Recommendations

Purpose of report: To seek approval for the proposal to erect a single storey rear extension for a disabled person.

Key decision? No

Single Member decision: Councillor Joe McManners ~ Housing Needs

Report approved by: David Edwards, Executive Director Regeneration and Housing.

Finance: Paul Jemetta
Legal: Jeremy King

Policy Framework: Meeting housing need

Recommendation(s): The Executive Member for Housing (Councillor McManners) is RECOMMENDED to:

1. Approve the use of the Aids and Adaptations budget for the erection of a rear extension at 20 Aldrich Road for the existing disabled tenant at an estimated cost of £41,403, and otherwise on terms to be agreed by the Head of Corporate Assets.

Background

1. The property is a three bedrooled pre-war semi-detached house of traditional brick-built construction, under a tiled roof and is in a good state of repair. There is a ground floor bathroom but it has steps leading down to it.

2. The existing secure tenants have rented the property since Nov 1989, and their three dependent children are happily settled in the local school. They have family and friends in the area who help out and consequently they do not wish to move to another area.
3. Owing to the difficulties that the existing disabled tenant has with using the stairs and bathroom, the Occupational Therapist (OT) and the Council's Housing Projects team have sought to find a cost effective solution to suit the tenant's needs.
4. However the layout of the property, particularly the position of the stairs, precludes the installation of a stair-lift and through-floor lift. This has meant that the only realistic way of meeting their needs is to build a single storey extension at the rear of the property which will provide a bedroom and wet room at ground floor level.
5. The Executive Board agreed, in February 2008, an approach to this type of Aids and Adaptations work, which required a report to the Executive where the works cost in excess of £25,000. Competitive tenders have been invited for these works and the lowest received is for the sum of £41,403.00.

Options

6. Because of the limitations with the existing property, there are only two viable options. The first option is to build the single storey rear extension as described above, which will fully meet the tenant's needs and enables family and friends in the near locality to help out when required.
7. The alternative is to find more suitable, ideally already adapted, accommodation. Officers and the OT have explored this option and have delayed the works to find a suitable property but as is often the case, suitable accommodation has not been found and, with the tenant's condition deteriorating, it is now important that the works proceed without undue delay.

Staffing Implications

8. Corporate Assets Housing Projects staff have designed, and will manage, the proposed works within their existing workload.

Environmental Implications

9. The extension is being built in accordance with the current Building Regulations and double glazed category A PVCu windows will be installed.

Risks

10. Failure to carry out these works will result in one or more of the following:
 - An increase in the difficulties experienced by the disabled tenant as his condition is worsening.
 - Possible injury to the tenant due to the difficulty in climbing the existing stairs.

Financial Implications

11. The Capital budget sum of £900,000 was approved by Council in February for carrying out disabled adaptation work for Council tenants.
12. Competitive tenders have been sought for this work and the lowest received was for the sum of £41,403.00. The other tenders received were for £43,992.00 and £46,374.67.

Legal Implications

13. There is no statutory duty on Oxford City Council to fund aids and adaptations work. If the Council did not use its Aids and Adaptations budget, the tenant could make a statutory Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) application to fund up to £30k (the maximum allowed) but as this would have to be funded from the HRA (as it is a Council tenant), the use of the Aids and Adaptations budget is the most appropriate way of addressing this.
14. The project was competitively tendered in accordance with the City Council's constitution.

Equalities Implications

15. Carrying out this work will enable the disabled tenant to stay in their own home and will meet their disability needs as assessed by the Occupational Therapist.

Name and contact details of author: Chris Pyle
cpyle@oxford.gov.uk
Extension: 2330

List of background papers: Occupational Therapists referral (Confidential).
Tender returns.

Version number: 3

Single Member Decision Report Risk Register – Council Wider Property Repair and Maintenance

Risk Score															
Impact Score: 1 = Insignificant; 2 = Minor; 3 = Moderate; 4 = Major; 5 = Catastrophic															
Probability Score: 1 = Rare; 2 = Unlikely; 3 = Possible; 4 = Likely; 5 = Almost Certain															
No.	Risk Description	Gross Risk		Cause of Risk	Mitigation	Net Risk		Further Management of Risk: Transfer/Accept/Reduce/Avoid		Monitoring Effectiveness				Current Risk	
		I	P			I	P			Q	Q	Q	Q	I	P
		1	2			1	2			1	2	3	4		
1.	Delays cause increase in costs	1	2	Recommendations not approved, causing delays and contractor will not stand by price.	Mitigating Control: Keep contractor in touch with process. (M)	1	2	Action: Accept Action Owner: C Pyle Mitigating Control: Accept Control Owner: C Pyle	Outcome required: Approval Milestone Date: 21 August 2011	1	2	3	4		
2.	Delays and increase in costs	2	2	Contractor goes into administration	Mitigating Control: Approach next lowest contractor Level of Effectiveness: (M)	2	2	Action: Accept Action Owner: C Pyle Mitigating Control: Accept Control Owner: C Pyle	Outcome required: Milestone Date:						
3.	Poor quality of work	1	2	Contractors operatives poor	Mitigating Control: strong contract management procedures ensures early identification of faults (M)	1	2	Action: Accept Action Owner: C Pyle Mitigating Control: Accept Control Owner: C Pyle	Outcome required: Approval Milestone Date: 21 August 2011	1	2	3	4		
4.	Delays and increase in costs	2	2	Contractor capacity issues	Mitigating Control: seek compensation and approach next lowest tenderer. Level of Effectiveness: (M)	1	1	Action: Accept Action Owner: C Pyle Mitigating Control: Accept Control Owner: C Pyle	Outcome required: Milestone Date:						

This page is intentionally left blank