

Report on the Outcome of Public Consultation on:

**Proposals to review and change the Adult
Social Care non-residential contributions
scheme – including very sheltered housing
and supported living**

4 September 2017 – 26 November 2017

Appendix 1

Purpose of Report

Proposals to review and change the non-residential Adult Social Care Services contribution scheme

The City of Wolverhampton Council are proposing to change the scheme for contributions to non-residential Adult Social Care, including Direct Payments and care and support provided in very sheltered housing and supported living accommodation.

Methodology

A twelve-week consultation commenced on 4 September 2017 and finished on 26 November 2017

Information on the proposals to review and change the current banded non-residential contributions scheme to an individual assessment scheme was sent to service users (**see Appendix 1A**), carers and stakeholders along with a letter inviting them to attend one of the public consultation meetings.

- Four public meetings were held
- One stakeholder meeting was held
- One specific service user group meeting was held
- The consultation was published on the City of Wolverhampton Council's current consultation pages inviting comment via a comments form
- A press notice was released giving information on the consultation and dates of meetings
- A customer services telephone number was provided to support people wishing to make comments
- A comments form was included on the website and sent to service users (**see Appendix 1B**)
- A total of 46 people attended the public/stakeholder events
- A total of 14 Comments Forms were received (see pages 4-6)

Appendix 1

Consultation Report

Consultation meetings

Date	Venue	Type of meeting	Number in attendance
Tuesday 10 th October 10.00 am - 12.00 noon	Ashmore Park Hub Griffiths Drive Ashmore Park	Public Consultation	9
Friday 13 th October 10.00 am – 12.00 noon	Bilston Town Hall Church Street Bilston	Public Consultation	4
Wednesday 18 th October 12.00noon – 2.00pm	Gathering Space Art Gallery	Stakeholder Consultation	4
Thursday 19 th October 2.00 pm – 4.00 pm	Action 4 Independence Albert Road	Public Consultation	11
Wednesday 25 th October 5.30 pm – 7.30pm	Bob Jones Community Centre Bromley Street Blakenhall	Public Consultation	6
Wednesday 22 nd November 11.00am – 12.00noon	Ernest Bold Resource Centre Bilston	Service specific – Learning Disabilities	12

Summary of comments from consultation meetings

Attendees received a powerpoint presentation on the proposed changes to the current banded non-residential contribution scheme given by Helen Winfield, Head of Community Financial Support and Matt Fisher, Principal Financial Assessments Officer. There were also Benefits and Assessments staff at the meetings to answer any individual personal questions 1:1.

The key elements of the proposed individual assessment scheme were presented including the proposals for a standard disability-related expenditure disregard and examples how the new scheme may affect service users with typical types of income.

There were queries raised about whether the proposals were part of a savings target for the Council and it was explained that the purpose of the review and proposed changes was to fully comply with the Care Act 2014; to provide a fairer scheme based on individual resources and also to address the changes to the benefit system which would introduce Universal Credit Full Service in Wolverhampton which would impact upon the level of individual's income. It was further explained that if the proposals were implemented, some

Appendix 1


individual's contribution would be less and some would be more. It was stated that where contributions were significantly more as a result of any changes implemented, there should be protection considered.

There was some opposition to the proposals to change from the current banded scheme. Some of the participants were of the belief that it was a decision that has already been made and were concerned with the financial burden they felt was being placed on the most vulnerable in society.


Some attendees felt that factors such as food and fuel poverty were not being considered, particularly for people who suffer from long-term disability. They felt a lot of people who are affected are experiencing hardship and their quality of life should be considered. It was especially noted that working age people are unfairly treated by the minimum income guarantee and that the Council have not addressed that in the discretion they have within the care and support statutory guidance to allow more generous disregards within the financial assessment. It was felt by a number of people that the Council should consider this further before final proposals were submitted.

There were also concerns raised about the reduction of care and support hours from recent re-assessments and the fact that the contribution remained the same.

Comments forms/correspondence received

1	<p>Summary submitted:</p> <p>It is recognised that changes need to be made to the current charging scheme for non-resident Adult Social Care in order to comply with the Care Act 2014. However, whilst the proposals made by Wolverhampton City Council appear to comply with the letter of the law, it is our view that they do not comply with the spirit of the statutory guidance published by the Government in support of the Care Act 2014.</p> <p>In the attached pages we have given detailed reasons for this view and have provided our proposals for improvements that should be made that will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not increase costs to Wolverhampton compared with the current scheme.• Provide transitional relief for those service users who will see significant increases in their charges• Better protect the income of the service users• Be fairer to disabled service users of working age especially those in the ESA support group who are unable to supplement their income through work. <p>Complete comments form submitted:</p> <p></p> <p>Comments Form re WCC Non-residentia</p>
---	--

Appendix 1

2	I received this letter on 30/9/17 concerning [Mr H service user] about his contribution to his adult social care. At the moment [Mr H] is adult social care which living at [care home]. The manager is [BS]. He has lived at this address from 4/9/15. I pay his money to [BS] every month which is 572.12 which is rent, food, electric. I also give money for [Mr H] for clothes or whatever he needs which is 250 a month. The I have to pay your bill which is contribution to his adult social care which is 453.15 one month or 362.52 another month. Could you please look into the money we pay out if Mr H's bill could be reduced. Thank you.
3	If a family member has to move in with their mom or dad to help with their care, the income should not be affected to the point it gets taken away from the disabled person. Where the funding contribution goes up or down needs to be carefully look at before decisions are been made.
4	Complete comments form submitted:  Non-resiConsultati onComments.pdf
5	I disagree with the proposed new scheme. I do not think that it is fair that people who have savings have to use them to pay for their care. Many of these people have worked all their lives and saved their earnings. People who have never worked get the same care and do not have to contribute towards costs.
6	The proposal to change the way the contributions are calculated to make a fairer system so those that can contribute towards their care and support do so is a good idea. The explanation of the new proposed scheme and the examples of how the proposed policy work are quite difficult to understand.
7	I attend Broadway Gardens Social Club every Thursday. I am very happy there. What I pay now is a fair price. I am happy with current arrangements.
8	My husband is no longer a Social Service User. He is a Nursing Care User.
9	My comments relate to disability related expenses. The 20% disregard may not cover these expenses. In addition DRE is only considered for monthly fees/costs. In the current climate with families being encouraged to find their own solutions & not request help from the council, incidental expenses should be considered. In my mother case I spent £400 on purchasing [care equipment] to monitor her. This year £300 on [care equipment] to prompt/remind her & will have ongoing disability related expenses as she deteriorates.
10	I have a carer in once a day to help me get dressed, give me my medication and do me a bit of breakfast. I do attend the blind institute but I only live down the road and pay £8.00 each day I attend the Blind Institute. Can you lower the cost for me and others like me. Thankyou.
11	I think its disgusting the way my son and his peers are being treated. His day centres have been closed and he has had to move to different places. We are getting older and have our own health issues and we are concerned about the future. He already has to pay towards his care and any activities and does not have a lot left.
12	Thank you for the presentation. We had a great help from Stacey Bell [Benefits and Assessments member of staff] with our PIPS so I am sure if we need this help again she is still there.

Appendix 1

13	Its absolutely disgusting yet again that this silly council is targeting the vulnerable. How about [if] the council sacked the overpaid councillors who do nothing and have no knowledge of the real world and how hard it is to be vulnerable and have to live with a lifelong disability. It's the easy solution for Wolverhampton council overpaid councillors to attack the disabled, as you know these people cannot defend themselves. DISGUSTING. TAKE A PAY DECREASE AND SEE HOW MUCH MONEY WILL BE SAVED, INSTEAD OF ATTACKING INNOCENT VULNERABLE PEOPLE.
14	He is awarded with: 83.10 Daily Living Need 58.00 Help with Mobility Need. Severe Learning Disabilities.

All queries raised in the comments forms relating to current payments have been addressed by Benefits and Assessments Officers.

The final proposals seek to address the issues raised consistently about disregarding enough money to allow for disability-related expenditure and avoid intrusive enhanced financial assessments and about protection against significant increases in contributions.