

Charges and contributions to adult social care services

Results of Consultation 25th November- 24th January Final Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Lewisham's Community Services Directorate consulted stakeholders from November 24th 2014 until January 25th 2015 on proposals to change the rules on charges and contributions for adult social care.
- 1.2 This report documents the analysis of all questionnaires, focus groups and public consultation events, and other responses submitted to the London Borough of Lewisham during the consultation period.

2. Background

- 2.1 The detail of the budget situation is set out in the main body of the report: Lewisham Future Programme 2015/16 Revenue Budget Savings Report, available at <http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s31899/05LFPRevenueBudgetSavings05112014.pdf>
- 2.2 That report sets out the budget challenges faced by the Council and outlines the savings proposals which are being presented to enable a balanced budget for 2015/16 to be put forward to Council in February 2015.
- 2.3 The saving under consideration proposed £375k of savings to be made through changing the charges and contributions to adult social care services policy.
- 2.4 The Council has not changed its Adult Social Care Contribution Policy since 1st April 2011.
- 2.5 On November 12th the Mayor authorised officers to carry out a public consultation on changing the charges and contributions to adult social care services policy.
- 2.6 The Mayor delegated the decision on how to meet the savings target to the Executive Director of Community Services subject to results of the consultation.

3. Methods

- 3.1 In developing the consultation schedule, officers followed the statutory guidance issued by the Department of Health, together with the Consultation Code of Practice for the Public Sector issued by the Cabinet Office. The consultation plans were presented to the Consultation Steering Group for comment and approval, and subsequently approved by the Healthier Communities Select Committee.

- 3.2 Between November 24th 2014 and January 25th 2015, Lewisham Council consulted with service users, carers, voluntary sector and service provider organisations and members of the public to obtain a comprehensive view of the potential impacts of implementing the proposed changes for adult social care charges and contributions.
- 3.3 To effectively consult on the proposed changes to adult social care the Council used a mixed methods approach including development of postal and online questionnaires, focus groups, home visits and public consultation.
- 3.4 To ensure that as many service users as possible had the opportunity to make their voices heard, a comprehensive programme of outreach was carried out over the entire course of the consultation. This ensured that those who might have difficulty in participating in the consultation had an opportunity to contribute their thoughts. This included home visits, interpreting and translation which were arranged on request for people that had difficulty understanding the consultation documents. One public consultation event was signed and all events were accessible to all service users. This included two public consultation events and three additional events, one for adults with a learning disability hosted by Lewisham Speaking Up, another hosted by Carers Lewisham and another Hosted by Lewisham Pensioners Forum.
- 3.5 Support for the consultation process was arranged by leaving a message on the dedicated telephone line, which operated 24 hours a day throughout the consultation period. Or by sending an email to a dedicated inbox that was monitored throughout the consultation.

Distribution of information and consultation documents

- 3.6 Lewisham's questionnaire was accompanied by a consultation pack explaining the proposals and giving case studies as possible examples of impact. This was available in an easy to read format with pictures and symbols and in large print or as an audio version on request. Around 2,500 questionnaires and information packs were circulated over the course of the consultation. These were distributed to existing service users, carers and voluntary and community sector organisations. In addition, the questionnaires were available to download from the council website or could be completed online.
- 3.7 A dedicated consultation email address was established to deal with comments and enquiries.
- 3.8 A dedicated consultation telephone line was established where people could leave messages requesting assistance with the consultation pack or get answers to other enquiries about how any changes might affect things.
- 3.9 32 people made contact via the helpline and via email.
- 3.10 Press advertisements were placed in various publications including: Lewisham Pensioners Forum Newsletter, Lewisham Hospital Staff newsletter, South London Press, News Shopper, Healthwatch enewsletter.
- 3.11 The consultation was also advertised online and on social media, including: Lewisham Council website, Carers Lewisham website, CCG website, Facebook and Twitter. The below indicates the coverage and engagement on social media and online.

Council Website		
Number of views	26	
Facebook		
<i>Date</i>	<i>Reach (shown to)</i>	
10 th December	316	
14 th January	122	
Twitter		
<i>Date</i>	<i>Impression (shown to)</i>	<i>Engagement (clicked)</i>
26 th November	1,472	33
8 th December	1,045	8
15 th December	1,070	12
29 th December	1,488	15
12 th January	2,144	17
18 th January	1,142	20

Consultation events

- 3.12 A series of consultation events were designed to capture public opinion on the proposals and also to collect in depth views of targeted groups. The following details the meetings, focus groups, workshops and meetings that took place to discuss the consultation:

Event	Attendees
Lewisham Speaking Up event	41
Public Consultation events x2	28
Lewisham Carers Event	20
Lewisham Pensioners Forum	55

- 3.13 Healthier Communities Select Committee

Members of the Healthier Communities Select Committee were formally consulted on the proposals on 14th January 2015 and resolved; to note the update reports; the Committee also noted its concerns about the combined impact of the proposals on service users and asked to be kept updated about the development of other options for funding provision of transport.

4. Key Findings

- 4.1 From the postal and online questionnaires there were 314 respondents in total. Of these 198 people completed Standard Questionnaires and 116 people completed Easy Read Questionnaires.
- 4.2 The results from the quantitative and qualitative data gathered during the consultation process are listed below. Please note tables of results for each option in full are on page 14 of this report and where numbers reported do not reflect 100% of responses, the discrepancy represents those who declined to answer the question.
- 4.3 **If we do not make changes to charges and contributions to adult social care are there any other changes the Council can make to meet our saving requirements?**
- 4.3.1 From the comments we received as part of this consultation there were many alternative suggestions as to how the required savings could be made. These are listed in more detail in section 5, but many felt that adult social care was being unfairly targeted for savings, and that it should be protected while other Council services make greater savings.
- 4.4 **Proposed Change 1: The income support buffer should be reduced from 35% to 25%**
- 4.4.1 The majority of those consulted were not in favour of reducing the income support buffer from 35% to 25%. 56.05% (176) were opposed to the proposed change, while 18.47% of people (58) supported the proposal. 19.11% (60) neither agreed nor disagreed or didn't know.
- 4.4.2 It was commonly reported that any increase in what service users are expected to pay would be unaffordable, as "they struggle already". Others worried that this meant they would have to cope with less care than they currently received. Some service users supported the change, but said they "disagree with the increment" and questioned why we had to reduce to the minimum possible buffer. Some service users at the Speaking Up Event felt that paying a bit more for all services would give them control and independence, they said "it would be a good chance to look after my own money". Lewisham Pensioners Forum "urge the council to consider phasing the reduction of the income support buffer from 35% to 25% if they decided to proceed with proposal 1, as well as phasing in of any other increases that may be agreed.
- 4.5 **Proposed Change 2: The Council should take 100% of your net disposable income into account when calculating how much you should contribute to the costs of your care.**

- 4.5.1 48.73% of respondents (153) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal. Just over a quarter of respondents 25.16% (79) agreed or strongly agreed increasing to 100% the amount of net disposable income taken into account when calculating service user charges. 21.97% (69) neither agreed nor disagreed or didn't know.
- 4.5.2 The qualitative data gathered demonstrated the worry that this proposal generated, with service users reporting that this change would put them "in financial hardship" as they have "other bills to pay". Other service users said that they already felt that their "benefits were not enough".
- 4.6 **Proposed Change 3: The maximum charge (£500) should be removed so that service users with high levels of capital would pay the full cost of their services.**
- 4.6.1 Over half of the respondents 56.69% of the respondents (178) were opposed to removing the weekly maximum charge limit which is currently £500. 21.34% (67) were in favour and 18.15% (57) were neither for nor against the proposal or didn't know.
- 4.6.2 Despite the clear opposition demonstrated by the quantitative data the comments were more supportive arguing that we should "ensure that the very wealthiest of service users meet the full real costs" and that "people with more money should pay more for services". However it also came across that the acceptance of this proposal "depends on eligibility level" that the Council set. These comments were reflected in the Public Consultation Events.
- 4.7 **Proposed Change 4: Charges should be introduced for supported accommodation.**
- 4.7.1 The majority of respondents 53.50% (168) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the Council introducing charges for supported accommodation. 21.66% (68) agreed or strongly agreed that charges should be introduced. 20.70% (65) neither agreed nor disagreed or didn't know.
- 4.7.2 Comments suggested that most people felt they already paid enough for supported accommodation and that if any charges were introduced they should be based on a "fair system". During the consultation officers were regularly required to explain that this change applied to care component, not to the housing component of supported accommodation.
- 4.8 **Proposed Change 5: Charges should be introduced for respite care provided at home.**
- 4.8.1 63.06% (198) were opposed to introducing charges for respite care provided at home. Only 13.06% (41) were in favour of the proposal with 19.11% (60) neither agreeing nor disagreeing or didn't know.

- 4.8.2 Most comments were strongly against introducing charges for respite care provided at home citing that it is “unfair” and the argument was made that the change would be counterproductive, “any charges for respite care will end up being ‘false economy’ and will put financial pressure on other council services”. Others said that this change would mean they have to give up receiving respite care and that their mental health would suffer.
- 4.9 **Proposed Change 6: Charges should be introduced for transport that the Council provides.**
- 4.9.1 Almost two thirds of respondents, 62.10% (195) were opposed to the Council introducing charges for transport which is currently provided free of charge. 17.83% (56) agreed or strongly agreed. 16.88% (53) neither agreed nor disagreed or didn’t know.
- 4.9.2 Comments were largely negative, some worried that having to pay for transport would mean “less people would be willing to attend the services” that we provide and that transport currently acts as a “lifeline” for otherwise “housebound” people. Other felt that this would only be fair if not applied to wheel chair users. Lewisham Pensioners Forums disagreed with this proposal.
- 4.10 **Proposed Change 7: Charges should be introduced for services provided to carers with a charge based on household income above a minimum level together with the value of the services given.**
- 4.10.1 Over half of those surveyed 60.51% (190) were opposed to introducing charges for carers services, that are currently provided free of charge. 13.69% (43) were in favour. With 20.38% (64) neither agreeing nor disagreeing or didn’t know.
- 4.10.2 The comments demonstrated that people felt that this change would put “more pressure on family carers who are suffering”. It was also repeatedly stated that many service users felt that this change would actually cost more to the council than it would save. Carers said that “we save the government a fortune” and that the reality of carer relationships means that any moves that make their lives more difficult will mean that “instead of one service user, you will end up with two service users”. Lewisham Pensioners Forum disagreed with this proposal, they thought it would be immoral and stated “A value cannot be placed on their role [Carers] - they save society and health and social care services so much”.
- 4.11 **Proposed Change 8: Charges should be increased for day centre attendance by the rate of inflation. Charges for this service are currently lower than the full cost of the service. We propose to increase these by 2.5% from 1 April 2015.**

- 4.11.1 Most people 51.91% (163) disagreed with increasing charges for day centre attendance by the rate of inflation. 23.25% of people (73) were in favour of the proposal. 20.06% (63) neither agreed nor disagreed or didn't know.
- 4.11.2 A strong current of argument was that day centre attendance has become vital to many service users' lives and so must remain "affordable and accessible to all who need it". Others thought that any increase would mean fewer people would use the service. However others acknowledged that while this change would be "undesirable" it would be "conscionable" if handled fairly.
- 4.12 **Proposed Change 9: Charges should be increased for meals the Council provides by the rate of inflation. Charges for this service are currently lower than the full cost of the service. We propose to increase these by 2.5% from 1 April 2015.**
- 4.12.1 Over half 53.50% (168) opposed the proposal and 21.97% (69) of respondents agreed with the proposal. 20.70% (65) neither agreed nor disagreed or didn't know.
- 4.12.2 From the comments we received there was little consensus. Some said a small rise was fair while others felt that paying a little more for meals would only be justified if the quality was increased, while others felt that providing healthy meals to vulnerable people was "not too much to ask" and that an increased cost may lead to unhealthy diets.
- 4.13 **Proposed Change 10: As from 1 April 2015, we propose to start charging service users for services they receive from the first day they receive them. In the past the Council have not backdated any charges.**
- 4.13.1 Over half of the people surveyed 55.73% (175) disagreed or strongly disagreed, less than a quarter 22.29% (70) agreed and 18.15% (57) neither agreed nor disagreed or didn't know.
- 4.13.2 Of the proposed changes this change seemed to have been misunderstood by a significant number of service users and there was a significant amount of worry expressed that current service users would have to back date any increases in charges that come about from these proposed changes. Some service users pointed out that they already had disputes about outstanding backdated charges that they believed were unfair, and that late direct payments compounded these.
- 4.14 **Are there any other ways we could change the adult social care charging policy to contribute to our saving requirements?**

4.14.1 There were not too many suggestions as to how the charging policy could be better changed. Although two arguments were repeatedly made, that tax contributions should be better taken into account and that those who can afford to pay more should.

4.15 **Will any of these changes affect you or your family?**

4.15.1 45.96% (91) service users who responded to the standard consultation pack said that the proposals would have a direct impact on them or their families. 21.21% (42) stated that there would be no impact on them or their families.

4.15.2 The qualitative data indicates that the effect these proposals would have on service users and their families would be extremely negative and that if all of the proposed changes went ahead it would be “nightmare” and that they could be considered “immoral”. This question also brought to the surface lots of confusion among service users who were unsure what the changes would actually mean for their financial situation.

4.16 **If you have any other comments or suggestions about the proposed changes**

4.16.1 Many people made other comments and suggestions; these are explained in more detail in the Key Themes section below.

5. **Key Themes**

5.1 **Caring for the vulnerable**

5.1.1 People felt strongly that there was a moral imperative to take care of and protect the sick, elderly and disabled in society. Strong feelings were expressed that some of the options were unfair and could disadvantage the most vulnerable disabled and frail/elderly. One person stated “I feel that such vulnerable people should be helped to obtain the most out of their lives without worrying if they can afford it, Handicapped people should not be targeted to make up any monies the government are falling to give”. Another person stated “I consider it quite immoral to remove help/increase charges, however well thought-out, to the most needy in the community, i.e. the vulnerable aged, the disabled and the under-fives.” Feedback from the Public Consultation Events and Lewisham Speaking Up also reflected these comments.

5.2 **Attitudes to paying for services**

5.2.1 It was generally felt that those with more income or savings should pay more if they can afford it, some stated “If I can pay, I will pay more” and “If someone is well off financially, i.e. owns property and good financial backing, then they should pay for the service”. However, there were also strong

feelings that it is unfair to penalise those who have saved over a lifetime and bought their own homes.

- 5.2.2 Some people wanted the current rules to stay as they are... 'I think you should leave it as it is'.
- 5.2.3 Some expressed anger that they had contributed to the welfare system all of their lives and it was now not providing for them at a time of need. "We all pay national insurance for care and old age".
- 5.2.4 Some people were resistant to paying more for their services predicting a poorer quality of life and diminished standard of living as a result.
- 5.2.5 However, some people understood that in today's economic climate there was a need for the Council to increase charges although many thought they were being particularly targeted. Some stated, "this is a devastating hammer-blow for the poorest in society and the most disabled."

5.3 **Impact on quality of life**

- 5.3.1 It was generally felt that people already did not have enough money and therefore could not afford to pay more for services, some stated "Don't have enough money to pay, my benefit is not enough."
- 5.3.2 Some felt that the increase in charges will have an impact on their general standard of living and wellbeing. Some stated "It will leave me a lot poorer.", "I will have less money for my holiday", and "I will have less money for myself.", "This will have a negative effect on vulnerable people's lives, well-being and self-worth." These comments were reflected in the Speaking Up consultation event.

5.4 **Cumulative effects of cuts to services**

- 5.4.1 Overall it was felt that the cumulative effects of cuts that have taken place over the last few years were not given enough consideration in these proposals. Some stated, "People with a learning disability and other people who have a disability have already lost most of their services and had their benefits reduced to the extent that they could not buy nourishing food and adequate clothes".
- 5.4.2 Some were worried about the impact on particular services; introducing charges for transport would lead to a reduced attendance at day centres and have an impact on people's wellbeing as they are no longer able to get out the house. Some stated, "I do not feel the Council will benefit as if they make charges which people cannot afford. If they... [cannot get to] ... day

centres and clubs these buildings will remain empty and it would be a loss to them.” Some stated that “The social clubs are a life-line to many an opportunity to see friends, which would be totally horrid if it couldn't continue.”

- 5.4.3 Some worried that the proposal could lead to increase cost in the future. Many mentioned that care actually save the Council money, “we need as much help as we can get. Caring drove me to a nervous breakdown, which cost the NHS services a lot. Most, 90% of carers are under a huge strain mentally and physically. We save this government a fortune.” Likewise supporting someone to use public transport would cost more, some stated “Most people using Lewisham transport would have a freedom pass; but not be able to use public transport without support, which would be more costly”

5.5 **Survey too complex and confusing**

- 5.5.1 Some respondents had difficulty understanding the complex nature of the financial arrangements outlined in the consultation document. Some were confused about what they were being consulted on because they were taking part in other consultations or surveys. Some stated “This leaves me very confused.” Feedback from the Public Consultation event shows there was concern that some people who received the consultation did not understand it.
- 5.5.2 However, qualitative data demonstrated that a significant amount of respondents did understand the proposal and gave meaningful feedback.

5.6 **Alternative suggestions to save money**

- 5.6.1 It was generally felt that this service user group were being targeted and that the Council should be making savings and revenue elsewhere in other departments. “You can make changes in another department it doesn't have to come from adult social care.”
- 5.6.2 Some alternative suggestions were listed below:
- The government should give Lewisham more money.
 - Reducing/review eligibility criteria for care services.
 - Get revenue from all the new housing in the borough.
 - Charging service users a little more money for services.
 - Make the savings requirement from other departments.
 - I think you should leave it as it is and stop the cuts happening.
 - Put up the council tax gradually.
 - The Council should remove high salaries to Council staff (in particular senior management, CEO and Directors) and politicians.
 - Employ more efficient, reliable and competent staff.
 - Reduce council office staff and save administrative costs.
 - Cut down heat and electricity prices.

- Install Photo Voltaic on corporate buildings to generate revenue from the feed-in tariff.
- Negotiate more cost-effective services.
- Close some libraries, reduce the number of councillors and look at frequency of refuse collections.
- Stop paying £6 million a year in consultants' fees.
- Create jobs and employ services users in the LD service.
- Cut the amount of office space the council has.
- Let more services to private contractors.
- Take more efficiency measures for example many of the councils services are hugely bureaucratic and no doubt there is still a certain amount of duplication across the departments.
- Stop giving free parking and charge for parking.
- Could do more by working with Charity and Community groups and Lottery funding to increase and improve NOT cut services.
- Most residential and supported living homes have sleep in staff. With assistive technology and roving night time support staff (each patrol checking multiple properties a night) sleep in staff could be removed and costs reduced. See CAYSH service operating in Croydon.
- Re-negotiate PFI Interest payments of £64M over the next 3 years
- Ensure data is joined up by having connecting systems between all the different partners' i.e. NHS/social care/care agencies/families.
- Allow telephone or online assessments as well as in person, this will reduce the number of home visits again saving time.
- Cut these sorts of things that are not essential services e.g. things like tree planting, Christmas lights and decorations etc.
- Find ways to tax the private landlords and the rich.
- Turn off lights and heating when offices not in use.
- Increase charges for planning permission
- Sell land and buildings.

6. Profile of respondents

- 6.1 Monitoring data was included for the standard questionnaire.
- 6.2 All of the consultation events that took place over the course of the consultation included representatives from potentially affected client groups, however formal monitoring data was not collected these events.
- 6.3 To simplify the easy read version, monitoring data was not collected.

**Postal and Online questionnaires – 314 respondents in total.
198 Standard Questionnaires and 116 Easy Read Questionnaires.**

6.4 Gender

- 6.4.1 Of the total 198 respondents only 176 answered this question. Some people left blank the gender category.

Responses	Total	%
Female	105	53.03%

Male	63	31.82%
Other	0	0.00%
I'd rather not say / left incomplete	30	15.15%
Grand Total	198	100%

6.5 Age groups

6.5.1 Of the total 198 respondents only 187 answered this question. Some people left blank the age category.

Responses	Total	%
Under 18	0	0.00%
18-24	4	2.02%
25-29	3	1.52%
30-34	3	1.52%
35-39	8	4.04%
40-44	10	5.05%
45-49	13	6.57%
50-54	22	11.11%
55-59	15	7.58%
60-64	13	6.57%
65+	89	44.95%
I'd rather not say / left incomplete	18	9.10%
Grand Total	198	100%

6.6 Ethnicity

6.6.1 Of the total 198 respondents only 182 answered this question. Some people left blank the ethnicity category.

Responses	Total	%
White British	111	56.06%
White Irish	6	3.03%
White Other	8	4.04%
Asian & White	1	0.51%
Black African & White	1	0.51%
Black Caribbean & White	0	0.00%
Mixed Race Other	1	0.51%
Chinese	1	0.51%
Bangladeshi	1	0.51%
Pakistani	0	0.00%
Indian	2	1.01%
Asian Other	2	1.01%
Black African	10	5.05%
Black Caribbean	25	12.63%
Black Other	3	1.52%
Other Ethnic Group	1	0.51%
Not Known, Not Stated, or rather not say	25	12.63%
Grand Total	198	100%

6.7 Disability

6.7.1 Of the total 198 respondents only 174 answered this question. Some people left blank the disability category.

Responses	Total	%
Yes	123	62.12%
No	40	20.20%
I'd rather not say	11	5.56%
[No Response]	24	12.12%
Grand Total	198	100.00%

6.7.2 Of the total 198 respondents only 134 answered this question. Some people did not specify the type of impairment.

Responses	Total	%
Physical impairment, such as difficulty using your arms or mobility issues which means using a wheelchair or crutches	89	28.62%
Sensory impairment, such as being blind/ having a serious visual impairment or being deaf/ having a serious hearing impairment	30	9.65%
Mental health condition, such as depression or schizophrenia	24	7.72%
Learning disability/difficulty, such as Down's Syndrome or dyslexia or cognitive impairment, such as autistic spectrum disorder	29	9.32%
Long-standing illness or health condition such as cancer, HIV, diabetes, chronic heart disease or epilepsy	48	15.43%
Other	25	8.04%
[No Response]	66	21.22%
Grand Total	311*	100.00%

**some people ticked more than one box so the total is higher the total number of people who responded to the survey (198).*

6.8 Religion and belief

6.8.1 Of the total 198 respondents only 180 answered this question. Some people left blank the gender category.

Responses	Total	%
None	30	15.15%
Christian (all denominations)	115	58.08%
Buddhist	2	1.01%
Hindu	0	0.00%
Jewish	1	0.51%

Muslim	5	2.53%
Sikh	0	0.00%
Any other religion/ belief	7	3.54%
I'd rather not say	20	10.10%
[No Response]	18	9.09%
Grand Total	198	100.00%

6.9 Sexual orientation

6.9.1 Of the total 198 respondents only 175 answered this question. Some people left blank the gender category.

Responses	Total	%
Bisexual	3	1.52%
Gay/ lesbian	6	3.03%
Straight/ heterosexual	139	70.20%
Other	4	2.02%
I'd rather not say	23	11.62%
[No Response]	23	11.62%
Grand Total	198	100.00%

7. Full Table of Results

7.1 Respondents to the standard consultation pack were asked if any of the changes would affect them or their families. As all of the Easy Read versions were sent directly to Service Users this question was not included in those versions.

Will any of these changes affect you or your family?

Responses	Total	%
Yes	91	45.96%
No	42	21.21%
[No Response]	65	32.83%
Grand Total	198	100.00%

Proposed Change 1: The income support buffer should be reduced from 35% to 25%

Standard Consultation Pack

Responses	Total	%
Strongly agree	13	6.57%

Agree	34	17.17%
Neither agree nor disagree	46	23.23%
Disagree	49	24.75%
Strongly disagree	42	21.21%
[No Response]	14	7.07%
Grand Total	198	100.00%

Easy Read Consultation Pack

Responses	Total	%
Agree	11	9.48%
Don't know	14	12.07%
Disagree	85	73.28%
[No Response]	6	5.17%
Grand Total	116	100.00%

Proposed Change 2: The Council should take 100% of your net disposable income into account when calculating how much you should contribute to the costs of your care.

Standard Consultation Pack

Responses	Total	%
Strongly agree	11	5.56%
Agree	36	18.18%
Neither agree nor disagree	38	19.19%
Disagree	53	26.77%
Strongly Disagree	52	26.26%
[No Response]	8	4.04%
Grand Total	198	100.00%

Easy Read Consultation Pack

Responses	Total	%
Agree	32	27.59%
Don't know	31	26.72%
Disagree	48	41.38%
[No Response]	5	4.31%
Grand Total	116	100.00%

Proposed Change 3: The maximum charge (£500) should be removed so that service users with high levels of capital would pay the full cost of their services.

Standard Consultation Pack

Responses	Total	%
Strongly agree	16	8.08%
Agree	38	19.19%
Neither agree nor disagree	36	18.18%
Disagree	52	26.26%
Strongly disagree	48	24.24%
[No Response]	8	4.04%
Grand Total	198	100.00%

Easy Read Consultation Pack

Responses	Total	%
Agree	13	11.21%
Don't know	21	18.10%
Disagree	78	67.24%
[No Response]	4	3.45%
Grand Total	116	100.00%

Proposed Change 4: Charges should be introduced for supported accommodation.

Standard Consultation Pack

Responses	Total	%
Strongly agree	10	5.05%
Agree	47	23.74%
Neither agree nor disagree	51	25.76%
Disagree	45	22.73%
Strongly disagree	34	17.17%
[No Response]	11	5.56%
Grand Total	198	100.00%

Easy Read Consultation Pack

Responses	Total	%
Agree	11	9.48%
Don't know	14	12.07%
Disagree	89	76.72%
[No Response]	2	1.72%
Grand Total	116	100.00%

Proposed Change 5: Charges should be introduced for respite care provided at home.

Standard Consultation Pack

Responses	Total	%
Strongly agree	6	3.03%
Agree	31	15.66%
Neither agree nor disagree	41	20.71%
Disagree	59	29.80%
Strongly disagree	52	26.26%
[No Response]	9	4.55%
Grand Total	198	100.00%

Easy Read Consultation Pack

Responses	Total	%
Agree	4	3.45%
Don't know	19	16.38%
Disagree	87	75.00%
[No Response]	6	5.17%
Grand Total	116	100.00%

Proposed Change 6: Charges should be introduced for transport that the Council provides.

Standard Consultation Pack

Responses	Total	%
Strongly agree	7	3.54%
Agree	42	21.21%
Neither agree nor disagree	36	18.18%
Disagree	66	33.33%
Strongly disagree	42	21.21%
[No Response]	5	2.53%
Grand Total	198	100.00%

Easy Read Consultation Pack

Responses	Total	%
Agree	7	6.03%
Don't know	17	14.66%
Disagree	87	75.00%
[No Response]	5	4.31%
Grand Total	116	100.00%

Proposed Change 7: Charges should be introduced for services provided to carers with a charge based on household income above a minimum level together with the value of the services given.

Standard Consultation Pack

Responses	Total	%
Strongly agree	5	2.53%
Agree	33	16.67%
Neither agree nor disagree	47	23.74%
Disagree	57	28.79%
Strongly disagree	45	22.73%
[No Response]	11	5.56%
Grand Total	198	100.00%

Easy Read Consultation Pack

Responses	Total	%
Agree	5	4.31%
Don't know	17	14.66%
Disagree	88	75.86%
[No Response]	6	5.17%
Total	116	100.00%

Proposed Change 8: Charges should be increased for day centre attendance by the rate of inflation. Charges for this service are currently lower than the full cost of the service. We propose to increase these by 2.5% from 1 April 2015.

Standard Consultation Pack

Responses	Total	%
Strongly agree	12	6.06%
Agree	57	28.79%
Neither agree nor disagree	44	22.22%
Disagree	35	17.68%
Strongly disagree	42	21.21%
[No Response]	8	4.04%
Grand Total	198	100.00%

Easy Read Consultation Pack

Response	Total	%
Agree	4	3.45%
Don't know	19	16.38%
Disagree	86	74.14%
[No Response]	7	6.03%
Grand Total	116	100.00%

Proposed Change 9: Charges should be increased for meals the Council provides by the rate of inflation. Charges for this service are currently lower

than the full cost of the service. We propose to increase these by 2.5% from 1 April 2015.

Standard Consultation Pack

Responses	Total	%
Strongly agree	10	5.05%
Agree	54	27.27%
Neither agree nor disagree	51	25.76%
Disagree	38	19.19%
Strongly disagree	42	21.21%
[No Response]	3	1.52%
Grand Total	198	100.00%

Easy Read Consultation Pack

Response	Total	%
Agree	5	4.31%
Don't know	14	12.07%
Disagree	88	75.86%
[No Response]	9	7.76%
Grand Total	116	100.00%

Proposed Change 10: As from 1 April 2015, we propose to start charging service users for services they receive from the first day they receive them. In the past the Council have not backdated any charges.

Standard Consultation Pack

Responses	Total	%
Strongly agree	12	6.06%
Agree	52	26.26%
Neither agree nor disagree	40	20.20%
Disagree	40	20.20%
Strongly disagree	50	25.25%
[No Response]	4	2.02%
Grand Total	198	100.00%

Easy Read Consultation Pack

Responses	Total	%
Agree	6	5.17%
Don't know	17	14.66%
Disagree	85	73.28%
[No Response]	8	6.90%
Grand Total	116	100.00%

