

# DISABILITY RIGHTS HANDBOOK UPDATER

June 2017

---

- Disability Rights Handbook updates
  - Significant recent case law
  - Timetable of future benefit changes
-

# Disability Rights UK bi-monthly updater

## Keeping you up to date with disability and welfare rights

<b>DISABILITY RIGHTS HANDBOOK UPDATES</b>	<b>3</b>
■ Page-by-page updates to the 42nd edition (April 2017-April 2018)	3
■ Updates by Handbook page number	4
<b>CASE LAW DIGEST</b>	<b>5</b>
■ Highlighting key welfare benefit decisions and judgments	5
<b>FUTURE CHANGES</b>	<b>11</b>
■ A timetable of future benefit and tax credit changes	11
<b>CONTACT DISABILITY RIGHTS UK (DR UK)</b>	<b>12</b>

### Benefits or tax credits questions?

#### Members Organisations' Welfare Rights Helpline

Our member organisations' benefits and tax credits advice service is hosted by Ken Butler. Call 020 7250 8184 or email [ken.butler@disabilityrightsuk.org](mailto:ken.butler@disabilityrightsuk.org). Unfortunately, we don't have the resources to answer queries from individuals who instead should ring the Disability Information and Advice Line (DIAL) on Freephone 0808 800 3333.

#### Helpline hours:

Monday to Friday:  
10am-12 noon and  
2-4pm.

### Join Disability Rights UK

#### Our Mission

We are disabled people leading change

- In three years we will enable at least 50,000 diverse disabled people to have voice and influence, connecting with each other and with us. We support change agents and enable disabled people to exert power and influence.
- We will work in partnership with other Disabled People's Organisations to showcase approaches to social, economic and public participation and share learning, including through joint projects.
- We will work with many organisations in a position to act, in all sectors, to support them to put disabled people's priorities at the heart of their policies and practices.
- We will campaign to strengthen and protect disabled people's rights.

Disability Rights UK is itself led by people with diverse experiences of disability and health conditions, from different communities. We work with allies committed to equal participation for all. Together we can be stronger.

Membership is open to organisations and individuals.

For details of the benefits and costs of membership [visit our website](#) email [members@disabilityrightsuk.org](mailto:members@disabilityrightsuk.org) or call us on 020 7250 8180.

#### Our Vision

**Equal participation for all.**

**We want a society where everyone can participate equally.**

#### Disability Rights Handbook Updater 2017-2018

Published June, August, October, December and February

A year's subscription costs £5

Disability Rights UK © June 2017

1/5

Free to members

# Disability Rights Handbook updates

## Page-by-page updates to the 42nd edition (April 2017-April 2018)

Compiled by its editor Ian Greaves, the following update the 42nd edition of the Disability Rights Handbook based on information available up to 16<sup>th</sup> June 2017.

New amendments in each edition are shown with the page number in **bold**. A summary table listing all amendments since publication appears after the updates.

### SECTION B

### CARE AND MOBILITY

#### Personal Independence Payment

##### Terminal illness

From May 2017 in England, DS1500 forms can be submitted online by healthcare professionals.

**UPDATES** SECTION B Chapter 5 Box B.8

Page **34**

#### Help with mobility

##### Motability

##### PIP re-assessments

If you are re-assessed for personal independence payment (PIP) and are not awarded the enhanced rate of the PIP mobility component, Motability will allow you to keep your vehicle for a further eight weeks (rather than three weeks) from the date the disability living allowance mobility payments cease. If you were on the Motability scheme in 2013 and are eligible for a lump-sum payment on losing your vehicle, you can keep the vehicle for up to six months while waiting for the reconsideration and appeal to be dealt with, but any lump-sum payment will be reduced accordingly.

**UPDATES** SECTION B Chapter 7 Box B.16

Page **56**

### SECTION G

### HELP WITH HOUSING COSTS

#### Universal credit housing costs amount

##### The standard interest rate

From 18<sup>th</sup> June 2017, following a change to the Bank of England's average mortgage rate, the standard interest rate to be used in the housing costs amount calculation is set at 2.61%.

**UPDATES** SECTION G Chapter 24(23)

Page **176**

### SECTION H

### GRANTS AND LOANS

#### Other grants and loans

##### Budgeting loans

The £2,000 savings limit for budgeting loans, above which your loan will be reduced on a pound-for-pound basis, applies if you are aged 63 or over.

**CORRECTS** SECTION H Chapter 30(2)

Page **207**

**SECTION I****EDUCATION AND WORK****Access to work****Annual cap**

From 1<sup>st</sup> April 2017, the annual cap for new claimants on the total amount of support that can be provided under Access to Work is £42,100.

**UPDATES** SECTION I Chapter 33(5)

Page **222**

**SECTION J****CARE AND SUPPORT****Paying for care and support****Capital and income****Scottish capital limits**

The upper capital limit in Scotland for local authority charging purposes is now £26,500; the lower limit is £16,500.

**UPDATES** SECTION J Chapter 36 Box J.9

Page **244**

**SECTION O****COMMON RULES TO BENEFITS****Challenging decisions****Making an appeal****Northern Ireland**

Appeals for social security benefits (administered by the Department for Communities) can be made on appeal form NOA1(SS), available from: [www.nidirect.gov.uk/publications/appeals-form-noa1ss](http://www.nidirect.gov.uk/publications/appeals-form-noa1ss)

**UPDATES** SECTION O Chapter 56(8)

Page **315**

**Updates by Handbook page number**

Topic		Section	Box	Chapter	Handbook page	Update edition
Personal Independence Payment	Terminal illness	B	B8	5	34	June 2017
Motability	PIP re-assessments	B	B16	7	56	June 2017
Universal credit housing costs amount	The standard interest rate	G		24(23)	176	June 2017
Grants and loans	Budgeting loans	H		30(2)	207	June 2017
Access to work	Annual cap	I		33(5)	222	June 2017
Paying for care and support	Capital and income – Scottish capital limits	J	J9	36	244	June 2017
Making an appeal	Northern Ireland	O		56(8)	315	June 2017

# Case law digest

## Highlighting key welfare benefit decisions and judgments

**Disability Right's UK's Welfare Rights Adviser Ken Butler provides you with a selected summary of recent welfare benefit case law decisions issued since our last Updater. [Detailed summaries hundreds of other significant decisions and Court judgments](#) are also available @ [www.disabilityrightsuk.org](http://www.disabilityrightsuk.org)**

A disabled person's welfare benefit entitlement is governed by rules set down in Acts and regulations agreed by Parliament.

However, these are then subject to interpretation as to their exact meaning from the date they are passed.

While most benefit appeals are decided by First Tier Appeal Tribunals their decisions do not establish legal precedents.

Instead, precedent is set by judgments issued by appeals to the Upper Tribunal and other higher courts.

While the individual facts in every appeal are different, often legal issues are involved that have arisen before and the facts can be considered in light of legal precedent.

For example, what needs to be established in deciding if finding someone fit for work would lead to a substantial risk to their health ([CE/2291/2014](#)) or whether someone's inability to use an oven to cook can be considered in relation to their eligibility for PIP ([CSPIP/40/2015](#)).

So, the citing of relevant case law may sometimes be useful in support of a disabled person's welfare benefit appeal.

---

### Disabled person's own use of a room is not relevant to the issue of whether it is a bedroom for bedroom tax purposes

<b>Benefit:</b>	Housing Benefit
<b>Court:</b>	Court of Session
<b>Case Name:</b>	Secretary of State for Work and Pensions against The City of Glasgow Council and IB [2017] ( <a href="#">CSIH 35</a> )
<b>No.</b>	

In a disappointing new judgment, the Court of Session in Scotland has ruled that the classification of a property as having one or more bedrooms is not related to the actual needs of the occupiers.

A First Tier and then an Upper Tier Tribunal (in [CSH/734/2014](#)) upheld a disabled claimant's bedroom tax appeal because one downstairs bedroom was no longer a bedroom as it had been especially converted to a living room for her.

In doing so, Upper Tribunal Judge Agnew explained that the claimant was someone with a severe learning disability and autistic traits and: "… can get unsettled and agitated and wants her own space to watch television programmes she likes and listen to music.

She has a television in her bedroom but does not use it. She has carers who call twice a week to take her out and spends some time in her living room with them."

Glasgow City Council Social Work Services had also stressed that both the claimant and her carers would benefit if she had a separate lounge to use for the above therapeutic purpose and carer support and privacy.

As a result, Judge Agnew held that whether a room is a bedroom is a question of fact to be decided in light of the circumstances pertaining to the case at issue:

"I found it credible and reasonable that the appellant required her own living space because of her disability and was satisfied that due its long-established use as a living room, the room in question had ceased to be a bedroom."

However, in Secretary of State for Work and Pensions against The City of Glasgow Council and IB [2017] CSIH 35, the Court of Session has upheld the DWP’s appeal against Judge Agnew’s decision.

This is on the grounds that the correct legal test is not what use is made of the room, but whether the room could be used as a bedroom looking at the property as if it was vacant:

“In our opinion, in a disputed case in the first instance it is for the local authority who is responsible for administering the housing benefit system to come to a decision objectively about the classification of the property offered for rent in its vacant state.

That may involve taking into account, for example, the number of rooms, their size, layout and function as living/dining space, kitchen,

washing/toilet facilities and what other space is available. This may include deciding whether a room is suitable to accommodate a bed with, for example, sufficient space, height, light, privacy to be classified as a bedroom. The classification decision is not dependent on suitability for occupancy by more than one person.

... An applicant for housing benefit and the occupants of a dwelling may choose or need or be advised to use the property in a way which best suits their needs but in our opinion that is not relevant to the issue of what is a bedroom for the purposes of the 2006 [Housing Benefit General] Regulations.

We consider that our approach to the interpretation of the word “bedroom” for the purposes of the 2006 Regulations does not raise any discrimination issue.”

**Need to consider the reasonable wishes of a claimant to “move around” / limits of tribunal’s inquisitorial role when assessing prescribed medication/ assessment of to “engage socially”**

**Benefit:**  
**Upper Tribunal Judge:**  
**File number:**

PIP  
 Gray  
[CPIP/3622/2016](#)

**Moving Around (Mobility Activity 2)**

With regard to Mobility Activity 2 the First-Tier Tribunal (FTT) restricted its consideration of her need to walk to that ‘reasonably required’,

However, Judge Gray holds that to the extent that was interpreted to exclude the appellant’s choice as to how often she would ‘move around’ and replace that choice with an objective test of how often she needed to do so, it was wrong:

“The tribunal found that the appellant was “reasonably likely to be able to walk 50 metres but not more than 200 metres safely, as often as reasonably required, to a reasonable standard and in a reasonable timescale.”

It seems likely that this phraseology was used in recognition of the test set out under regulation 4, and the definitions at 4(4) of the terms used in 4(2A), in particular the definition of “repeatedly” in 4 (2A) (c), which appears at 4 (4) (b): (b)“repeatedly” means as often as the activity being assessed is reasonably required to be completed.

To the extent that this definition was interpreted to exclude the appellant’s choice as to how often she would ‘move around’ (in the words of the schedule; I might use the expression ‘walk’), and replace that choice with an objective test of how often she needed to do so, that was wrong.

... If the tribunal looked at the concept ‘repeatedly’ on one walk to a local shop and then back home each day, which an appellant could accomplish at one stretch, perhaps because it felt that she would be able to pick up what she needed on such an outing, that would be to assess her on an overly limited basis: she may wish to walk on to the park, or meet a friend, and why should she not?”

He adds that:  
 “... a tribunal does not need to accept the genuineness of an extreme routine put forward in an apparent attempt to “generate” points, but if it is accepted that somebody would like to walk further or more frequently and such activity is not inherently unreasonable then that wish should be factored in to the calculation of how often the

factored in to the calculation of how often the activity being assessed is reasonably required to be completed. To address this matter otherwise would be to calculate entitlement upon the tribunal's view of what the disabled person's activities should be.”

So, Judge Gray finds that unless it is inherently unreasonable an appellant's choice should be respected. In doing so he cites the Court's ruling in *Secretary of State v Fairey (R(A) 2/98)* that the yardstick of a “normal life” is important and that this is a better approach than adopting the test as to whether something is “essential” or “desirable”.

### Assessing prescribe medication

The appellant's rheumatologist had made a report that said “she has been tried on numerous medications in the past which have been discontinued either because of adverse effects or lack of efficiency, and she is presently taking hydroxychloroquine 200 mg daily, prednisolone 5 mg daily and in addition dermatave ointment”.

However, the First-Tier Tribunal (FTT) found that the appellant's “functional ability might be improved by more regular and better pain relief.” It awarded 2 points for activity 1b, the need and aid or appliance, rather than the personal assistance which was contended for. A similar approach was taken to activity 6 dressing and undressing; the finding being qualified by the phrase “especially given the availability of better pain relief”.

Judge Gray holds that in doing so the FTT was in error:

“Whilst the tribunal has the function to enquire, there are certain clinical matters which should be respected. In particular, in this case there was the evidence of the consultant that a variety of medication had been tried but was unsuitable. In that circumstance, it seems to me beyond doubt that the FTT was wrong in basing its assessment upon her being able to take additional medication to improve her function.”

He adds that in any event a tribunal should be highly circumspect in such an approach:

“It is one thing to infer the severity of a condition, for example, from the level of medication or a failure to refer or a discharge from specialist treatment, and very properly that inference may bear upon the expected level of functional disability.

It is quite another where there is evidence of treatment and the reasons for it, for the tribunal to go behind the clinical judgement of those treating the appellant or impute treatment that is not being given.”

### Engaging with other people face-to-face (Activity 9)

The appellant's evidence was that whereas she did engage with family and close friends face to face, she found it difficult to mix with other people, and in particular felt uncomfortable to be with new people due to the lesions and scars on her face.

The FTT reasoned, following observations as to her appearing to engage satisfactorily with health professionals and with the tribunal, that she would be able to engage with others “whenever reasonably necessary”.

However, Judge Grey finds that this is the wrong test.

He holds that the definition of “engage socially” informs activity 9 (*SF-v-SSWP (PIP) [2016] UKUT 543 (AAC)*). It includes the ability to establish relationships. The ability, therefore, to engage with people known to her (family and existing friends) or with whom she needs to engage for a specific and limited purpose (health professionals or the tribunal) is insufficient to engage the baseline (zero scoring) descriptor.

Further, there is no legal basis for limiting the assessment of her ability to engage with others face to face to such engagement as is reasonably necessary. The purpose of PIP, like DLA before it, is to assist those with disabilities to live, as far as possible, the life that they would wish to live, and any mitigating behaviour adopted because of that disability must be disregarded: *EG-v-SSWP (PIP) [2017] UKUT 101 (AAC)*.

---

## Need to wear clean clothing/young person's ability to make budgeting decisions

---

**Benefit:**

PIP

**Upper Tribunal Judge:**

Hemingway

**File No:**[CPIP/3730/2016](#)

The claimant was 16 at his refused claim for PIP and had ADHD.

The tribunal decided that 6 points were scored under the activities and descriptors relevant to the daily living component of PIP and no points at all under those relevant to mobility. The points scored were under descriptors linked to the activities of "Preparing food"; "Washing and bathing" and "Engaging with other people face to face", 2 points being awarded for each.

But the tribunal did not award any points under the descriptors linked to the activities of "Dressing and undressing" or "Making budgeting decisions".

It said with respect to dressing and undressing:

"At the examination, the appellant told the HCP that he tends to wear clothes that he likes and which are comfortable. His mother tells him to wear appropriate clothing but he is unconcerned whether colours go together or not. He can dress his whole body and he would only wear a coat if he thinks it is cold outside.

The HCP reported that the appellant knows how to dress and undress himself. At the examination he was well kempt, had normal cognition and insight and there were no physical restrictions.

The tribunal found that the evidence suggested that the appellant can dress and undress unaided. This was consistent with the appellant's medical condition and treatment and was accepted by the tribunal."

With respect to budgeting decisions the tribunal found that the evidence suggested that the appellant can manage complex budgeting decisions unaided:

"This was consistent with the appellant's medical condition and treatment and was accepted by the tribunal. The tribunal accepts that as a young man the appellant has yet to experience financial independence. However, he has no cognitive impairment and he told the tribunal in his oral evidence that he was able to purchase items of food when he was at college, to know how much the items cost and to understand the change that should be received."

However, in upholding the claimant's appeal and remitting it for rehearing, Judge Hemingway holds as follows:

"If a claimant, in consequence of a physical or mental condition will without intervention select items of clothing which have become malodorous or which it has become unhygienic to continue to wear, he/she may score points under the descriptors linked to activity 6 (dressing and undressing) either because of a need for prompting or assistance to select appropriate clothing or because of an inability to dress to an acceptable standard.

In addition, he finds that it is appropriate to consider a claimant's ability or otherwise to make complex budgeting decisions under the descriptors linked to activity 10 (Making budgeting decisions) even though that claimant may only be 16 or 17 years old.

A claimant who is impulsive may score points under the descriptors linked to activity 10 even if entirely capable of making all the sorts of decisions set out in the definition of "complex budgeting decisions" within Schedule 1 to the PIP Regulations if he may, nevertheless, then spend money it has been decided to pay bills with on something else."

## Hesitation in selecting appropriate clothing may lead to the award of points under Activity 6 (dressing and undressing)

**Benefit:**

PIP

**Upper Tribunal Judge:**

Hemingway

**File No:**

[CPIP/3760/2016](#)

In this decision, Upper Tribunal Judge Hemingway holds that Hesitation in selecting appropriate clothing may lead the award of points under Activity 6 when used in conjunction with regulation 4 (2A) and 4 (4) of the PIP Regulations so long as the hesitation is as a result of a health condition.

The claimant had health problems which included depression, anxiety, bulimia and irritable bowel syndrome. She also displayed features of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, autistic spectrum disorder and obsessive compulsive disorder.

She explained to the tribunal that she experienced difficulty with the activity of dressing and undressing in that she needed prompting to dress (though she said she could do so when she had to such that she was able to dress for work).

She said that when she took her son to school she would put a coat on over her night clothes rather than dressing properly. She also said that she found it difficult to select suitable clothing as a result of her “body issues” which she linked to her bulimia and how she felt about her body in consequence of her suffering from that condition.

However, the tribunal did not award her points for this, stressing that the claimant was physically, to get dressed and undressed unaided:

“Her issue with dressing is selecting appropriate clothing. She feels that due to her eating disorder and depression she takes longer than most to choose clothes she feels happy to wear. This is not the test. Her difficulties in choosing clothes, whilst accepted, is not so serious that she is unable to leave the house or ever change clothes. She is able to make a decision eventually. No points were awarded.”

In holding that the tribunal had erred, Judge Hemingway says that:

“The point is that the difficulties experienced by a claimant, in order to allow that claimant to score points, must be a consequence of a physical or mental condition. Viewed from that perspective, what is important is not whether the claimant is hesitating over her clothing selections on the basis of appearance but, rather, assuming that she is, whether her hesitation or indecision is a consequence of a health condition.

The tribunal did appear to accept that the claimant would or might take longer to dress than would a person who did not have her health difficulties ...

In particular, its observation that with respect to selecting clothes to wear “she is able to make a decision eventually” does seem to point to its having accepted that there was a degree of difficulty of some significance.

It did seem to contemplate (without making a clear finding on the point) a link that to her eating disorder and depression. It is possible, though it did not say this, that it also had in mind her assertion that she displayed features of obsessive compulsive disorder. I would stress, though, that I cannot see any evidence that a diagnosis of that condition has been made.”

Judge Hemingway then explains that:

“The claimant would have scored 2 points had it been found that she satisfied daily living descriptor 6c. That descriptor has two limbs one of which relates to a need for “prompting or assistance to be able to select appropriate clothing”. Her ability to address and undress had to be assessed in light of regulation 4(2A) of the Regulations which says that in order to be found capable of carrying out an activity a claimant must be able to perform it “within a reasonable time period” which is then defined in regulation 4(4) as no more than twice as long as the maximum period that a person without a physical or mental

condition which limits that person's ability to carry out the activity in question would normally take to complete that activity.

It does seem to me that the tribunal, having seemingly accepted a degree of difficulty with respect to the time it would take the claimant to dress, failed to make findings as to the cause of the difficulty and (in the event of its finding that a health condition was the cause) as to how long it would take her to dress and, in particular, whether she was not able to do so within a "reasonable time period" as defined within regulation 4(4)."

So in setting aside the tribunal's decision and remitting her appeal for rehearing, Judge Hemingway concludes that the claimant's:

"... ability to address and undress had to be assessed in light of regulation 4(2A) of the Regulations which says that in order to be found capable of carrying out an activity a claimant must be able to perform it "within a reasonable time period" which is then defined in regulation 4(4) as no more than twice as long as the maximum period that a person without a physical or mental condition which limits that person's ability to carry out the activity in question would normally take to complete that activity."

### Other welfare case law summaries online

There are hundreds of other [welfare benefits case law summaries](#) online @ [www.disabilityrightsuk.org](http://www.disabilityrightsuk.org)  
Organised to help you readily find relevant decisions and judgments our case law section includes:

- Latest decision summaries
- Higher Court judgement summaries
- Case law summaries in year order from 2003 to 2017
- Decision-making and appeals case law summaries
- Disability living allowance and attendance allowance case law summaries
- Employment and support allowance case law summaries
- Incapacity benefit case law summaries



## Personal Independence Payment (PIP)

### A step-by-step guide to claiming the new benefit

PIP is a new benefit for people who need help taking part in everyday life or who find it difficult to get around. It replaces disability living allowance for people between the ages of 16 and 64 inclusive.

Our free guide includes:

- What is PIP and when it's being introduced;
- What happens to people already on DLA;
- The qualification criteria and new points-based assessment;
- How to claim, including step-by-step instructions on completing the claim form and helpful tools and tactics.

Free to download

[Download your copy @ www.disabilityrightsuk.org](http://www.disabilityrightsuk.org)

# Future changes

## A timetable of future benefit and tax credit changes

Compiled by Disability Right's UK's webmaster Martin Inch

<b>Note</b>	This timetable may be subject to change. You should regularly check for <a href="#">updates</a> online at <a href="http://www.disabilityrightsuk.org">www.disabilityrightsuk.org</a>
<b>September 2017</b>	<b>Universal Credit comes to Northern Ireland</b> Northern Ireland will launch a phased start up new claimants from 25th September 2017.
<b>April 2018</b>	<b>Support for Mortgage Interest becomes a loan</b> New Support for Mortgage Interest (SMI) will be paid as a loan, to be repaid upon sale of your house, or when you return to work.
<b>April 2018</b>	<b>Part-time maintenance loans introduced</b> New part-time maintenance loans from 2018-19 to support the cost of living while studying.
<b>April 2018</b>	<b>Abolition of class 2 National Insurance Contributions</b> Class 2 National Insurance Contributions (NICs) will be abolished and the Government will reform Class 4 NICs as a route to self-employed individuals building entitlement to the State Pension and other contributory benefits..
<b>April 2019</b>	<b>Social Sector Housing Benefit Cap to Local Housing Allowance levels</b> There will be a cap on the amount of rent that Housing Benefit will cover in the social sector to the relevant Local Housing Allowance, which is the rate paid to private renters on Housing Benefit. This includes a Shared Accommodation Rate for single claimants under 35 who do not have dependent children.  The cap will also be applied to all supported housing tenancies from April 2019, though Local Authorities will receive funding to meet the additional costs of supported housing in their area.  For general needs housing, the cap will apply from April 2019 for all tenants on Universal Credit, and to Housing Benefit tenants whose tenancies began or were renewed since April 2016.
<b>October 2020</b>	<b>State pension age increases</b> State pension age for both men and women increases to 66.
<b>November 2021</b>	<b>Post office card account</b> Post Office card account (POCA) to be reviewed.
<b>April 2026 to April 2028</b>	<b>State pension age increases again</b> State Pension rises in stages to 67.

# Contact Disability Rights UK (DR UK)

## Disability Rights UK

Ground Floor, CAN Mezzanine,  
49-51 East Road, London N1 6AH.

### How to find us

[Our location](#) on a map.

Nearest underground station:

Old Street (Northern Line).

We are a two minute walk from the station.

## Contact us

### General enquiries

Office number: 020 7250 8181

Open Monday to Friday

9am-12.30pm and 1.30-4.00pm

Please note this line is not an advice line.

Email: [enquiries@disabilityrightsuk.org](mailto:enquiries@disabilityrightsuk.org)

### Membership enquiries

Phone: 020 7250 8180

Email: [members@disabilityrightsuk.org](mailto:members@disabilityrightsuk.org)

### Sales enquiries

Phone: 020 7250 8191

### Media enquiries (for journalists only)

Phone: 07590 929441

### Website enquiries

Email: [webmaster@disabilityrightsuk.org](mailto:webmaster@disabilityrightsuk.org)

## Helplines for individuals

### Equality Advisory & Support Service (EASS)

Phone: 0808 800 0082

Textphone: 0808 800 0084

Open Monday-Friday 9am-8pm and Saturday  
10am-2pm (closed Sundays and Bank Holidays)

There is a webcam portal for BSL users via the  
Royal Association for Deaf people.

Website: [www.equalityadvisoryservice.com](http://www.equalityadvisoryservice.com)

### Disabled Students Helpline

Phone: 0800 328 5050

Open Tuesday and Thursday 11am-1pm

Email: [students@disabilityrightsuk.org](mailto:students@disabilityrightsuk.org)

### Personal Budgets Advice Service

Phone: 0300 555 1525

Open: Monday and Thursday 9am-1pm

Email: [independentliving@disabilityrightsuk.org](mailto:independentliving@disabilityrightsuk.org)

## Helplines for advisers

### Member Organisations

### Welfare Rights Advice Service

Phone: 020 7250 8184

Open Monday to Friday

10am-12noon and 2pm-4pm

Email: [ken.butler@disabilityrightsuk.org](mailto:ken.butler@disabilityrightsuk.org)

