

**PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE FAIRER CONTRIBUTIONS POLICY**

**To:** Adults Committee

**Meeting Date:** 8<sup>th</sup> March 2018

**From:** Claire Bruin, Assistant Director, Adults & Safeguarding

**Electoral division(s):** All

**Forward Plan ref:** Not Applicable      **Key decision:** No

**Purpose:** To provide the Committee with the results of the consultation on proposed changes to the Fairer Contributions Policy that ended on 23 February 2018.

**Recommendation:** The Committee is asked to decide whether or not to support the following proposed changes to the Fairer Contributions Policy:

- 1) To include the Enhanced Rate of Personal Independence Payment (PIP) in the person's income when carrying out financial assessments to establish the level of contribution towards the cost of care and support.
- 2) To assess individuals who receive short term respite accommodation under residential rules rather than community rules to determine the contribution towards the cost of the respite stay.
- 3) To charge for the appointee function (for help with running their finances) for all services users who have capital above £3,000 with one of the options below:
  - a. Residential Care @ £10 per week; Community Care @ £12.50 per week
  - b. Residential Care @ £7.50 per week; Community Care @ £9.38 per week
  - c. Residential Care @ £5 per week; Community Care @ £6.25 per week
- 4) To make direct debits the default method for Adult Social Care invoices issued in respect of contributions towards the cost of care and support.

<b><i>Officer contact:</i></b>		<b><i>Member contacts:</i></b>	
Name:	Claire Bruin	Names:	Cllr Bailey/Cllr Howell
Post:	Assistant Director, Adults & Safeguarding	Post:	Chair/Vice-Chair
Email:	<a href="mailto:Claire.bruin@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">Claire.bruin@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>	Email:	<a href="mailto:annabailey@hotmail.co.uk">annabailey@hotmail.co.uk/</a> <a href="mailto:mark.howell@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">mark.howell@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>
Tel:	01223 715665	Tel:	01223 706398

<b>Reason for urgency</b>	The report 'Proposed Changes to the Fairer Contributions Policy' has been published late because time was needed after the close of the consultation on 23 February 2018 to collate all the feedback into a report for consideration by the Members of the Adult Committee when deciding on whether or not to adopt any of the proposals that had been subject to the consultation.
<b>Reason for lateness</b>	The expectation was set through the consultation that the feedback would be considered and decisions made at the Committee meeting on 8 March 2018. People affected will be anxious to know the outcome and therefore it would not be appropriate to delay the report.

## **1.0 BACKGROUND**

- 1.1** At the Adults Committee meeting on 9 November 2017, Members considered four proposals for changes to the Fairer Contributions Policy. Options for potential changes were discussed and the Committee confirmed the options that should be consulted on in line with Government requirements for changes to contribution/charging policies.
- 1.2** Care and support provided under the Care Act 2014 is subject to means testing to determine how much each service user should contribute to the cost of their care and support. The process of financial assessment used to determine this contribution is carried out in line with Department of Health guidance. This income is used within the Adults budget to offset the cost of the care and support provided to people in Cambridgeshire and contributes to the Council's ability to support the people in most need of care and support.

## **2.0 PROPOSALS CONSIDERED IN THE CONSULTATION**

- 2.1** The following proposals were consulted on over a 12 week period, ending on 23 February 2018. Examples used to illustrate the changes that were included in the consultation material are set out below for ease of reference.
- 2.2 Proposal 1:** Amend the CCC Contributions Policy to allow the Financial Assessment Team to take into account the Enhanced Rate of Personal Independence Payment (PIP). Currently the enhanced rate is not taken into account.
- 2.2.1** This proposal would impact on people aged 18-64 whose disabilities (including the impact of mental health issues) are significant enough to lead to the Enhanced Rate of PIP being awarded. People aged 18-64 who have not yet been assessed for PIP and still receive Disability Living Allowance or Attendance Allowance will not be affected. The change would apply once they move onto PIP. People over 65 would not be affected because there are no plans by the Department of Work and Pensions to introduce PIP for people over 65.
- 2.2.2** The people who are most likely to be affected are people with significant learning or physical disabilities who would require 24/7 care.

### 2.2.3 Example

The assessment process can be complicated as it takes into account an individual's personal financial circumstances. Please see below an example case study which shows how this change may impact on customers.

#### *Under current arrangements*

Mr Jones is a 37 year old man who is in receipt of home care funded by the Council. His current contribution is calculated as follows:

Weekly Income – Employment and Support Allowance (ESA) £125.55 and Personal Independence Payment £83.10. Therefore, his total weekly income is £208.65 per week.

Currently the Council disregards the difference between the standard rate and enhanced rate of Personal Independence Payment, meaning that £27.45 is disregarded from his income. This means that income of £181.20 is included in the financial assessment.

In addition, the Council is required to make an allowance for normal living costs in the financial assessment. The personal allowance for Mr Jones is £151.45 per week.

The Council also makes an allowance for any Disability Related Expenditure that Mr Jones may have. The rate applied for Mr Jones is £20.00 per week.

Therefore, the financial contribution would be calculated as follows:

- Total assessable income = £181.20 per week
- Less personal allowance = £151.45 per week
- Less Disability Related Expenditure = £20.00 per week
- Remaining assessable income = £9.75
- Fairer Contribution = £9.75

#### *Under the new proposal*

The Council proposes to remove the disregard between the standard rate and enhanced rate of Personal Independence Payment, meaning that income of £208.65 can be included in the financial assessment.

The financial contribution would then be calculated as follows:

- Total assessable income = £208.65 per week
- Less personal allowance = £151.45 per week
- Less Disability Related Expenditure = £20.00 per week
- Fairer Contribution = £37.20 per week

**2.3 Proposal 2:** Amend the CCC Contributions Policy to enable the Financial Assessment Team to assess individuals who receive short term respite accommodation under residential rules. Currently the community or non-residential rules are used.

**2.3.1** This proposal would impact most on older people, living in their own home who stay in residential or nursing homes for short periods to provide a vital break for family carers - spouses, or sons and daughters who may be balancing caring for their parents with bringing up their children.

### 2.3.2 Example

The assessment process can be complicated as it takes into account an individual's personal financial circumstances. Please see below an example case study which shows how this change may impact on customers.

#### *Under current arrangements*

Mrs Smith is a 74 year old lady who regularly has residential respite stays funded by the Council. Her current contribution is calculated as follows:

Weekly Income – State Retirement Pension £131.50, Private Pension of £43.20 and Attendance Allowance of £83.10. Therefore, her total weekly income is £257.80 per week.

Currently the Council applies a contribution for residential respite stays under non-residential charging rules. This means that a proportion of Attendance Allowance is included within the financial assessment and allowances are made for Disability Related Expenditure and for costs as if she was at home. Mrs Smith has the standard Disability Related Expenditure allowance of £20 per week and an allowance for normal living costs of £194.50 per week.

Therefore, the financial contribution would be calculated as follows:

- Total assessable income = £230.35 per week
- Less personal allowance = £194.50 per week
- Less Disability Related Expenditure = £20.00 per week
- Remaining assessable income = £15.85
- Fairer Contribution = £15.85

#### *Under the new proposal*

The Council proposes to assess the financial contribution for residential respite stays under the rules for residential care charging. This means that you would not receive an allowance for any Disability Related Expenditure and a personal expense allowance would be disregarded in the financial assessment. Furthermore, the full value of Attendance Allowance would be disregarded.

The financial contribution would then be calculated as follows:

- Total assessable income = £147.25 per week
- Less personal expense allowance = £24.90 per week
- Fairer Contribution = £122.35 per week

### 2.4 **Proposal 3:** Apply a charge for the appointee function for all service users who have capital above £1,000. Currently there is no charge for this non-statutory function.

#### 2.4.1 This would impact on people who need assistance to manage their finances and do not have family members who can do this for them. If this proposal is agreed, Adult Committee supported the intention to use the income raised to fund more staff capacity to offer this support to more of the vulnerable people we support who cannot manage their finances.

**2.5 Proposal 4:** Make direct debit the default payment method for Adult Social Care invoices issued in respect of contributions towards the cost of care and support.

**2.5.1** Direct debit would be promoted for all people, but other ways of payment would also be available for people who do not have a bank account or do not want to use direct debits.

### **3.0 CONSULTATION PROCESS**

**3.1** To consult on the four proposals, a questionnaire was placed on the Council's website with supporting information to help to explain the possible impact of the changes on the contributions that people would make to their care and support. The examples were only representative because each person's contribution is based on their individual circumstances and a financial assessment.

**3.2** To ensure that the people most likely to be affected by these changes were aware of the consultation, over 1000 individual letters were sent to service users and/or their appointees or the person identified for correspondence on their case file. These letters also offered four face to face meetings where people could find out more about the proposals, ask questions and share their views.

**3.3** The website and the letters also provided a contact email and telephone number. The telephone number was covered by a colleague from the Financial Assessment Team who had the technical knowledge to answer questions about the proposed changes.

**3.4** Officers also worked with Cambridgeshire Alliance for Independent Living who support the service user Partnership Boards to ensure that people were aware of the consultation and had the opportunity to contribute their views.

### **4.0 FEEDBACK FROM THE CONSULTATION**

**4.1** The consultation ended on 23 February 2018. The results and comments from responses to the questionnaire, views gathered from face to face meetings and other contact through the channels provided are set out in full in the report attached at Appendix A, with the questionnaire and supporting information used for the consultation included in that report as Appendix 1.

**4.2** The results of the survey questionnaires are set out below with the key themes from the comments and some sample comments taken from the full report at Appendix A. Some of the comments from the consultation meetings and telephone calls are also set out below to demonstrate some of the views expressed through these parts of the consultation.

#### **4.3 Feedback from Surveys**

**4.3.1** At the end of the consultation period:

- Total number of surveys undertaken = 315
- Completed surveys = 229 (86 online; 143 paper)
- Partially completed surveys (online) = 86

**4.3.2 Proposal 1:** Amend the CCC Contributions Policy to allow the Financial Assessment Team to take into account the Enhanced Rate of Personal Independence Payment. Currently the enhanced rate is not taken into account.

<b>4.3.3</b>		Response percentage	Response total
	I agree with the Council's proposal	17.78%	40
	I do not agree with the Council's proposal	82.22%	185
		Answered	225
		Skipped	4

**4.3.4** 135 comments have been made. The three main points made in the comments were:

- 1) People who receive enhanced rate Personal Independence Payment (PIP) do so because their care needs are higher and this would penalise the most vulnerable due to their disability.
- 2) The proposal was unfair because people said that they were already struggling to pay the bills and this would not leave them enough to live on.
- 3) There were some comments that the proposal targeted people who were receiving (or would receive in future) the enhanced rate of PIP and not those on Disability Living Allowance (DLA). This meant that people were being treated differently and this was unfair.

**4.3.5** Sample comments:

*'Living on benefits is a subsistence existence as it is, and it is getting harder year on year as general living costs seem to be increasing faster than the benefits. There are lots of costs associated with being disabled that aren't always quantifiable and tangible and to make such a change as planned above is hitting the most vulnerable people in society even harder. I appreciate that money is finite and savings have to be made where possible, but this seems the wrong area and will cause much more hardship and stress for those affected.'*

*'No I do not agree to this! This money is given to me to help me live with my disability, so that I can buy the equipment and disposable items I need on a day to day basis. The help I receive from the county council is for my care and does not cover these expenses. If you were to take this money away from me I would no longer be able to live at home and would end up in a care home.'*

*'There are many more things I could add to this list that I need to purchase either on a regular weekly basis or replace or repair equipment as necessary. If you include my enhanced rate of PIP in your fairer contributions scheme I will not be able to afford to buy the things I need and both my mental health/depression and physical health will be badly affected. The fairer contribution scheme is already unfair due to the out of date allowances for living costs such as electric, gas, water and groceries.'*

*'Things are already difficult for those people who have special needs. They have so many other expenses related to their conditions i.e. diet, clothing, transport, extra heating, etc. To have even more taken from them is hardly a 'fairer contribution'.'*

*‘ ... the application was unfair as it won’t apply to those on DLA only those on PIP so level of contribution was reliant on speed of PIP roll out and was targeting people with higher levels of need / disability. There is no increase in income when a person moves from DLA to PIP but the levels of contribution are increasing significantly (amount quoted was an increase of £27.45 per week).’*

**4.4 Proposal 2:** Amend the CCC Contributions Policy to enable the Financial Assessment Team to assess individuals who receive short term respite accommodation under residential rules. Currently the community or non-residential rules are used.

**4.4.1**

	Response percentage	Response total
I agree with the Council’s proposal	26.19%	55
I do not agree with the Council’s proposal	73.81%	155
	Answered	210
	Skipped	19

**4.4.2** 100 comments have been made. The three main points made in the comments were:

- 1) People will still have costs to pay whilst in respite accommodation and the proposed change would put a huge strain on people’s finances.
- 2) People were worried that this could be potentially a large increase in contribution and that it was not a fair proposal.
- 3) People were worried that families may be put off using respite services because of this proposal and this would affect the health and wellbeing of not only the people who would have been using respite but also place added strain on their family carers.

**4.4.3** Sample comments:

*‘This amount is far too great an increase. This will put pressure on carers who will feel they cannot afford to put someone into respite. As it is short stay that means they still have a house to run with bills etc. The savings to social services will be short sighted when they then have to have someone in permanent care.’*

*‘There must be enough money left for the person to pay ongoing bills that will continue whilst in residential care.’*

*‘If a person is living at home most of the time the expenses incurred running that home do not disappear when one is in respite care. I believe severe financial problems would occur if this were to happen.’*

*‘This is unfair - people (who) are requiring respite require it for a reason, expecting them to pay all this extra money is unfair and unkind.’*

*‘I agree with this proposal as long as allowances were reasonable and that a person staying in short term respite accommodation still had money to pay for housing rental costs, council tax and heating etc. as these still need to be paid for while in temporary accommodation otherwise they might not have a home to go back to or end up in debt.’*

**4.5 Proposal 3:** Apply a charge for the appointee function for all service users who have capital above £1,000. Currently there is no charge for this non-statutory function.

<b>4.5.1</b>		Response percentage	Response total
	I agree with the Council's proposal	36.02%	76
	I do not agree with the Council's proposal	63.98%	135
		Answered	211
		Skipped	18

**4.5.2** 100 comments have been made. The three main points made in the comments were:

- 1) This proposal discriminates against people who do not have family or friends to undertake this service.
- 2) The Council should bear the cost of this work.
- 3) For those who agreed with the proposal they felt that making a charge for the service was fair but that it should be kept to a reasonable amount. Also people felt that the £1,000 savings in the bank threshold should be higher.

**4.5.3** Sample comments:

*'It seems that elderly and disabled people who have no family support are being penalised.'*

*'I think the council should offer this service as part of its own costs.'*

*'We understand that this takes valuable time from completing these forms ourselves on many occasions. As long as the individuals have enough money to pay for this service we believe this is fair.'*

*'It does seem reasonable for a charge to be made for what is quite a time consuming service and this is still hugely subsidised I would say.'*

*'I think the idea on the whole is necessary but a limit of £1000 in savings is far too low. Increase the limit to £5000 and reduce the actual rate charged to £5 and £7.50 respectively.'*

**4.6 Proposal 4:** Make direct debit the default payment method for Adult Social Care invoices issued in respect of contributions towards the cost of care and support.

<b>4.6.1</b>		Response percentage	Response total
	I agree with the Council's proposal	61.79%	131
	I do not agree with the Council's proposal	38.21%	81
		Answered	212
		Skipped	17

**4.6.2** 86 comments have been made. The three main points made in the comments were:

- 1) Among those who agreed with the proposal, many said that they either did this already or that this was a sensible, cost-effective method.
- 2) Some people were generally in favour but raised concerns about the monitoring of the payments and what might happen if changes needed to be made – for example, how much notice people might have of any change to their invoicing.
- 3) For those who disagreed with the proposal, there was concern about individuals who do not have banking facilities and cannot set up Direct Debits.

**4.6.3** Sample comments:

*'I already pay bills through Direct Debit.'*

*'I am not sure about this. I have seen care bills that have been worked out incorrectly several times and people have been able to question before paying however if this is done as a direct debit it will be harder to challenge the bill and take too long to get it reimbursed.'*

*'This is a sensible arrangement PROVIDED close monitoring is done to ensure the direct debits are set up and closed down as necessary since the Adult receiving social care will most likely not be in a position to do so themselves.'*

*'This is fine as long as client is kept informed of any changes in amounts to be collected.'*

*'My account is not using Direct Debit - Post Office.'*

## **4.7 Feedback from Consultation Meetings, Emails and Telephone Calls**

**4.7.1** In addition, the Council has carried out other engagement activity related to the consultation. This has included:

- Three information meetings (in March, Cambridge and Huntingdon).
- Five drop-in meetings run by adults with learning disabilities and adults on the autistic spectrum (in Knapwell, Huntingdon, March, Fulbourn and Ely).
- A presentation at a Forum meeting with lived experience and carer representatives.

Also emails and telephone calls about the proposed changes have been received via the dedicated email and consultation telephone number.

**4.7.2 Proposal 1:** Feedback at the meetings about the proposal has included

- People felt that the most vulnerable members of society with the highest support needs were being targeted again by the Council.
- People are awarded the enhanced rate of PIP for a reason – because they have high care needs caused by their disability or illness. As this is a benefit for the most

disabled the extra £27.45 should be used for the extra expenses that are due to their disability, such as transport to hospital, doctor's appointments. For example, although they are receiving high rate Mobility Allowance this does not cover the cost of transport and paying for a carer to support the service user.

- Service users who have had their care packages reduced are having to use their benefits to pay for care staff to go with them to activities e.g. cinema, swimming, as well as their own fees. Increasing contributions would mean there would be no money left for this and people's quality of life, health and wellbeing would be compromised.
- Service users that are living at home and being supported by their family will be penalised. The family have expenses that are not covered by the financial assessment such as heating and household expenses. It would cost the Council more if service users were in residential care.
- The proposal treats people on PIP differently to those on DLA and this is unfair.
- The proposed change will have a huge financial impact on those people affected and this will mean that they will not be able to afford to do the activities that they might do now, making them more socially isolated and putting more strain on their family carers.
- Concerns were raised that the new mortgage interest support changes that are due to change in April 2018 would be put into the financial assessment as income when in fact they will be a loan.
- As Cambridgeshire is the fastest growing authority, the potential to raise income through Council Tax should be exploited, rather than targeting and penalising the most vulnerable people in the County.

#### **4.7.3 Proposal 1:** Feedback from telephone calls has included:

- Younger service users are again having their welfare benefits cut. The more severely disabled who need the money the most are again having their money taken away, when in fact the Council should take into account that the most severely disabled need more financial support not less.
- The welfare benefits increase is not in line with the cost of living if the additional £27.45 is taken into account.

#### **4.7.4 Proposal 2:** Feedback at the meetings about the proposal has included:

- This proposal may prevent people from accessing respite which will place added strain on carers who need supporting.
- People should not be penalised for needing respite care – this is vital for the individual having the respite and also for their carers. Family carers are under enough pressure as it is and if they had to stop using respite the situation may become too much and then their family member might have to move permanently into residential care – which the individual and the family wouldn't want and it would cost the Council more money.
- People thought that the Council didn't understand all the bills and support needs that individuals and their families still continue to have even if they do go into short-term respite accommodation – it isn't just things such as rent or Council Tax.

- That money given to carers in direct payments was for respite when it would be better if it could be used for a holiday as carers worry when service users are in respite accommodation.
- Some people agreed with the proposal as long as household expenses were taken into account.

#### **4.7.5 Proposal 3:** Feedback at the meetings about the proposal has included:

- The amount that people should be allowed to have in their bank account for emergencies should be far more than £1,000 before charging for appointee services, for example from £3,000 - £5,000. What happens if your boiler breaks down? The cost of a funeral alone could be £3,500.
- Those people who agreed with the charge said that this was okay as long as the income was reinvested into the service to allow more people to use the appointee service.
- Some people have suggested that the proposed fees could be added into a person's disregarded income.

#### **4.7.6 Proposal 4:** Feedback at the meetings about the proposal has included:

- People agreed generally with this proposal as a default payment method, but wanted to be assured that other methods of payments would still be available and the proposed change would not be compulsory.
- The date of invoices for direct debits was queried as invoices have sometimes not been received in time for them to be cancelled.
- People wanted to be sure that the invoicing would be clear and transparent as there were concerns that people would not be able to easily claim back any discrepancies or find out if mistakes have been made.

#### **4.7.7 In addition,** people attending one meeting have asked that if the proposals are accepted Members agree to meet with them to hear directly what the impact will be on the lives of severely disabled people, who are totally dependent on benefits and require high levels of staff or family carer support, typically 24/7.

## **5.0 OVERVIEW**

### **5.1** The consultation has resulted in significant opposition to proposals 1 and 2, a smaller majority opposed to proposal 3 and a similar level of support for proposal 4.

### **5.2 Proposal 1: To include the Enhanced Rate of Personal Independence Payment (PIP) in the person's income when carrying out financial assessments to establish the level of contribution towards the cost of care and support and Proposal 2: To assess individuals who receive short term respite accommodation under residential rules rather than community rules to determine the contribution towards the cost of the respite stay.**

- 5.2.1** Very strong views have been expressed about the negative impact of proposals 1 and 2 by increasing contributions for care and support services, including short term respite care, which is seen as targeting the most vulnerable people that we support and family carers. Increasing Council Tax was offered as an alternative way to increase income.
- 5.2.2** Members will need to consider the reported impact on people's ability to manage the additional financial commitments resulting from their disabilities and/or frailty against the potential additional income that these proposals could raise (approximately £244,000 per annum). As set out in the business planning documents presented to Full Council in February 2018, alternative ways to achieve this would be to increase the expectation on a number of other savings initiatives, the detail of which would need to be confirmed or explored within the business cases resulting from the work with CapGemini and ImPower.
- 5.3    Proposal 3: To charge for the appointee function (for help with running their finances) for all services users who have capital above a specified level**
- 5.3.1** The majority of people did not support this proposal to charge for the appointee function for all service users who have capital above £1,000 and the feedback included a number of recommendations to reconsider the capital threshold below which there would be no charge and to reconsider the level of the charges levied.
- 5.3.2** Although the proposed charges of £10 per week for people in residential care and £12.50 per week for people in the community were benchmarked against other Local Authorities, two alternative options are offered for consideration by Members in recognition of the feedback from the consultation.
- 5.3.3    Original proposal:**  
 Capital Threshold for charging for appointee function £1,000  
 Charge for people in residential care @ £10 per week x 35 people raises £18,200 per annum  
 Charge for people in community @ £12.50 per week x 2 people raises £1,300 per annum  
**Total £19,500 per annum**
- 5.3.4    Option 1:**  
 Capital Threshold for charging for appointee function £3,000  
 Charge for people in residential care @ £7.50 per week (reduced from £10) x 30 people raises £11,700 per annum  
 Charge for people in community @ £9.38 per week (reduced from £12.50) x 2 people raises £975 per annum  
**Total £12,675 per annum**
- 5.3.5    Option 2:**  
 Capital Threshold for charging for appointee function £3,000  
 Charge for people in residential care @ £5.00 per week (reduced from £10) x 30 people raises £7,800 per annum  
 Charge for people in community @ £6.25 per week (reduced from £12.50) x 2 people raises £650 per annum  
**Total £8,450 per annum**

**5.3.6** These charges would be applied quarterly, and would be taken from the person's capital rather than being added to their weekly contributions for care and support. If their capital falls below the threshold of £3,000, the charge would not be levied. The money raised by these charges would be reinvested in additional staffing creating capacity for 10 people who are currently waiting for this service and other people who are identified as needing an appointee. The income raised would determine the additional capacity available to deliver the appointee function.

**5.4 Proposal 4: To make direct debits the default method for Adult Social Care invoices issued in respect of contributions towards the cost of care and support.**

**5.4.1** There was more support for introducing direct payments as the default method for paying invoices for contributions for care and support. However, people did reinforce that other payment options will still need to be available for those people who do not use a bank account or who do not want to make these payments through a direct payment.

**5.5 Amending the Fairer Contributions Policy**

**5.5.1** The Fairer Contributions Policy will be amended as required to reflect the decisions made by the Adults Committee and presented at the next Adults Committee meeting.

**6.0 ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES**

**6.1** Report authors should evaluate the proposal(s) in light of their alignment with the following three Corporate Priorities.

**6.2 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all**

There are no significant implications for this priority.

**6.3 Helping people live healthy and independent lives**

The proposals above have been considered alongside the need to support people to live healthy and independent lives and continue to meet the requirements of government guidance on financial assessments for service user contributions to care and support packages.

**6.4 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people**

The proposals above have been considered alongside the need to support and protect vulnerable people and continue to meet the requirements of government guidance on financial assessments for service user contributions to care and support packages.

**7.0 SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS**

**7.1 Resource Implications**

The proposed changes would increase the level of income collected as contributions to care and support, and reduce the level of debt accruing where contributions are not paid.

## **7.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications**

There are no significant implications within this category.

## **7.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications**

The options set out above detail where there may be vulnerability to legal challenge and alternative options are offered to mitigate this risk.

## **7.4 Equality and Diversity Implications**

The proposals only impact on those people assessed as having eligible needs for social care support which is a means tested service, and requires the Council to undertake financial assessments to determine the contribution that each individual should make towards their care and support.

## **7.5 Engagement and Communications Implications**

A 12 week consultation, in line with the COMPACT, has been undertaken to provide feedback to the Adults Committee to inform the discussion and decisions of the Committee.

## **7.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement**

There are no significant implications within this category.

## **7.7 Public Health Implications**

There are no significant implications within this category.

<b>Implications</b>	<b>Officer Clearance</b>
<b>Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?</b>	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Stephen Howarth
<b>Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement?</b>	No Name of Officer:  NA
<b>Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law?</b>	No Name of Legal Officer:
<b>Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Claire Bruin
<b>Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Claire Bruin
<b>Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact?</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Claire Bruin
<b>Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health</b>	No Name of Officer:

<b>Source Documents</b>	<b>Location</b>
The Care Act 2014	<a href="http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2014/23/contents/enacted">http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2014/23/contents/enacted</a>
Factsheet 5: Charging and Financial Assessments	<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/care-act-2014-part-1-factsheets/care-act-factsheets#factsheet-5-charging-and-financial-assessments">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/care-act-2014-part-1-factsheets/care-act-factsheets#factsheet-5-charging-and-financial-assessments</a>
Fairer Contributions Policy, Cambridgeshire County Council	<a href="https://ccc-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/adults-&amp;-older-people/Fairer%20contributions%20policy.pdf?inline=true">https://ccc-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/adults-&amp;-older-people/Fairer%20contributions%20policy.pdf?inline=true</a>