



GWSF RESPONSE TO SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON THE RSL ADAPTATIONS BUDGET AND FUNDING CRITERIA FOR 2012/13

INTRODUCTION

GWSF is the leading membership body for community-controlled housing associations and co-operatives (CCHAs) in Glasgow and the West of Scotland.

We have 55 members throughout the west of Scotland. CCHAs provide affordable, quality rented housing for around 75,000 households in the region, often working in disadvantaged communities that have high levels of poverty and poor health.

In May this year, GWSF published the results of a members' survey carried out in response to the Scottish Government guidance note on adaptations published in March. The survey report is attached to this response, and is relevant to the present consultation.

RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

Questions 1 to 3 combined

£300/£500/£1,000 funding cuts per adaptation

- a) The £300/£500/£1,000 funding thresholds set out in the latest consultation are arbitrary. They do not alter GWSF's principled opposition to housing associations being forced to fund **any** part of the cost of adaptations.
- b) The Government suggests that passing on part of its own responsibilities is about getting "the maximum return for our expenditure on adaptations". We strongly disagree.

If the Government were to make housing associations responsible for funding adaptations, the people who will foot the bill for direct contributions to adaptations (whether £300, £500 or £1,000) are other housing association tenants.

This would simply compound a growing tendency for housing association tenants to have to pay directly for services when other council tax payers do not. In Glasgow, this includes costs such as bulk uplifts of refuse, and council services to address anti social behaviour.

- c) Housing associations house many of the poorest households in Scotland. Tenants' rents will need to subsidise the adaptations their neighbours need to live independently and with dignity, and the Government will be imposing an additional

financial burden on the poorest people in Scottish society. This is impossible to justify, particularly when the Government's "Social Wage" policy includes free prescriptions and council tax freezes for every household in Scotland, regardless of their income.

- d) The Government should be aware that if it introduces direct contributions in 2012/13, the outcomes would be highly damaging. In our May 2011 survey:
- Almost all of our members told us that there was a strong likelihood that older and disabled tenants would face longer waiting times for adaptations;
 - Many said they would be forced to cut services for other tenants to bridge the funding gap;
 - A significant number said they would stop carrying out adaptation works altogether.
- e) Adaptations are a prime example of the kind of cost-effective, preventative spending the Programme for Government says we need more of. Adaptations account for less than 0.5% of public expenditure on health and social care in Scotland. With these two facts in mind, cutting adaptations funding is short-sighted and at odds with the Government's "Re-shaping Care" policy and its draft National Strategy for Housing for Older People.
- f) We welcome the fact that the Scottish Government has initiated a more fundamental review of adaptations through the Adaptations Working Group. It is vital to make the process work better for older and disabled people, and to embed adaptations as an integral rather than a marginal part of "Re-Shaping Care" strategies and programmes at local level. It is also essential to address the many geographical, sectoral and tenure-based inconsistencies that successive Scottish governments have allowed to emerge.
- g) Short-term change will only intensify these inconsistencies. It would be more sensible to consider changes to adaptations funding for housing association tenants as part of the "whole system" review that is now underway. Otherwise, adaptations funding will become even more of a postcode and tenure lottery than it already is.
- h) We note that no equalities impact assessment has been provided with the present consultation document, and assume that this will be provided with any proposals to change the present funding arrangements. This will be a key area of interest for many stakeholders if the Government proceeds to introduce funding contributions by housing associations for 2012/13. Our view is that such measures would increase existing inequalities within the overall adaptations funding system, and could therefore result in legal challenge.

Question 4

Administration allowances for adaptations

- a) An arbitrary removal of administrative allowances would mean that housing associations (and therefore all of their tenants) would need to directly subsidise the provision of adaptations for older and disabled tenants. We have already explained our concerns about this in our response to questions 1 to 3.

Question 5

Alternative proposals

- a) The Government should not make arbitrary, short-term changes that require housing associations and their tenants to part-fund adaptations. Instead, it should make informed, long-term decisions based on the findings of the Adaptations Working Group.
- b) If the Government is intent on making such changes, it should do so in a way that is consistent with its own policies on “Re-shaping Care” and preventative spending. As described in our response to question 16, we are not yet seeing much practical evidence of action on the ground to prioritise preventative spending that has a specific housing dimension.
- c) If the Government intends to make further Change Fund awards for 2012/13, it could make these conditional on NHS Boards assuming funding responsibility for certain types or levels of health-related adaptations, to be funded from the balance of care savings the Government expects them to achieve. This would be a more rational way of shifting some element of financial responsibilities from central government, instead of placing a tax on low-income households in our poorest communities.

Question 6

Allocation of funding for adaptations

- a) GWSF members operate in single local authority areas rather than across many, so we do not have the same perspective as specialist housing associations will be able to offer on this important question. However, we are aware of a host of different funding practices.
- b) For example, some LSVT RSLs receive adaptations funding, while others (including GHA and the GWSF members who have purchased housing under second stage transfers) do not. In the latter scenario, adaptations are effectively fully funded, because the cost of future adaptations was built into pre-transfer valuations and business plans.
- c) GWSF members that have added former GHA stock to their existing housing face the prospect of a two-tier funding system for works to older and disabled tenants' homes:

- Adaptations to houses acquired from GHA would be fully funded, as described above;
 - Adaptations to other stock would be part-funded by tenants, if the Government introduces funding thresholds for 2012/13.
- d) Similarly, there are anomalies in how different local authorities fund adaptations for owner-occupiers and private renters.
- In formal terms, adaptations for these groups are always means-tested, with full funding dependent on the receipt of certain types of benefits.
 - But to give just one example, we are aware of at least one local authority in our membership area that funds the full cost of the installation and future maintenance of stair lifts for all owner-occupiers who need this equipment, regardless of income.
- e) Before any changes to adaptations funding are made, it is essential for the Scottish Government to publish its own detailed analysis of funding allocations and practice across Scotland, across all tenures. As far as we are aware, the Government has not yet done this. This will mean that short-term funding changes for 2012/13 will lack a satisfactory evidence base. It would also mean that the Government may be seen as having failed to conduct a sufficiently robust equalities impact assessment.

Question 7

Timescales and processes for adaptations

No response

Question 8

Monitoring and reporting of adaptations expenditure

- a) The Scottish Government is the main funder of RSL adaptations in 30 out of 32 Scottish local authority areas, but it publishes very little information about adaptations. We would like to see a much better level of information published by the Government itself.

Question 9

Adaptations in communal areas

No response.

Question 10

Assessment of need, consistency and prioritisation

- a) See our response to question 6. While it is good that housing associations are being asked about their individual experiences, we would expect the Government to provide its own evidence and perspective, given that it is the main funder of housing association adaptations in 30 out of 32 local authority areas.

- b) The members' survey we published in May provided some anecdotal evidence of concerns on the part of some housing associations about needs assessment and prioritisation. For example, timescales for completing assessments and the impact on tenants; concern that in some cases occupational therapists may be "over-specifying" the type of work required; and concerns that OTs do not consider that future maintenance issues.

Question 11

Issues for RSLs with supported accommodation

No response

Question 12

Funding in Glasgow and Edinburgh

- a) Our members have not reported any problems that result specifically from the TMDF arrangements.
- b) They are more concerned that funding for adaptations does not meet the level of demand among their tenants, and that this results in longer waiting times for older and disabled tenants.

Question 13

Procurement processes

- a) Unless the Government has carried out its own analysis of procurement costs and issues, we suggest this is best addressed by the Adaptations Working Group.
- b) We recognise that there could be potential for framework contracts open to multiple landlords, to help reduce costs for commonly procured items. Similarly, there could be potential for local care and repair projects or others to play a co-ordinating role, but this would need to be properly resourced,

Question 14

Maintenance and re-use

- a) These are major concerns for our members, since the maintenance of adaptations has to be funded from general rental income. The need to remove adaptations when properties are re-let is a financial burden for smaller landlords in particular.

Question 15

Use of own resources

No response

Question 16

Current management of adaptations budget and wider policies to support independent living

- a) Current Scottish Government policies are clear in recognising the social and economic value of housing adaptations. Our May 2011 report on adaptations drew on evidence published by the Government to demonstrate the cost–effectiveness of adaptations as a preventative spending measure. Across the 1,500 property adaptations covered by our members’ survey, we found that the average cost per property was £2,267, a fraction of the costs to the public purse of failing to allow older and disabled people to continue living independently at home or of hospital admissions as a result of falls in the home etc.
- b) The present funding arrangements are not adequately supporting the achievement of the Government’s policy aims, on two levels.
- Firstly, present budget provision does not match demand and results in lengthy waiting times for some tenants.

This will become an even bigger problem if present budgets are reduced and if the Government passes on part of the cost of individual adaptations in 2012/13, ahead of its broader review of adaptations policy.

If the Government is serious about meeting its wider policy goals, it should be increasing rather than cutting the adaptations budget, and focusing attention on reducing expenditure in high cost and preventable areas within health and social care.

- Secondly, the policy intention of reducing expenditure on residential and acute services towards preventative solutions is not yet being delivered on the ground.

The Government’s “Re-Shaping Care” policy and the ideas set out in its draft National Strategy for Housing for Older People both present the right way forward for the future. But at local level, we have yet to see real evidence of strategic or financial commitment to the part that housing solutions such as adaptations can play in making the desired changes real and sustainable.

Question 17

Additional comments

- a) We have discussed our response with the Scottish Federation of Housing Associations (SFHA), the national representative body for the RSL sector in Scotland. Between us, SFHA and GWSF represent the vast majority of the bodies who will be directly affected by changes to present funding arrangements for adaptations.

- b) GWSF and SFHA are both strongly opposed to the introduction of arbitrary and short-term funding contributions by housing associations towards the cost of adaptations. We will continue to campaign vigorously for a fair deal for housing associations and their tenants.

**Glasgow and West of Scotland Forum of Housing Associations
September 2011**



Glasgow and West of Scotland
Forum of Housing Associations



Briefing on Funding for Housing Adaptations

May 2011

Summary

Glasgow and West of Scotland Forum of Housing Associations (GWSF) is a campaigning body for community-controlled housing associations and co-operatives. We have 55 members in west and central Scotland.

On 31 March 2011, the Scottish Government issued a **Guidance Note on funding adaptations to the homes of older and disabled housing association tenants**. The Guidance Note took immediate effect, without consulting housing associations or any of the older and disabled people who will be affected.

In future, registered social landlords (RSLs) will be required to fund adaptation works costing less than £1,000 per house **and** the first £1,000 per house on all adaptations above this amount.

This Briefing sets out the results of a member questionnaire issued by GWSF during April 2011, to:

- **Measure the financial impact** of the funding cuts in the Guidance Note
- **Collect and report members' views** about the Guidance Note and how it will affect adaptations work in future.

30 GWSF members (owning around 27,000 houses at 31 March 2010) completed the questionnaire.

The information they have provided shows that:

- The 30 landlords carried out around **1,500 property adaptations** in the last three years, around **6% of all of their housing**. So the cuts in funding will affect large numbers of tenants.
- **Funding for adaptations is already reducing** for many housing associations, even before the latest cuts are implemented. As a result, **more vulnerable tenants are already on waiting lists** to have essential work carried out. **This will increase** if the cuts are enforced.
- The average cost of adaptations in our survey was **£2,267 per property** – a low cost for helping older and disabled tenants live independently in their own homes
- Applied to all of the adaptations carried out in the last three years, the new guidance would have **cut government funding by a massive 41%**. For some individual landlords, the cut would have been even higher.
- The likely effect of the new guidance is that **tenants will have to wait longer for essential adaptations** to be carried out. Many housing associations say they will be forced to **consider cuts in the services they provide to all of their tenants** to meet the funding gap. And a significant number of GWSF members have said that they **may have to stop carrying out adaptation works altogether**.

In the same month as the new housing adaptations guidance, the Scottish Government also published a major policy document on “**Reshaping Care for Older People**”. This says:

“Our policy goal is to optimise the independence and wellbeing of older people at home or in a homely setting. This will involve a substantial shift in focus of care from institutional settings to care at home – because it is what people want and provides better value for money...

There is now a body of evidence which demonstrates the contribution which housing and housing related services (such as adaptations and housing support) play in supporting older people to live independently at home....

The provision of equipment and adaptations, as opposed to more costly interventions such as home care or residential care, can also produce significant savings for health and social care partnerships”

The “Reshaping Care” report quotes from a Bristol University study for the HM Government Office for Disability Issues¹, to support these statements. The Bristol study says that:

- For a **seriously disabled person** using a wheelchair, residential care costs £700-£800 a week (£400,000 in 10 years)
- **Residential care for an older person** costs £26,000 per person per annum
- An **hour’s home care per day** costs £5,000 a year. Where adaptations

remove or reduce the need for daily visits, savings are estimated to be between £1,200 to £29,000 per case

- The **average cost to the State of a fractured hip** is £28,665 (100 times the cost of fitting hand and grab rails to prevent falls)
- Older people suffering from depression are at **higher risk of hip fractures**. There is evidence of a 70% increase in feelings of safety among older people after an adaptation has been carried out their home.
- **£6,000 spent on major adaptations** lasting 5 years would only purchase an average home care package of 6.5 hours per week for 1 year and 3 months.

Housing adaptations play a vital part in enabling thousands of older and disabled people to live independently and with dignity in their own homes as they wish.

The Government already recognises that this represents excellent value for public spending, by reducing demands on health and social care budgets. In these circumstances, passing on a substantial part of the costs of adaptations to housing associations and their tenants is completely unjustified.

GWSF calls upon the incoming Scottish Government to withdraw the adaptations Guidance Note as a matter of urgency.

¹ “Better outcomes, lower costs: Implications for health and social care budgets of investment in housing adaptations, improvements and equipment: a review of the evidence”, University of Bristol, 2007

Introduction

1. This Briefing sets out the results of a GWSF member questionnaire, on funding changes for Stage 3 adaptation works to the homes of housing association tenants.
2. Adaptations are works of a structural or permanent nature that allow older and disabled people to continue to live in their own homes. They include grab rails and ramps, providing suitable bathing and toilet facilities, and in some cases major structural alterations such as lifts.
3. On 31 March 2011, the Scottish Government issued a guidance note which announced three major changes to adaptations funding:

- Registered social landlords (RSLs) to fund Stage 3 adaptation work costing less than £1,000 per house **and** the first £1,000 per house on all adaptations above this amount.
- Where possible, RSLs to be encouraged to increase their contribution above the £1,000 minimum, to “enable a higher contribution towards meeting the needs of an ageing population and the disabled”.
- The standard administration allowance RSLs receive in respect of their own costs in managing adaptations works (10% of the works cost) to be removed

4. These new arrangements took effect on 1 April, 2011, the day after the guidance note was published.

GWSF’s Questionnaire

5. Our questionnaire sought to:
 - Quantify the number and cost of adaptations during the last three financial years (2008/09 to 2010/11)
 - Measure the financial impact of the funding cuts set out in the guidance note
 - Gauge members’ views about guidance itself and the implications for funding adaptations in future.
6. We received 30 detailed responses from GWSF members. The housing associations and co-operatives who completed it are listed at **Appendix 1**.

Key numbers from the GWSF questionnaire

7. All but one of the organisations responding to our questionnaire are “general” rather than specialist housing providers. The impact of the new funding arrangements will be even greater for housing associations that specialise in providing housing for older or disabled people.
8. **Level of adaptations activity**
- The 30 questionnaire respondents have carried out **1,506 adaptations** in the last three years.
 - This represents **6% of the 30 landlords’ total housing stock** at 31 March 2010, showing that there is a significant need for adaptations housed by general housing providers.
 - Some organisations are carrying out a considerably higher level of adaptations.
 - 12 of the 30 landlords have carried out more than 50 adaptations each in the last 3 years (highest individual value: 169 adaptations)
 - 7 of the 30 landlords have carried out adaptations to 8% or more of their total housing stock over the same period (highest individual value: 18%)
 - The number of adaptations completed in 2010/11 was approximately **20% less** than in each of the two preceding financial years. Several respondents said this was due to **reductions in funding for 2010/11** and that they now have **adaptations waiting lists** as a result.
 - The questionnaire results suggest a **double squeeze** going forward - **less funding overall, and less funding for individual adaptations**
9. **Past funding for adaptations**
- **Grant received** for the 1,506 adaptations reported for the last 3 years was £3,413,630 – **an average of £2,267 per adaptation**
 - As would be expected, the **average grant cost per housing association** varied – from £1,289 per adaptation to £4,023 per adaptation

10. Quantifying the impact of the cut in funding

- Respondents calculated what funding they would have received over the last three years, applying the new funding arrangements announced in the March 2011 guidance note.
- Across all 30 organisations, the total cut in funding for the last 3 years would have been £1,401,310 – **a cut of more than 41%**. Under the new guidance, this would have to be funded directly by each housing association or co-operative.
- For individual housing and co-operatives, the **size of the cut for individual housing associations ranges from 25% to 77%**.
- Those facing the largest cuts in percentage terms were landlords carrying out **larger numbers of lower cost adaptations under £1,000** where the new cut-off figure for access to grant has a disproportionate effect
- In addition to the cut in funding for works costs, the new guidance note abolishes entitlement to **allowances** for housing associations, to contribute to the costs of staff time spent liaising with tenants, occupational therapists etc and in commissioning the works themselves. Over the 3 year period to 31 March 2011, the value of **allowances income** to the 30 questionnaire respondents would have been **£300,366**

11. Paying for the cut

- The questionnaire asked what options housing associations and co-operatives would consider to fund the cut in adaptations funding.
- In almost all cases, the questionnaire was completed before discussion by management committees, so the results are best viewed as an indication rather than a definitive statement of the options that are likely to be considered.
- The questionnaire provided a number of options (as shown in the table below), and allowed respondents to specify more than one option.

The results were as follows:

	Number of responses	% of responses
Set a service charge/adjust rent for adapted properties only	3	11%
Increase rents across all tenancies	3	11%
Meet from existing income, by making savings or cuts elsewhere	13	46%
Ration the number of adaptations carried out	19	68%
Ration the type of adaptations carried out (eg high cost adaptations may not be funded)	12	43%
Stop carrying out adaptations altogether	11	39%

The implications arising are that:

- Very few respondents are prepared to fund adaptations by levying **rent increases on all of their tenants**
- In a small number of cases, consideration may be given to setting a **service charge specifically for adapted properties** – although concerns were expressed about this option in relation to the impact on disabled tenants and in relation to housing benefit eligibility
- Almost two-thirds of respondents said they will be forced to **ration the number or type of adaptations carry out** – illustrating the clear potential for the Government guidance to have a deeply damaging impact on individual tenants in need of adaptations
- A substantial minority of respondents (almost 40%) said they would be forced to consider **not carrying out adaptations at all**, if the funding cuts are enforced
- Just under half of respondents (46%) said they would consider **making cuts in other service areas** to contribute to the cost of adaptations. But only one of the 30 respondents identified this as the only option it would consider. All other respondents said they would need to consider other options as well (notably rationing the number or type of adaptations carried out).

Key comments from the GWSF questionnaire

How the guidance was introduced, and its immediate impact

12. GWSF members expressed strong concerns that the Guidance simply announced the new funding arrangements as a matter of fact, without any prior consultation and without providing any reasons for the change in funding.
13. These are some typical comments from the questionnaire responses:

“We are astonished at the way in which the proposed changes were announced without any proper form of consultation with RSLs, disability interest groups, health and social work bodies or the public in general”.

“This is an outrageous decision. What happened to consultation?”

14. From a practical perspective, members were also concerned that the guidance had been published without any opportunity to plan for its introduction:

“We haven't budgeted for this expenditure in the forthcoming year”

“Budgets for 2011/12 have already been set and tenants have been advised of the rent increase – so unfunded costs for this year will have to be borne in full by the Association”.

“This is an immediate cost to the Association that has not been budgeted for”.

The adaptations cuts and wider government policy

15. Several responses described the adaptations cuts as a crude measure, at odds with wider government policy on health and social care issues:

“Where is the cost benefit analysis of often small but much needed improvements to our tenants’ homes? In our own case, we have received just over £100,000 to fund adaptations in the last three years. This would barely have provided the subsidy needed to build two new affordable homes. The funding we have received has allowed 55 existing tenants to receive a piece of kit that has allowed them to continue living independently. This far outweighs the arguments for making such drastic cuts that will directly affect some of our most vulnerable tenants”.

“We are told that bed blocking is a major cost to the NHS. It costs well over £1,000 to keep a patient in a hospital bed overnight. Restricting funding for adaptations is short-sighted and will add to health service costs, because it will delay discharges of patients from hospital”.

“We see this as an attack on vulnerable households that will restrict our ability to keep many people in their homes for longer thus reducing other more expensive costs to the public purse such as nursing and hospital care”.

16. Housing associations across Scotland have expressed similar views, along with advocacy groups such as Age Scotland and the Scottish Disability Equality Forum.

The impact of the cuts on older and disabled tenants

17. The most frequently expressed concern was **the damaging impact the cuts in funding will have on older and disabled tenants:**

“The proposed changes will have significant implications for our tenants and their ability to stay in their homes. The current timescales from tenants being assessed by the occupational therapist to actually having the adaptation carried out are already ridiculously long. These proposed changes will exacerbate the problem for our tenants”.

“We would be unable to accommodate the additional costs and therefore anticipate that we would have to stop carrying out adaptations. In addition to the funding needed when adaptations are first provided, we also need to consider the reinstatement costs when an adapted property is relet”.

“In effect the Association can no longer afford to assist people to remain in their homes. Due to our predominately elderly client group this may have a significant impact on our tenants”.

“People will wait longer for adaptations as a result of this guidance. We may have to encourage tenants to transfer to another house rather than have their own house adapted. This will not be a popular option since most adaptations are for elderly people who will be reluctant to move or whose transfer options will be limited for health reasons”.

“Our Management Committee has decided it has no choice but to continue providing adaptations because these make such a positive difference to tenants with mobility problems. They view the new guidance as an attack on the most vulnerable people in our communities and an attempt by the Government to back RSLs into a corner on this issue”.

“As a result of the guidance, it is likely that we would no longer do adaptations such as showers over baths, concentrating instead on those which are high cost and could not be

done by tenants themselves”.
“We will have no choice but to introduce a waiting list for adaptations, based on urgent need. Dependent on the costs involved, the Association may need to consider adjusting rents for adapted properties in future”.
“We think our management committee will decide not to carry out adaptations in future, other than in exceptional cases”.
“Depending on the number and cost of adaptations, we may have to consider limiting the number of adaptations carried out and may have to turn down high cost adaptations for budgetary reasons”.
“It is very likely that we will stop carrying out adaptations – these should be funded from health rather than housing budgets”.
“It is likely we would consider increasing rents for the specific properties which are adapted and work out a figure based on depreciation/expected life of the component. Therefore, those properties with more expensive adaptations are likely to pay more especially if the item needs replaced fairly regularly”.
<p>“One of our recent adaptations was for a through the floor lift to meet the needs of a child with cerebral palsy, at a cost of nearly £18,000. It is likely that we would be required to make a greater contribution than the £1,000 minimum stated in the guidance note”.</p> <p>“We already contribute to the cost of adaptations by re-cycling the “allowance” into direct work and we also front load adaptations if work is required in advance of HAG being made available. Consequently, with this flexibility and assistance from Glasgow City Council, we have until now managed to complete all OT referrals received each year without creating a waiting list. At the very least, the new guidance will prevent us from achieving that in future”.</p>

The impact of cuts in overall funding levels

18. Respondents expressed concern that as well as passing on part of the costs to housing associations, cuts are also taking place to the overall level of funding being made available for adaptations.

“We were able to fund all our adaptations in 2008/09 and 2009/10 through HAG. However, our adaptations funding was capped at £10,000 for 2010/11 and as a result we now have a waiting list for adaptations”.
“We currently have 8 referrals for Stage 3 Adaptations that have been on hold since 2010/2011 funding ran out last August.”
“We have been allocated £22,000 to carry out adaptations in 2011/12, the funding we asked for to clear the existing backlog was £50,000. Simply to clear the current

backlog, the new guidance will require us to find £14,250 that we have not budgeted for. Currently, we have three tenants waiting for ramps to be installed in their homes – they are effectively housebound unless they can be lifted into and out of their homes”.

“The funding available to us for adaptations is only half of what it was last year. Combined with the change in funding for individual adaptations, this will mean a lot of tenants will have to wait longer for work to be done”.

The impact of the adaptations cuts on other tenants

19. GWSF members expressed strong concerns that the cost of the cuts in adaptations funding would ultimately be borne by all of their tenants, even if this is not reflected in a specific rent increase across all tenancies.

If the guidance is not withdrawn, it is likely that other services would need to be cut. Whatever mechanism is used to fund the £1,000 contribution, tenants will still be paying for the work”.

“We operate in an area with some of the worst indices for poverty, employment, health etc in the country and therefore it is likely that requests for medical adaptations will continue at current levels, if not greater. This is likely to have an ongoing impact upon our budgets or may require other services or activities to be cut, if medical adaptations are prioritised”.

“Are we really expecting those in poverty to pay for their neighbours’ health adaptations?”

“It is unlikely we will continue to carry out an adaptations programme if this Guidance is implemented. Our Management Committee has already expressed concern that existing tenants are continually being asked to pay for Government initiatives such as maintaining open waiting lists, the implications arising from the Tenants’ Charter, increased levels of private finance etc. This is yet another example of costs being transferred to our tenants”.

“In future, we would be reluctant to increase rents across all tenancies, but may have no choice but to do this”.

Inconsistent funding frameworks

20. Some respondents drew attention to the inconsistent funding arrangements that apply to adaptations.

“Tenants of private landlords and owner occupiers have adaptations paid for through Council Tax, which our tenants also pay”.

“100% grants are paid to private sector tenants and owner occupiers where the disabled person is receiving specified income-related benefits. There is inconsistency in across different sectors in how adaptations are funded – the whole system needs to be overhauled”.

“This is the latest example of the poorest in society paying twice for a service that is available to tenants of private landlords and owner occupiers”.

Appendix 1

GWSF Members who completed the Adaptations Funding Questionnaire

Arklet Housing Association
Barrhead Housing Association
Blairtummock Housing Association
Blochairn Housing Association
Calvay Housing Association
Cathcart & District Housing Association
Copperworks Housing Co-operative
Craigdale Housing Association
Drumchapel Housing Co-operative
Elderpark Housing Association
Ferguslie Park Housing Association
Govan Housing Association
Govanhill Housing Association
Milnbank Housing Association
Molendinar Park Housing Association
New Gorbals Housing Association
North Glasgow Housing Association
Paisley South Housing Association
Parkhead Housing Association
Queens Cross Housing Association
Reidvale Housing Association
Rosehill Housing Co-operative
Ruchazie Housing Association
Southside Housing Association
Spire View Housing Association
Thenew Housing Association
Thistle Housing Association
Wellhouse Housing Association
Williamsburgh Housing Association
Yorkhill Housing Association