

Agenda



HYNDBURN
The place to be
an excellent council

Communities and Wellbeing Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 1 December 2025 at 4.00 pm,

Queen Elizabeth Room, Scaitcliffe House, Ormerod Street, Accrington

Membership

Chair: Councillor Stephen Button (in the Chair)

Councillors Jodi Clements, Clare Yates, Clare McKenna, Mike Booth, David Heap, Loraine Cox and Tina Walker

Cooptees: Sandie Dent, Jackie Rawstron, Jean Battle and Matthew Shaw

A G E N D A

1. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

2. Declarations of Interest and Dispensations

3. Minutes of Last Meeting (Pages 3 - 10)

The Minutes of the Communities and Wellbeing Overview & Scrutiny Committee held on 13th October 2025 are submitted for approval as a correct record.

Recommended

- That the Minutes be received and approved as a correct record.



4. Disabled Facilities Grants (Pages 11 - 16)

To consider the support and value of the Disabled Facility Grant service to the community.

Recommended - That the comments be noted and actioned as required.

5. Citizens Advice

Presentation provided by Justine Williams and Julia Hannaford – Citizens Advice Rossendale & Hyndburn.

COMMUNITIES AND WELLBEING OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Monday, 13th October, 2025

Present: Councillor Stephen Button (in the Chair),
Councillors Clare Yates, Clare McKenna, David Heap, Loraine Cox and
Tina Walker and Bernard Dawson
Co-optees Jackie Rawstron and Jean Battle

In Attendance: Councillors Melissa Fisher accompanied by the Environmental Health
Manager – Environmental Protection
Councillor Stewart Eaves accompanied by the Head of Environmental
Services
Councillor Clare Pritchard accompanies by the Community Safety
Manager

Apologies: Councillors Jodi Clements, Mike Booth and Sandie Dent

168 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Booth, Clements and Sandie Dent.

Councillor Dawson acted as substitute representative for Councillor Booth.

169 Declarations of Interest and Dispensations

There were no interests or dispensations declared at the meeting.

170 Minutes of Last Meeting

The Minutes of the meeting of Communities and Wellbeing Overview & Scrutiny Committee held on 14th July 2025 were submitted for approval as a correct record.

Councillor Yates pointed out that Councillor Brereton had been in attendance at the previous meeting but omitted from the minutes.

Resolved **- That the Minutes be received and approved as a correct record, subject to the amendment, as set out in the minutes, above.**

171 Chair's Update

The Chair updated the Committee on the recommendations made at the last meeting, as follows:

a) The Draft Climate Strategy & Action Plan

Three recommendations were made on the Draft Climate Strategy & Action Plan.

The first recommendation was to request that Cabinet gave consideration to extending the Council's climate fund, to facilitate the Council's ability to achieve its net zero targets. This recommendation had been submitted to the Cabinet held on 10th September and agreed.

Updates were also provided on two further recommendations made under this item.

The first referred to concern about the increasing number of empty commercial properties in Accrington Town Centre and the impact of these on the Council's ability to achieve its net zero target. The Committee was informed of how the Council dealt with empty properties and the challenges of managing them, as well as what action the Council had taken to provide businesses with opportunities to become more energy efficient.

Secondly, there had been a further recommendation to request consideration for carrying out a stock condition survey of property in the borough. This was to provide the Council with detailed knowledge of the work required on properties to help it to reach its net zero target. The Head of Regeneration and Housing had advised that the cost and resources to do this work would be extensive and consequently, there were currently no plans to undertake this work.

b) Allotments Update

The Committee was provided with an update on the recommendations relating to the Allotments Review. A recommendation referred to the budget and time constraints of the Regeneration Project Manager in managing the allotment sites. The Committee was informed of the budget allocated to the position and how the role of the Manager was split between managing the allotments and ecology work. They were informed that consideration would be given to how the allotment service could be best supported, taking budget constraints into account.

c) Co-optee Vacancy

The Chair reported that the Overview & Scrutiny Officer had contacted Six Form Colleges in the borough and Accrington & Rossendale College to request that they advertised the vacant Co-optee position for a young person. There had been no applications received via this advertisement, however, one application for the post had been received and would be considered later in the meeting.

172 Fly Tipping & Enforcement

Two reports were submitted to the Communities and Wellbeing Overview & Scrutiny Committee in relation to fly tipping, waste accumulation and enforcement. One report was submitted by the Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Environmental Health, Councillor Melissa Fisher, supported by the Environmental Health Manager – Environmental Protection and dealt with fly tipping and the accumulation of waste on private land and the second report was submitted by the Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Waste Services, Councillor Steward Eaves, who was supported by the Head of Environmental Services and dealt with fly tipping and the dumping of waste on public land.

The Committee was provided with statistical information from both departments and details on the enforcement policies used to remove fly tipped and accumulated waste, issue fixed penalty notices (FPNs) and prosecutions.

The Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Environmental Health, Councillor Fisher, referred Members to the report and responded to the questions submitted in advance by the Committee in respect of fly tipping, waste accumulation and enforcement on private land:

1. Is the Fixed Penalty Notice amount fixed by statute or is there flexibility to vary this?
The limits for UK environmental crime fixed penalty notice (FPN) payments are set by a combination of national legislation and local authorities. Legislation provides the framework by setting the maximum and minimum amounts that can be charged for specific offences, while local authorities choose to set their own penalty amounts within the legislative limits.
2. What happens if a fine is not paid or the resident cannot afford to pay the fine?
Environmental Protection hasn't issued any FPNs this year however, the legal process would need to be followed for non-payment.
3. Does the amount of fly tipping correlate with the location of HMOs or has there been an increase in fly tipping around HMOs?
Some research had been done as evidence for Article 4, however, whilst officers could see if addresses were HMOs, they did not routinely overlay the information with Dirty Back Yards (DBY)/fly tipping locations. There had been no correlation between fly tipping and HMOs identified.
4. How quickly is the Council able to remove waste which is considered a risk to public health such as asbestos?
Environmental Protection investigate waste fly tipped on private land or waste within dirty back yards (DBY). They visit to assess the waste, establish owner/occupier details, serve Notices on owners to remove waste (within a time limit of least 7 days), visit to check if the waste has been removed and arrange for its removal if not. This could be a further 7-10 days and the cost would need to be recouped from the owner/occupier.
5. Is there enough staff to support the need for enforcement action?
Yes

The Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Waste Services, Councillor Stewart Eaves, referred Members to the report and responded to the questions submitted in advance by the Committee in respect of fly tipping, waste accumulation and enforcement on private land:

1. Is the Fixed Penalty Notice amount fixed by statute or is there flexibility to vary this?
In the legislation there is a range set for fines for fly tipping which is between £400 and £1000. Historically the Council has used the lower end of this range, however, Cabinet is exploring increasing the fine for fly tipping to nearer the top of the range as more of a deterrent.
2. What happens if a fine is not paid or the resident cannot afford to pay the fine?
If the Fixed Penalty Notice is not paid then this outstanding debt to the Council goes to the Council's Debt Recovery Team. They contact the person who has been fined to agree payment. This can be a one-off payment or via instalments. Should the person not co-operate with the debt recovery team then usually the debt goes to County Court judgement.
3. Does the amount of fly tipping correlate with the location of HMOs or has there been an increase in fly tipping around HMOs?
There is no evidence to collaborate this statement.
4. How quickly is the Council able to remove waste which is considered a risk to public health such as asbestos?
The Council would usually remove waste which may be a risk to public health quite quickly within a day or two. For general fly tipping this is usually done over the next 5 to 10 days when the refuse crews are in the area.
5. Is there enough staff to support the need for enforcement action?
There are currently two staff within Waste Services undertaking enforcement work on public land relating to side waste, fly tipping, commercial waste, abandoned

vehicles, littering and graffiti. If there were more enforcement staff they would undertake a greater volume of work.

The Chair provided Members of the Committee with an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments as follows:

- Were there enough enforcement staff to manage cases of fly tipping?
- In relation to fly tipping on private land, why was there a case still outstanding after a year?
- Skip Days – what type of items could be disposed of in the skips?
- How is the success of Skip Days measured?
- Could information on HMOs be shared between both Departments?
- Why had there been little enforcement action taken place by Environmental Protection during the last two years.
- What costs could be attached to property owners if they continued to do nothing about removing waste?
- What success has Environmental Protection had in recouping money after removing specialist waste, such as asbestos?
- Is fly tipping usually carried out by the same people?
- Are there any plans in place to hire more enforcement staff to increase service productivity?
- Are there any plans to erect CCTV in the Belthorn area as a preventative measure to reduce the amount of fly tipping taking place there?
- A request to provide financial data (the total amount of fines, the total amount of income and the total amount outstanding).

Responses to the above were given as:

- Both Departments reported that although they considered the number of enforcement staff was adequate, additional personnel would increase the effectiveness of the services.
- The Committee was informed that the unresolved fly tipping case was a complex one and challenging. One of the reasons that it had not been resolved promptly, was because of the difficulties and the time consuming nature of trying to locate the owners of the property. Councillor Fisher reported that a full response to this question would be circulated to Members after the meeting.
- Skip Days had been successful but they did not take bulky items or recyclable waste. A request for evidence of its success would be emailed to Councillors, after the meeting.
- Information on HMOs was shared between Departments and had been for the provision of the Article 4 Direction.
- Members were informed of the difficulties of identifying those responsible for fly tipping including hazardous waste, and as such it was a challenge on the Council's resources and, particularly time-consuming, in preparing cases for prosecution. However, the Council would often be successful in recouping costs if they were required to remove waste.
- Enforcement processes included serving a range of Notices, although the Council would try to speak and work with the public before taking any action.
- Both Departments provided an outline of their enforcement processes.
- The Committee was informed that the financial data requested in respect of the number of fines issued, those paid and those still outstanding would be circulated to the Committee, after the meeting.
- CCTV had already been considered for use to deter fly tipping in places such as Belthorn but the Committee was advised that its implementation would take time.

Members of the Committee referred to the challenges of finding evidence to prosecute for fly tipping and was advised that other enforcement agencies, such as the Police, regularly sought permission from residents to use their domestic doorbell cameras as evidence. The Committee suggested that this was something that the Council could also consider. Councillor Fisher pointed out that people were not always co-operative but acknowledged the proposal.

The Chair permitted Councillor Shabir Fazal, a non-Member of the Committee, to speak at the meeting. Councillor Fazal expressed concern at the amount of fly tipping in the borough and encouraged the Council to ensure robust measures were in place to deter people from doing it.

Councillor Loraine Cox requested that thanks be given to the Environmental Protection and Waste Services Teams for their hard work in tackling the challenges of fly tipping.

Resolved

- (1) **That the Environmental Health Manager – Environmental Protection, circulates a full explanation of the reason why an unresolved fly tipping case was still outstanding;**
- (2) **That the Waste Services Manager provides the Committee with information about the success of recent Skip Days; and,**
- (3) **That the Environmental Health Manager – Environmental Protection and the Waste Services Manager provides the Committee with financial data to show the amount of fines issued, the amount paid and the amount outstanding in the last 12 months; and**
- (4) **That Council Officers working in the Environmental Protection and Waste Services Departments be thanked for their hard work and efforts to ensure that the borough is kept clean of fly tipping and waste.**

173 Crime & Disorder and the Community Safety Partnership

The Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Community Safety, Councillor Clare Pritchard, submitted a report to update the Communities and Wellbeing Overview & Scrutiny Committee on the Community Safety Partnership. Councillor Pritchard was accompanied by the Community Safety Manager who supported her in the presentation to Committee.

Councillor Pritchard referred Members to the report and the three attached appendices, as below:

Appendix 1 – Hyndburn & Pennine CSP Structures 2024-25

Appendix 2 – Hyndburn District Profile 2025

Appendix 3 – Lancashire Strategic Assessment 2025-28

Members had submitted several questions, in advance of the meeting, to the Officer and Cabinet Portfolio Holder and responses were provided as below:

Why are the Ribble Valley and Pendle Borough Council's not represented on the Community Safety Partnership?

Pendle are an unofficial partner and do attend the Pennine partnership meetings. Ribble Valley are not part of the partnering due to resource.

Statistics show that women are at their most vulnerable to abuse when pregnant. The Hospital Emergency Department has a process of dealing with maternity cases of concern so that issues of violence, domestic abuse, domestic homicide etc. are picked up and dealt with through a multiagency approach. How do maternity vulnerabilities fit into the CSP priorities?

This is a public health priority as stats are rising. HARV are an integral part of the CSP and work closely with our Public Health Colleagues and Victim Support in devising vulnerability markers to prevent this abuse and provide wraparound support throughout the entire pregnancy. Hyndburn CSP attend the Lancs-wide DA forum where this rising issue is tabled for action and hold a local DA multi-agency partnership to expedite actions from the forum.

A Public Spaces Protection Order has been proposed for Accrington town centre, could you detail what the PSPO will cover and the consequences if it is breached. Do they have enough Police resources to deal with the outcomes?

PSPOs can be used to restrict a broad range of activities. Under Section 59 of the 2014 Act, local authorities must be satisfied on reasonable grounds, as listed in the Act.

The public determine this activity based upon survey results.

Breach of a PSPO is a criminal offence. The penalty for breach of a PSPO can be a fixed penalty notice of £100. A person committing an offence will have 14 days to pay the penalty. However, if someone persistently breaches an order they could receive more formal action such as a Community Protection Warning/Notice or a Respect Order (nee ASBO). Failure to comply with the order if prosecuted is an offence carrying a maximum fine of £1000.

There will be no reliance on the Police to determine a breach. The Council and the entire CSP partnership can report breaches including members of the public and businesses via the radio network we have amongst retailers within the town centre of Accrington.

Could there be an extension of the PSPO to other town centres?

Yes

The Neighbourhood Boards are considering community safety in the town centre and, with funding allocated through the Levelling Up fund for this, could you suggest ways in which funding could be used and which services would need to feed into this?

To have a dedicated team addressing anti-social behaviour within the town centre and for additional services for youths and family event spaces.

Councillor Pritchard added that there had been concern about the prolific shoplifting taking place in the town centre but that action was being taken to address this.

The Chair referred to the radio network project and asked how long the scheme had been working and if it had been a success.

Councillor Pritchard reported that the scheme had been operating for many years and informed the meeting that larger businesses often used the scheme more than smaller businesses but agreed that there could be greater promotion of the project to increase use of the scheme.

Members of the Committee expressed concern about the levels of anti-social behaviour in Accrington Town Centre.

Councillor Pritchard pointed out that the Police Inspector for Accrington had recognized the problem of anti-social behaviour in Accrington Town Centre and intended to focus on this issue.

Members referred to the local multi-agency operations, Op Centurion and the Bin the Banger project. They acknowledged the additional £2m secured by OPCC to enable Hyndburn to benefit from additional foot patrols to target ASB in key areas and asked about the effectiveness of these operations. The Committee was informed that anti-social behaviour in the town centre had been recognized as an issue and that extra funding would be advantageous in addressing this. They were also provided with information on how abandoned vehicles were dealt with.

Councillor McKenna reported on the issues of anti-social behaviour and drug dealing happening in her ward, Barnfield, and informed the meeting how she had built up a good working relationship with the neighbourhood PCSOs in addressing these issues.

Councillor Pritchard informed the Committee of the projects in place to deal with anti-social behaviour around the borough and agreed that the PCSOs did do a good job. She also explained how Youth Services contributed to this. The Community Safety Manager outlined the effectiveness of the Youth Panel and gave details of how it worked.

Councillor Fazal asked if anything was being done about issues of hate crime in the town centre. He also referred to the importance of sporting events and activities for young people in the prevention of anti-social behaviour.

Councillor Pritchard responded that there had been conversations with the Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner to discuss how to deal with rising tensions. She reported that the intention was to deal with issues immediately, sending out a message of this behaviour not being acceptable.

Resolved - **That the Community Safety Manager be thanked for the work she has done and for the report to be noted.**

174 Exclusion of the Public

Resolved - **That, in accordance with Section 100A(4) Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during the following item, when it was likely, in view of the nature of the proceedings that there would otherwise be disclosure of exempt information within the Paragraph at Schedule 12A of the Act specified at the following item.**

175 Co-optee Nomination

Exempt Information under the Local Government Act 1972, Schedule 12A, Paragraph 1 – Information relating to an individual

The Committee was requested to consider and make a recommendation to Full Council on the application submitted for the vacant co-optee position on the Communities and Wellbeing Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

Resolved - **That the Communities and Wellbeing Overview & Scrutiny Committee recommend that Full Council approve the application for the vacant co-optee position.**

Signed:.....

Date:

Chair of the meeting
At which the minutes were confirmed

Agenda Item 4.

REPORT TO:	Communities and Well Being O & S Committee	
DATE:	01 December 2025	
PORTFOLIO:	Councillor Melissa Fisher - Deputy Leader of the Council (Housing and Regeneration)	
REPORT AUTHOR:	Sarah Whittaker	
TITLE OF REPORT:	Disabled Facilities Grants	
EXEMPT REPORT (Local Government Act 1972, Schedule 12A)	No	Not applicable
KEY DECISION:	No	If yes, date of publication:

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To update the Committee on Disabled Facilities Grants, the process, the funding that we receive and what is delivered with the funding.
- 1.2 To report on the current programme and waiting list times

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That committee notes the content of the report and directs any questions to Sarah Whittaker, Regeneration Manager.

3. Reasons for Recommendations and Background

- 3.1 Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG's) are mandatory grants delivered under the Housing Grants, Construction and Regeneration Act 1996. The 1996 Act sets the framework for the Disabled Facilities Grant. It gives local authorities a legal duty to award grants where the criteria are met—but it also allows for a maximum amount to be set by the regulations. The current maximum grant is £30,000 and this has been in force since 2008. Grants under this legislation are awarded by the Council to home owners, tenants and landlords to carry out works that will enable a disabled person to remain in their own homes. The 1996 Act also stipulates what works can be covered. The Act defines the purposes for which a DFG can be given (e.g. facilitating access to the home, making the dwelling safe, improving heating or access to essential amenities for the disabled occupant). These purposes have been updated by later regulations (for

example, access to gardens was added by the Disabled Facilities Grants (Maximum Amounts and Additional Purposes) (England) Order 2008).

- 3.2 The grants awarded as DFG's relate to work that has been prescribed by an Occupational Therapist (OT) or Trusted Assessor (TA) as being works that are required for the disabled person to remain independent within their home. These people have the medical training in order to state what is necessary and appropriate for the disabled persons needs to enable them to remain independent.
- 3.3 All applicants for a DFG are given the choice of either the Council managing the works on their behalf, or for them to self-manage the works at the start of the grant application process. Most of these grants are project managed by the Council, and each are individual projects tailored to the individual's needs and the individual's residence. In some instances the applicant organises the work themselves if they want to do something different to what has been prescribed by the OT or TA. The Council is able to provide the funding that would have been allocated to carry out the works that we would have done, provided that what is then done by the applicant still meets the needs of the disabled person, and that those alterations have been approved by their OT or TA.
- 3.4 The funding for the DFG programme moved in 2015/16 to become part of the Better Care Fund (BCF) and instead of being paid directly to the Local Authorities, was paid to Lancashire County Council (LCC) as part of the Social Care Funding and it was then distributed to the individual Local Authorities. This move meant looking at the Care Act 2014 alongside the DFG policies to try and prevent hospital admissions and to keep people living at home as much as possible.
- 3.5 Each year a determination letter is issued to the Local Authorities stating how much funding each Local Authority will receive. The allocation for Hyndburn for 25/26 is £1,359,906 for the BCF. We carried forward £357,069 from 2024/25 and have a programme for 2025/26 of £1,716,975. Hyndburn Council is able to introduce its own grant policies under the Regulatory Reform (Housing Assistance) (England And Wales) Order 2002 (RRO) which meant that Council's had more freedom in order to design our own local policies in order to support disabled people and offer additional support alongside DFG's.
- 3.6 We first introduced our own community tailored grants through our Housing Renewal Assistance Policy July 2019. We introduced several types of grants including Discretionary DFGs, whereby we removed the need for a means test for any items under £7,500 and introduced an additional £20,000 top up if people were on low incomes or had low savings. This was because we were finding that people applying for Stairlifts didn't want to divulge their financial details and were therefore not getting grants, and because the maximum DFG of £30,000 did not cover the costs of extensions any more. We also introduced the Affordable Warmth Grants, Home Security Grants, Hospital Discharge Grants and Emergency works grants and all were introduced to facilitate vulnerable people to remain in their own homes via a number of additional types of grants. These were also introduced at a time when we had a build up of underspends from previous years because funding received had risen from

£761,990 in 2015 to almost £1million in 2019 and we were spending around £650,000 per annum on DFGs.

3.7 We reviewed the policy again in April 2025 and changed the upper limits for some grants, taking the amount before we means test up to £10,000 from £7,500 to match the Lancashire DFG review funding suggestion. The Home Security Assistance Grants were renamed Home Safety Assistance Grants and eligible works now includes replacement floor coverings, house clearance and dementia friendly and safety works. The aim of these changes is to make the grants more accessible and support a wider range of vulnerable households. We also introduced fees for non-agency grants (where applicants manage the application themselves) of 7.5% + VAT. prior to that there was no charge, so we are now able to offer more support to those carrying out works themselves as the costs for our time spent dealing with those grants are now covered.

3.8 Appendix 1 shows the allocation of funding, the types of grant that it is attributed to, the current spend to date, the allocation committed and the amount remaining to be committed. It also sets out the current waiting list for DFG's and gives a summary of performance in previous years.

4. Alternative Options considered and Reasons for Rejection

4.1 Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG's) are mandatory grants delivered under the Housing Grants, Construction and Regeneration Act 1996. The 1996 Act sets the framework for the Disabled Facilities Grant. It gives local authorities a legal duty to award grants where the criteria are met, and the RRO gives Councils discretion to introduce its own grants to meet local need.

5. Consultations

5.1 The portfolio holder was consulted in terms of the breakdown of the funding to each type of grant, as was the Head of Regeneration and Housing who issues the grant approvals.

6. Implications

Financial implications (including any future financial commitments for the Council)	All forms of assistance will be subject to approval in the Council's Capital Programme. The Council's DFG allocation for 2025/26 is £1,716,975.
Legal and human rights implications	DFG's are a mandatory grant. The Council is required by the Regulatory Reform (Housing Assistance) (England and Wales) Order 2002 to adopt and publish a policy setting out how it will exercise the power to provide the housing assistance set out in Article 3 of the Order.
Assessment of risk	By not approving and publishing the Housing Renewal Policy we would be contravening Article 4 of the Regulatory Reform (Housing Assistance) (England and

	<p>Wales) Order 2002 and thus not able to provide housing assistance. The main financial risk is overspending on the annual approved budget. This continues and will be closely managed and monitored through appropriate internal controls and regular reporting at the capital programme working group and to Cabinet</p>
<p>Equality and diversity implications <i>A Customer First Analysis should be completed in relation to policy decisions and should be attached as an appendix to the report.</i></p>	<p>The Council is subject to the public sector equality duty introduced by the Equality Act 2010. When making a decision in respect of the recommendations in this report Cabinet must have regard to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation; and • advance equality of opportunity between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who don't; and • foster good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who don't. For these purposes the relevant protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

**7. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985:
List of Background Papers**

7.1 *Copies of documents included in this list must be open to inspection and, in the case of reports to Cabinet, must be published on the website.*

8. Freedom of Information

8.1 The report does not contain exempt information under the Local Government Act 1972, Schedule 12A and all information can be disclosed under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

Appendix 1 Communities and Well Being O & S 01/12/25

Better Care Fund Allocations and Performance to end October 2025

Allocation for 2025/26	£1,359,906
Carried forward budget	£357,069
Total Budget for 2025/26	£1,716,975

	Original Budget	Actual to date	Commitments	Budget remaining to be committed
Disabled Facility Grants (DFG)	£931,975	£503,883	£393,374	£34,718
DFG Affordable Warmth (AWG)	£150,000	£43,372	£0	£106,629
Emergency Works Grants (EWG)	£50,000	£29,367	£0	£20,633
Home Security Grants (HSG)	£25,000	£0	£0	£25,000
Hospital Discharge Grants (HDG)	£10,000	£1,650	£0	£8,350
LCC Respite Centre Great Harwood - approved at Cabinet 15/01/2020	£300,000	£0	£300,000	£0
Health & Well Being Board Project	£250,000	£55,069	£0	£194,931
Total	£1,716,975	£633,341	£693,374	£390,260

DFG Current performance to end October 2025

Cancelled	35	19 of which we have done work on
Completed	80	
Approved	42	
Design Work in progress	38	
Applications released	23	
Total in current year's programme	218	

Priority 1 waiting list - access	7 July 2025 oldest referral
Priority 2 waiting list - bathing	43 February 2025 oldest referral
Total on Waiting list	50

Performance in previous years

	2024/25	2023/24	2022/23	2021/22	2020/21	2019/20
DFG spend	£1,416,980	£1,270,974	£1,258,049	£865,606	£679,691	£696,080
DFG numbers completed	155	145	148	123	81	116
AWG spend	£189,887	£193,418	£145,805	£172,775	£68,645	£0
AWG numbers completed	46	69	47	54	27	0
EWG spend	£52,899	£41,166	£31,732	£0	£0	£0
EWG numbers completed	13	9	5	0	0	0
HDG spend	£3,381	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
HDG numbers completed	0	0	0	0	0	0
HSG spend	£10,913	£0	£0	£1,768	£0	£0
HSG numbers completed	0	0	0	2	0	0
Allocation from Better Care Fund	£1,359,906	£1,191,591	£1,095,958	£1,095,958	£1,095,958	£965,897
Total spend	£1,674,060	£1,505,558	£1,435,586	£1,040,149	£748,336	£696,080
Total number of grants completed	214	223	200	179	108	116

Difference between spend and allocation **-£314,154** **-£313,967** **-£339,628** £55,809 £347,622 £269,817

You can see that each year since 2021/22 we have exceeded the budget allocated to us from Central Government.

The same is likely for this year as we have already committed almost all the DFG allocation.