

**To:** Delegated Decisions of the Board Member, Housing Needs

**Date:** 3rd November 2011

**Item No:**

**Report of:** Head of Corporate Assets

**Title of Report:** Proposed Extensions for the Disabled at 1 Outram Road, 9 Bears Hedge, 74 Balfour Road and 5 Nicholson Road.

### Summary and Recommendations

**Purpose of report:** To seek approval for the proposal to erect single storey rear extensions to four Council houses for the use of disabled persons.

**Key decision?** Yes

**Single Member decision:** Councillor Joe McManners ~ Housing Needs

**Report approved by:**

**Finance:** Yes

**Legal:** Yes

**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 Capital budget for the erection of rear extensions to 1 Outram Road (estimated cost £50,000), 9 Bears Hedge (lowest tendered sum £39,635), 74 Balfour Road (lowest tendered sum £45,883) and 5 Nicholson Road (lowest tendered sum £29,562) for the existing disabled tenants and otherwise on terms to be agreed by the Head of Corporate Assets.

### Appendices

1. Risk Register.

## **Background**

1. The properties concerned are:-
  - a) 1 Outram Road - a four bedroom pre-war semi-detached house of traditional brick/render construction, under a tiled roof. The Occupational Therapist's (OT) recommendation is to provide a ground floor double bedroom to enable the carer to be in the same room and an adjacent wet room with wc. An application for Planning approval will be submitted in due course.
  - b) 9 Bears Hedge - a two bedroom post war house of traditional brick construction under a concrete tiled roof. The OT has recommended a ground floor bedroom with adjacent wet room and wc. Planning approval has been obtained for this project.
  - c) 74 Balfour Road – a three bedroom easiform non-traditional semi-detached house. The OT has recommended a ground floor bedroom with adjacent shower room and wc. Planning approval has been obtained for this project.
  - d) 5 Nicholson Road – a three bedroom post war house of traditional construction. The OT has recommended a ground floor bedroom with shower and wc room. This work is for a disabled child and the family are happy for the existing dining room to be used as a bedroom with a small extension for the shower room/wc. This extension is classed as permitted development and Planning permission is not required.
2. All are secure tenancies and have the support of family and friends in the area who help out and consequently they do not wish to move to another area. Often the trauma of moving home has a detrimental affect on the disabled person's medical condition.
3. Owing to the difficulties that the existing disabled tenants have with using the stairs and first floor bathroom, the Occupational Therapist (OT) and the Council's Housing Projects team have sought to find a cost effective solution to suit the tenants' needs.
4. In all cases the position of the stairs and the room layout, precludes the installation of a stair-lift and through-floor lift. This has meant that in all cases 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. In the case of 5 Nicholson Road, the existing dining room is to be used as a bedroom and a smaller extension built for the wet room in order to save costs.
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 per property. Competitive tenders have been invited for three of these projects, the results off which are shown in the Financial Implications section. 1

Outram Road is currently being designed in conjunction with the OT and the cost is estimated.

### **Options**

6. Because of the limitations with the existing properties, there are only two viable options. The first option is to build single storey rear extensions 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 but as is normally the case, suitable accommodation has not been found and, with the tenants' condition deteriorating, it is now important that the works proceed without undue delay. The Choice Based Lettings scheme does not help this process and officers are seeking to find ways to improve the situation by consulting with other authorities and reviewing the processes.

### **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 are being built in accordance with the current Building Regulations and double glazed category A PVCu windows will be installed. Showers, aerated basin taps and dual flush wc's are specified to reduce water consumption.

### **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 tenants as their condition deteriorates.
  - Possible injury to the tenant due to the difficulty in climbing the existing stairs.
  - Increased pressure on the carers within the family.

### **Financial Implications**

11. The Capital budget sum of £900,000 was approved by Council in February 2011 for carrying out disabled adaptation work for Council tenants. The level of spend at 31 August 2011 was £554,866. As this budget is a responsive one, based upon OT recommendations, close monitoring of referrals will be undertaken as, if spend continues at the current rate, it is predicted that there will be an overspend of the budget.

This will result in projects being delayed or the approval of additional funding.

12. Competitive tenders have been sought for three of these projects, as outlined below:-
  - a) 9 Bears Hedge, the lowest tender sum being £39,635.06. The other tenders received were for £41,308.00 and £44,778.00.
  - b) 74 Balfour Road, the lowest tender sum being £45,883.00. The other tender received was for £58,636.00.
  - c) 1 Outram Road is estimated to cost £50,000.
  - d) 5 Nicholson Road, the lowest tender sum being £29,562. The other tenders received were for £46,853 and £60,300.

### **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 also have to be funded from the HRA (as it is for Council tenants), the use of the Aids and Adaptations budget is the most appropriate way of addressing this.
14. The projects were 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 need as assessed by the Occupational Therapist.

**Name and contact details of author:** Chris Pyle  
[cpyle@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:cpyle@oxford.gov.uk)  
Extension: 2330

**List of background papers:** Occupational Therapist's referral (Confidential).  
Tender returns.

**Version number: 4** (14.10.2010)

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

Risk Score <b>Impact Score:</b> 1 = Insignificant; 2 = Minor; 3 = Moderate; 4 = Major; 5 = Catastrophic <b>Probability Score:</b> 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	Action	Outcome	Q	Q	Q	Q	I	P
1.	Delays cause increase in costs	1 2	P 2	Recommendations not approved, causing delays and contractor will not stand by price.	Mitigating Control: Keep contractor in touch with process. (M)	1 2	P 2	Action: Accept Action Owner: C Pyle Mitigating Control: Accept Control Owner: C Pyle	Outcome required: Approval Milestone Date: 21 August 2011	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	I	P
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	P 2	Contractors operatives poor	Mitigating Control: strong contract management procedures ensures early identification of faults (M)	1 2	P 2	Action: Accept Action Owner: C Pyle Mitigating Control: Accept Control Owner: C Pyle	Outcome required: Approval Milestone Date: 21 August 2011	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	I	P
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