



*Disabled Facilities Grant Programme:  
The Government's proposals to  
improve programme delivery*

---

Summary of responses





*Disabled Facilities Grant Programme:  
The Government's proposals to  
improve programme delivery*

Summary of responses

Department for Communities and Local Government  
Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London  
SW1E 5DU

Telephone: 020 7944 4400

Website: [www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

© Crown Copyright, 2007

*Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.*

*This publication, excluding logos, may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium for research, private study or for internal circulation within an organisation. This is subject to it being reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the publication specified.*

Any other use of the contents of this publication would require a copyright licence. Please apply for a Click-Use Licence for core material at [www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/online/pLogin.asp](http://www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/online/pLogin.asp), or by writing to the Office of Public Sector Information, Information Policy Team, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich, NR3 1BQ.

Fax: 01603 723000 or email: [HMSOlicensing@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:HMSOlicensing@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk)

If you require this publication in an alternative format please email [alternativeformats@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:alternativeformats@communities.gsi.gov.uk)  
Communities and Local Government Publications

PO Box 236

Wetherby

West Yorkshire

LS23 7NB

Tel: 08701 226 236

Fax: 08701 226 237

Textphone: 08701 207 405

Email: [communities@twoten.com](mailto:communities@twoten.com)

or online via the Communities and Local Government website: [www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

August 2007

Product Code: 07HC04533/11

# Contents

|  | Page      |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Introduction</b>                                    | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Consultation proposals and summary of responses</b> | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Comments on related issues</b>                      |           |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                                      | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Annex 1</b>   |           |
| list of respondents                                    | 13        |



## Introduction

The Government recognises that the Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) Programme needs updating and improving. In January 2004 Communities and Local Government (formerly the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister) started a wide ranging, interdepartmental review of DFG to consider what changes were necessary and in that context commissioned an independent review of the programme from the University of Bristol.

The Bristol Report identified a number of problems and challenges facing the DFG programme, and made recommendations to the Government on how to improve the programme. The Government implemented the recommendation to exempt children's cases from means testing straight away. This meant that families needing to adapt their homes to care for a disabled child are no longer subject to means testing.

The Government has considered the recommendations in the Bristol Report alongside recent policy developments and Communities and Local Government launched the consultation *Disabled Facilities Grant Programme: The Government's proposals to improve programme delivery*. The consultation sought comments and suggestions on the proposals aimed at making the help available more accessible, comprehensive and fair. The changes proposed would enable local authorities (LAs) to deliver more front line support to disabled people as part of a wider package to support independent living.

This document provides a summary of consultation responses, taking each proposal in turn and provides the Government's interim response ahead of the results of the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) 2007. Decisions on funding will be subject to the results of the CSR which are expected in the Autumn.

The consultation exercise ran from 18 January 2007 until 13 April 2007, although late responses were accepted after that date. The Department received 253 responses to its consultation paper.

The breakdown of respondents is as follows:

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Local authorities                                | 179 |
| Disability organisations                         | 11  |
| General voluntary organisations                  | 4   |
| Housing, health professionals and organisations  | 28  |
| Home Improvement Agencies                        | 10  |
| Housing associations/Registered social landlords | 14  |
| Miscellaneous individuals and organisations      | 7   |

## Consultation proposals and summary of responses

**Proposal: Increase the maximum grant limit of £25,000 to £30,000, then to £50,000 in stages if the evidence shows that local authorities are realising sufficient offsetting savings through using powers to reclaim DFG.**

Responses showed widespread support for increasing the grant to £30,000. There was also substantial support for increasing the grant to £50,000.

A number of respondents noted that in some parts of the country £50,000 would not be sufficient to pay for the most expensive adaptations.

Local Authorities in particular expressed concern that the potential receipts from reclaiming the grants would not be sufficient to fund the increase to the maximum limit.

**Proposal: Power for local authorities to reclaim DFG in certain cases when adapted property in owner occupation is sold, subject to safeguards and limits. A charge would be placed against the adapted property.**

**Three options were proposed:**

- A) A charge for grant above £5,000, limited to a £10,000 maximum charge.**
- B) A charge for grant above £10,000, limited to 80 percent of the total grant.**
- C) A charge for grant above £10,000, limited to a £10,000 maximum charge.**

The majority of respondents supported this proposal. Of the three options put forward, option A was the most popular, followed by option B.

Despite the broad support for charging in principle, many expressed concerns about the potential impact. For example, that the charge could act as a disincentive to the take up of essential adaptations. Also it was noted that many adaptations do not enhance the value of a home and could devalue a property. Some LAs suggested the safeguards should be discretionary and that the range and scope of exemptions would have a significant impact on the level of grants that could be reclaimed.

Many LAs commented that there would be a substantial time lag between setting up a charging scheme and receiving resources back from them. In some areas a higher percentage of DFG grants are awarded to Housing Association (HAs) properties and this would restrict the potential to reclaim the grant.

### **Observations on the safeguards for the charging proposal**

- 1. Only apply where the disabled person who was the relevant person for the purposes of the means test, also owned the property.**

This safeguard was not supported by the majority of responses who commented. One of the reasons offered was that the benefit would still be realised by the owner when the property was sold.

- 2. The charge would last a maximum of 10 years.**

This proposal received overall support among those who expressed an opinion.

**3. Provisions to exempt from the charge applicants who had to move to alternative accommodation in the private sector for a variety of personal reasons.**

Many expressed concerned that this safeguard was too vague and required further clarification.

**4. The charge should not apply to applications concerning adaptations for disabled children.**

There was considerable opposition to adaptations for disabled children being excluded from charging. Many noted that adaptations for children tended to be the most expensive and added the most value to a property.

**Proposal: Improve the means test. Views were invited on which of the following changes to the DFG means test would be most beneficial and help target assistance to those most in need:**

- 1. To disregard working tax credit and child tax credit as income to be taken into account.**
- 2. To allow for either average or actual housing costs (whichever is the higher) to be taken into consideration when determining the financial position of any person subject to the means test.**
- 3. To disregard the first element of earned income with the amount depending on available resources.**
- 4. To simplify the DFG means test by increasing the range of benefits which would entitle a DFG applicant to be passported through for maximum automatic assistance.**

The majority of respondents supported making changes to the DFG means test. The passporting proposal (number four) gained the most support. A significant number of respondents expressed concern about the inclusion of some of the listed benefits as they are not income related.

The second most popular proposal was to allow either average or actual housing costs to be used in the means test (number two). A number of respondents suggested that there should be some provision made to take regional variations into account.

The proposal to disregard the first element of earned income from the means test (number three) received the least support. Some of those who commented on this proposal requested further detail.

**Proposal: Allow greater flexibility to use central government ring-fenced funding for DFG. Two options were proposed:**

- 1. The ring-fence around the funding will be maintained, but its scope widened to support any LA expenditure incurred under the Regulatory Reform**

**(Housing Assistance) (England and Wales) Order 2002. This would be in addition to expenditure incurred under the Housing Grants, Construction and Regeneration Act 1996 (the 1996 Act) for mandatory DFG.**

- 2. To provide a targeted grant to LAs. The grant will no longer be ring-fenced, but Regional Assemblies (RAs) will be in a position to monitor how the funds are spent by the authorities in relation to the outcomes to be achieved.**

The proposal to improve the flexibility of the DFG funding received widespread support across all groups. Whilst it was acknowledged that the current 60/40 split in funding between central government and the local authority was too restrictive there was concern that any move away from the current split would need to be costed and that current proposals lacked clarity.

There were also concerns that the proposals did not address tenure neutrality. Local authorities in particular were concerned that proposals placed no obligation on HAs to provide adaptations to their housing stock as is the case with local authority housing. Furthermore, proposals to reclaim grants which would apply only to owner occupiers appeared to discriminate.

Option one, to retain the ring fence and widen the scope, received most support. A general concern was expressed that if the ring fence was abolished there would be a risk that funds intended for DFG could be redirected for other purposes. A small number of those who responded commented that the widening of the ring fence to include work under the RRO could increase budget pressures.

**Proposal: Clarify that access to the garden is covered by DFG legislation, by making it a specific purpose for grant.**

There was widespread support across all groups for DFG to include provision for access to the garden and other outside areas. Disabled groups and related organisations commented on the potential health benefits and improved quality of life. A number of concerns were raised about the cost and the need for specific guidance on the coverage of this access. For example, whether it would cover both the front and rear gardens, communal areas and if it would extend beyond the living space.

**Proposal: Issue new guidance to Regional Assemblies to ensure that Regional Housing Strategies have a more explicit policy on adaptations as well as a more strategic and coherent approach to accessible housing.**

Proposals to issue new guidance to Regional Assemblies to ensure a more explicit policy on adaptations and a more strategic approach to accessible housing were widely supported by those who expressed a view. Some respondents expressed concern that the Regional Assemblies were too far removed to be able to take full account of needs at a district level particularly if they are to exercise greater influence over the allocation of available funding.

**Proposal: Simplify the funding system for housing associations (HAs) with one funding source for major adaptation. And guidance for HAs emphasising the need for them to contribute towards the regional strategy on accessible housing and to reach local agreements with local authorities in relation to major housing adaptations with a view to sharing the cost.**

The proposal to issue guidance to HAs to encourage them to contribute towards a regional strategy on accessible housing and enter into local agreements with local authorities, received widespread support. Whilst local agreements were broadly welcomed, concern was expressed that there was no mandatory requirement for HAs to contribute to the cost of adaptations. HAs expressed concern that no funds had been identified to enable them to undertake this responsibility. It was also noted that many HAs operate across a wide number of local authority areas which could be potentially problematic where agreements need to be reached with a number of local authorities.

The proposal to redistribute the Social Housing Grant (SHG) through the central DFG fund received overall support. Some concern was expressed that removing the SHG funding stream would encourage housing associations to view DFG as the only source of funding for adaptations and place further pressure on budgets.

**Proposal: Pilot the increased use of Home Improvement Agencies (HIAs) in the delivery of housing adaptations. Two possible initiatives:**

- 1. To provide a rapid response for the prevention of accidents and promote early release from hospital.**
- 2. To provide a full agency service for housing adaptations in county areas.**

The proposal to enhance the role of the HIAs in delivering adaptations received majority support among those who expressed a view on the issue. Of the two initiatives proposed the 'rapid response programme' (option one) received the most support. Some LAs commented that it was not necessary for HIAs to take over the delivery of adaptations in all areas, that HIAs across the country were not uniform and that their role as an independent advocate would be compromised by budgetary responsibility.

**Proposal: Re-designate stair lifts as items of equipment to be provided by the Community Equipment Service rather than through DFGs.**

Proposals to re-designate stair lifts as equipment and be provided through the Community Equipment Service received widespread support. However it was noted that stair lifts specifically designed for a particular property had little potential for reuse.

**Proposal: Promote new methods for procurement of adaptations equipment to reduce costs.**

The potential benefits of improved procurement were widely acknowledged and the majority of those who expressed a view supported the proposal. Some respondents expressed concern that moves toward regional procurement could lead to a reduction in the use of local contractors with local knowledge and reduce the benefits to the local economy. It was also noted that harmonising procurement practices between authorities could be difficult.

**Proposal: Introduce a simplified application process for DFG.**

There was widespread support for the application process to be simplified and for a simplified form to be available online. However, some respondents commented that the information requested on the form was necessary and should not be lost by simplifying the form.

## **Proposal: Disabled Facilities Grant would be re-badged and called Accessible Homes Grant to reflect its wider ambit.**

The majority of those who expressed a view on this proposal supported the change, acknowledging that the new name captured the expanded scope of the grant. However there were concerns about the costs of re-branding, the loss of a familiar name and whether the use of 'assistance' rather than 'grant' would be more appropriate.

## **Other issues raised**

Comments were received on other areas:

- There was considerable support for VAT to be abolished on all works of adaptation. This proposal from the Bristol report falls within the wider Treasury review of fiscal policy.
- It was broadly acknowledged that there remained a need to ensure that assessments should be undertaken by a qualified Occupational Therapist (OT) or a proven specialist, particularly with a view to establishing long term, rather than just immediate needs. It was also noted that in some cases (for minor adaptations in particular) self assessment may be an appropriate alternative to full OT assessment.
- The Lifetime Homes Standard was widely acknowledged to be positive. There was support for the inclusion of the standard, as part of the Code of Sustainable Building, to become mandatory. It was also suggested that the Lifetime Homes Standard was not robust enough and whilst it provided for the elderly it did not take into account the more complex needs of the severely disabled.
- Specific guidance and clarification on the scope for applying DFG to applications for people with behavioural and learning difficulties was requested. It was commented that it was difficult to obtain standardised assessments for children with autism or other behavioural problems.
- There was interest in the evaluation of the Individual Budget (IBs) Pilots. It was noted that if IBs are rolled out nationally, there was a need to harmonise means tests to eliminate inconsistencies. Some concerns were raised that IBs could be too complicated and that DFG funding could be lost to other priorities.
- Establishing a disabled/accessible housing register was considered a positive step. However it was noted by LAs that registers can be difficult to operate and adaptations are often non-transferable. In order to improve registers it was suggested that a national standard for the categorisation of adaptations be established to ensure consistent recording of adaptations and enable easy comparisons to be made between properties.

## Conclusion

We have welcomed the significant response to the consultation which indicates strong support to modernise and improve the DFG programme. Over 250 organisations fed in their views on how the programme could be improved. This reflects how important this programme is and the value placed on DFG. In light of the range of comments and suggestions received we are committed to carry out further work on how we can develop these proposals fully.

This conclusion forms our initial thoughts following the response to the DFG consultation. It is not an exhaustive list of the work we now intend to take forward over the coming months.

Some changes to the DFG programme have cost implications and decisions about these cannot be made until the Comprehensive Spending Review is completed. The consultation process also recognised that existing demand for DFG has generated pressures on the programme, and raised concerns that any changes the Government introduces must be sufficiently funded, and not cause additional strain on the current system.

## Maximum Limit

Respondents expressed strong support for the proposal to increase the maximum limit of DFG to £30,000. This reflects the increased costs of carrying out DFG work, combined with a requirement for adaptations for those with increasingly complex needs. An increase to the maximum limit cannot be introduced without additional resources to support this proposal. We have received many enquiries on this subject and would like to clarify that should the maximum limit be raised, this will not take effect in 2007-08. We will consider introducing this increase, subject to securing adequate funding to resource the proposal over the long term.

There was also support for increasing the maximum limit of DFG to £50,000, although there was concern from respondents that this increase may not be sufficiently supported by the consultation proposal for grant revenue to be recycled through charges on properties. Further work on the potential for charges to support this increase will need to be undertaken including how such changes may be phased in.

## Charges

Many respondents supported the introduction of charges on properties. Of the three options proposed the proposal to put a charge to the portion of grant above £5,000, but limited to a maximum charge of £10,000, received the majority of support. We acknowledge that some respondents raised genuine concerns over the potential negative impact that charging may have. The range and scope of the exemptions were identified as having the potential to reduce the revenue generated by the charge. In particular the proposal to exempt adaptations for disabled children from the charge provoked a particularly strong response. In light of the varied responses that have been received we will undertake further analysis of the charging proposals and the potential impact of the range of exemptions currently proposed.

## **Means test**

In line with our objectives to modernise and simplify the DFG programme, early analysis also indicates support for the administration of the means test to be simplified. Of the options put forward, the proposal to increase passporting secured the majority of support. We recognise the concerns raised over the range of benefits included in the passporting proposal. In recognition of these concerns further work will be required to assess how passporting can be utilised effectively to deliver a fair and improved service. We will work with other government departments to establish how this can be best achieved, subject to the availability of resources. We acknowledge that improvements in delivery could be assisted through a simplified application form and easier online access. We will work with the LGA and stakeholders in order to establish how this can best be achieved.

## **Guidance and single funding stream**

There was clear support for proposals to provide guidance to Regional Assemblies, local authorities and housing associations. We are committed to undertaking further work with the relevant bodies to ensure better strategic planning and more effective partnership working. Where possible we will be seeking to draw upon and utilise current research and evidence of best practice already being undertaken across the country. There was also majority support for the proposal to transfer the Social Housing Grant to DFG, and we intend to proceed with this proposal.

## **Access to the garden**

Many respondents supported the proposal on clarifying access to garden areas for disabled people. Whilst this assistance can already be provided under current legislation, we are inclined to make access to the garden a specific purpose for which a grant must be approved. A number of local authorities raised concerns over the range and scope of the works to be covered by the proposal, and the potential cost implications. As with other changes with cost implications, we will not implement this change prior to securing an appropriate level of funding.

## **Funding flexibility**

Responses also indicated that the scope of DFG is currently too restrictive and that moves towards increased flexibility would be welcomed. In recognition of this response we will undertake further work to review the current ring fence. DFG has formed part of the Individual Budgets pilot in which a greater degree of flexibility for the use of DFG has been agreed, an evaluation of this approach will be carried out which will help inform proposals around flexibility. We will continue to review the funding arrangements in line with other departmental changes and in consultation with colleagues from other government departments and the Treasury to establish the most appropriate way to introduce greater flexibility to DFG funding.

Once this further work is complete and the future funding position for DFG is known, the Government intends to announce a package of changes to improve the programme and help raise the quality of support provided through DFG.

# Annex 1

## List of respondents:

A1 Housing Bassetlaw Ltd  
Age Concern  
Alison Dixon, Occupational Therapist (OT)  
Alison Honour, Community Children's OT  
Anchor Staying Put – Mid Sussex and Crawley HIA  
Angela White, Community OT  
Anthony Allott, OT  
Ashford Borough Council  
Aspire – Supporting People with Spinal Injury  
Aspire Housing Ltd  
Association of Residential Managing Agents  
Association of Retirement Housing Managers  
Audit Commission  
Aylesbury Vale District Council  
Balbir Frankin, OT  
Basildon District Council  
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council  
Birmingham City Council  
Blyth Valley Borough Council  
Bolsover District Council  
Bolton Council  
Bournemouth Borough Council  
Bournville Village Trust  
Bracknell Forest Borough Council  
Bradford Department of Social Services  
Bradford District Council – Private Sector Housing  
Breckland Council  
Brentwood Borough Council  
Brighton and Hove City Council  
Bristol Care and Repair  
Burnley Borough Council  
Bury Metropolitan Borough Council  
Calderdale Council  
Cambridge City Council Housing Services – Home Aid Manager (HIA)  
Cambridge City Council Housing Strategy Officer  
Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust  
Canterbury City Council  
Care and Repair England  
Carol Daw, OT  
Central Lancashire Housing Partnership  
Central Region Adaptations Benchmarking Club  
Chartered Institute of Environmental Health  
Chartered Institute Of Housing  
Cheshire County Council  
Cheshire Peaks & Plains HT  
Chester City Council  
City of Durham Council, Environmental Health

City of Lincoln Council  
City of Westminster  
City of York  
College of Occupational Therapists  
College of Occupational Therapists – Children Young People and Families  
Specialist Section  
Colne Housing  
Council for Disabled Children  
Coventry City Council  
Craven HA, Yorkshire Housing Group  
Cumbria Children's Services  
Cumbria HIA Partnership  
Dartford Borough Council  
Denise Anderson-Moll, OT  
Derby City Council  
Derbyshire County Council  
Devon Chief Environmental Officers' Housing Sub Group  
Devon Children with Special Needs Housing Panel  
Devon County Council Adult and Community Services  
Disability Rights Commission  
DISC Ltd  
Doncaster Physical Disability and Sensory Impairment Partnership Board  
Dorset County Council (multi agency response)  
Dorset County Council Disabilities Team  
Dorset Local Authorities Private Sector Housing Group  
Dover District Council  
Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council  
Durham County Council Occupational Health Therapists  
Durham Housing and Neighbourhoods Group  
East Lindsey District Council  
East Cambridgeshire District Council  
East Dorset District Council  
East Hampshire District Council,  
East Midlands Regional Assembly  
East Northamptonshire Council  
East of England Regional Assembly  
East of England regional Disability Facilities Grants Group  
East Sussex Adult Social Care  
Eastbourne Borough Council  
Eastleigh Borough Council  
Ellesmere Port and Neston Borough Council  
Enfield Disability Action  
Epping Forest District Council  
Essex County Council – Adult Social Care  
Essex County Council – Head of Strategic Planning and Resources  
Festival Housing Group  
Foundation for People with Learning Difficulties  
Foundations National Co-ordinating Body for Home Improvement Agencies  
Gateshead Council  
Gloucestershire NHS Primary Care Trust  
Gosport Borough Council  
Gravesham Borough Council

Greater Haven Gateway Sub Regional Private Sector Housing Group  
Greater Norwich Housing Partnership  
Grunden Consulting  
Habinteg Housing Association  
Halton Borough Council  
Hampshire County Council  
Hampshire County Council Adults and Children's Services  
Hanover Housing Association  
Harborough District Council  
Hastings Borough Council  
Havant Borough Council  
Help the Aged  
Herefordshire Council  
Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire Housing Specialist Groups  
Hertfordshire Housing Liaison Group  
Horsham District Council  
Huntingdonshire District Council  
Hyndburn Borough Council  
Inquilab Housing Association  
Irene Lewis, OT  
Joint District and Borough Councils of West Sussex and West Sussex County Council  
Kent County Council – Adult Social Services  
Kent Housing Group  
Kerrier District Council  
Kingston upon Thames Council  
Leeds City Council  
Leicester Housing and Regeneration Office  
Leicestershire County Council  
Lewes District Council  
Lewisham Independence – Therapy and Rehab Service  
Lift and Escalator Industry Association  
Lincolnshire County Council  
Local Government Association  
London Borough of Barking and Dagenham  
London Borough of Barnet  
London Borough of Bromley  
London Borough of Bromley, Occupational Therapy Team  
London Borough of Camden Council  
London Borough of Ealing  
London Borough of Hackney  
London Borough of Hillingdon  
London Borough of Islington  
London Borough of Merton  
London Borough of Newham HIA Manager  
London Borough of Newham, Occupational Therapy Team  
London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames  
London Borough of Southwark – Housing Regeneration Initiatives  
London Borough of Sutton  
London Borough of Sutton Children with Disabilities Team  
London Borough of Tower Hamlets  
London Borough of Wandsworth  
London Councils

Luton Borough Council  
Maidstone Borough Council  
Medway Council  
Mencap  
Mendip District Council  
Metropolitan Borough of Wirral  
Michele Finney, Specialist Housing OT  
Middlesbrough Council  
Miriam Fallon, Occupational Therapist  
Motor Neurone Disease  
Multiple Sclerosis Society  
Newcastle City Council  
Norfolk County Council  
Norfolk Home Improvement Agencies  
North East Assembly  
North East Lincolnshire Council  
North Tyneside Council  
North Warwickshire Borough Council  
North West Regional Assembly  
North Yorkshire LAs joint response  
Northern Adaptations Group  
Northern Housing Consortium  
Northumberland Care Trust  
Northumberland Home Improvement Agency  
Notting Hill Housing Trust  
Nottingham City Council – Adult Services, Housing and Health.  
Nottinghamshire County Council Adult Social Care and Health  
Parkinson's Disease Society  
Penwith Accessible Homes Partnership  
Phil Elliott  
Phil Scott, OT  
Places for People  
Pluss Equipping  
Plymouth City Council  
POhWER the Advocacy Agency  
Portsmouth City Council  
Reading Borough Council  
Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council  
Redditch Borough Council  
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council  
Ribble Valley Borough Councils  
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea  
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead OT/Environmental Health Departments  
Royal National Institute for the Blind  
Runnymede Borough Council  
Rushmoor Borough Council  
Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council  
Scope – Policy and Government Affairs Division (Adults)  
Sedgefield Borough  
Sefton Council – Health and Social Care Directorate  
Sevenoaks District Council

Sheffield City Council  
Shropshire and Herefordshire Housing Renewal Group  
South Bedfordshire District Council – Bedfordshire Sub-regional response  
South Buckinghamshire District Council  
South East Regional Housing Forum  
South Northamptonshire Council  
South Oxfordshire District Council  
Southampton City Council  
Spinal Injuries Association (SIA)  
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council  
Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council  
Stockton on Tees Borough Council  
Stockton on Tees Borough Council  
Stoke on Trent City Council – Housing Services Division  
Suffolk Coastal District Council  
Suffolk County Council  
Suffolk County Council, Adult and Community Services  
Suffolk Home Improvement Agency Forum  
Sunderland City Council  
Swale Borough Council  
Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council  
Tees Community Equipment Service  
Telford and Wrekin Council  
Thanet District Council  
The Guinness Trust  
The Law Society  
Three Rivers District Council – Housing and Health  
Tonbridge and Malling  
Trafford Council  
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council  
Tynedale Council  
Vanguard Consultants  
Wakefield Metropolitan District Council  
Warrington Borough Council  
Warwickshire County Council -combined response  
Wealden District Council  
Wear Valley District Council  
West Berkshire Council  
West Dorset District Council  
West Lancashire District Council  
West London Housing Partnership  
West Midlands Regional Assembly  
West of England Housing Officer Group  
West Oxfordshire District Council  
West Wiltshire Housing Society  
Whitefriars Housing Group  
Wiltshire Council  
Wolverhampton City Council  
Wychavon District Council  
Wyre Borough Council  
Wyre Forest District Council

