

SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**SCIA 16 (16/17)**

Chief Officer:	Chief Housing Officer	Service:	Housing
Activity	Housing Advice and Standards	No. of Staff:	3 statutory fte (1 fte is externally funded)

Activity Budget Change	2016/17 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
Housing Register managed by West Kent Housing Association (WKHA)	(15)	Ongoing

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

The housing register has been managed for the Council by WKHA since 1989 when the housing stock was transferred. Over the last few years the cost has increased more than inflation. The budget is currently £89,000 per annum.

Through negotiation with WKHA it is expected that a reduction in the cost of providing the service can be delivered to ensure the arrangement continues to deliver value for money to both organisations.

Key Stakeholders Affected

Homeless people
Housing Advice team
WKHA
Social Services

Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)

If the Register is still managed by WKHA it will provide continuation of service and improved value for money and importantly not confuse the people applying for re-housing.

If the saving is agreed by WKHA (due to some innovative ideas currently being discussed) then this will be a positive situation.

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

Low

SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**2015/16 Budget**

	£'000
Operational Cost	89
Income	-
Net Cost	89

Equality Impacts

The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no perceived impact on end users.

SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**SCIA 17 (16/17)**

Chief Officer:	Chief Housing Officer	Service:	Housing
Activity	Disabled Facilities Grants	No. of Staff:	2.5 fte

Activity Budget Change	2016/17 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
Fee income from Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) management	(20)	Ongoing

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

As the DFG process is now managed successfully in house, it is proposed to generate around £20,000 per annum fee income for undertaking certain work in the process.

A fee (being considered but could be 12% of the grant being paid out) for officers to provide technical expertise, project management and procuring contractors to deliver works.

Key Stakeholders Affected

DFG applicants
KCC Social Services

Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)

This process will not adversely affect DFG applicants as the process for them will be the same. It is about extending the support side of the service rather than other organisations charging for their time.

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

Low

2015/16 Budget

	£'000
Operational Cost	534
Income	(477)
Net Cost (capital)	57

Equality Impacts

The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no perceived impact on end users.

SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**SCIA 18 (16/17)**

Chief Officer:	Chief Housing Officer	Service:	Housing
Activity	Private Sector Lettings scheme	No. of Staff:	1 fte (shared between 2 staff)

Activity Budget Change	2016/17 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
To reduce the Private Sector Lettings (PSL) scheme budget	(5)	Ongoing

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

The scheme assists potentially homeless people to rent in the private sector and reduces homelessness by offering rent in advance and a deposit bond as a loan.

The reduction of £5,000 per annum will not affect the scheme because the team is now negotiating for Discretionary Housing Payments in applicable cases which will cover this amount.

Key Stakeholders Affected

Homeless people. Landlords (private sector)

Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)

There will be no negative impact on the service or homeless people as Discretionary Housing Payment will meet the gap if not, homeless funding can be used.

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

Low

2015/16 Budget

	£'000
Operational Cost	10
Income	-
Net Cost	10

Equality Impacts

The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no perceived impact on end users.