

Survey to help inform the Equalities, Fairness and Rights Impact Assessment.

A total of 91 people responded to a survey sent out by the Carers' Centre and SDS Forum

Do you agree with the proposal to introduce a charging policy for non-residential social care?

- | | |
|---|----|
| <input type="radio"/> Strongly agree | 0 |
| <input type="radio"/> Agree | 7 |
| <input type="radio"/> Neither agree or disagree | 2 |
| <input type="radio"/> Disagree | 8 |
| <input type="radio"/> Strongly disagree | 74 |

The proposal for a charging policy is suggesting charging £20 per hour for non-residential care services. This is less than the lowest cost we can purchase care for. Do you think this is

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| <input type="radio"/> Too much | 76 |
| <input type="radio"/> About right | 13 |
| <input type="radio"/> A bit low | 2 |

If the assessment found you were in a position to pay towards your non-personal care, and 60% of your current disposable income (as outlined above) went towards this, how would this affect you?

- | | |
|--|----|
| <input type="radio"/> I would be able to manage this | 3 |
| <input type="radio"/> The change would affect me a little | 3 |
| <input type="radio"/> This could affect how much I have for extras | 6 |
| <input type="radio"/> This could affect how much I have for essentials | 10 |
| <input type="radio"/> I am seriously worried about the impact this will have on my ability to meet my essential living costs | 53 |
| <input type="radio"/> I would think about whether I want to carry on getting help from adult social care | 16 |

Please share any other comments you have about the financial implications of the proposal to introduce charging for non-residential care

- This is the most horrendous cost cutting exercise I have ever heard. From a council that can rebuild a swimming pool and theatre that is not required to spending 1.2 million on one schools sports facility. East Ren has its priorities all wrong! I'm disgusted that this is even a discussion.
- You are denying your statutory duty
- My child used get a financial award for care then ER changed the goalposts and now zero funding. Her life is already restricted versus her peers, fill your boots ERC you already deny effective educational support to your people with additional needs, you have made it clear to me as a parent that you don't want children like mine and refuse to educate then as they negatively affect your stats. Now if she was ever to be able to leave home

you'll take most of her benefit to pay for her support. You've already ruined her self-confidence and sense of self-worth by showing her that her school just wanted rid of her. There are no effective support schemes to assist young people like her gain meaningful academic qualifications to get to college to get anything other than a minimum wage job. So go ahead impose your charges, ruin the chances of vulnerable people to have anything other than the most basic if existences. This reeks of "we don't want people like you in ER". You can spend a fortune on ridiculous cycle lanes and vanity projects, but are determined to grind those who are the most vulnerable and least able to fight for their rights into the ground.

- I think just implementing the policy and the fact that the majority of people who receive care will most likely want a further care needs assessment as I know certain areas of care were not included In the report we received that if this policy is implemented it will cause further financial costs to ERC. Also the extra stress it will put on the cared for person and their unpaid carer will be catastrophic in many cases as the majority of people in these groups are already coping with high levels of stress/mental health issues due to their circumstances and this could lead to further people requiring help and unpaid carers unable to continue in their role.
- There are plenty of other means of saving money without impacting on the most vulnerable people in society. E.g. Unused cycle lanes and the insane active travel proposals, libraries, unnecessary roadworks and general poor financial management.
- Most people receiving care, need it. There are many who do not, and it's those who have ruined the system for everyone else.
- My son is at the very beginning of his adulthood. It is likely he will need non-residential care all his adult life. He will never be able to work or live independently. As his lone parent who is getting on in years myself I cannot give my child the care he requires, much as I would like to. If the charges are brought in as they stand my son will have to reduce his care hours putting more strain on my already fragile physical health which will in turn cost the HSPC more money as both of us will require emergency care and then long term care.
- I feel that this is discriminatory towards disabled people and their families. The severely disabled will never be able to earn a living and in our case we already contribute towards our sons care and as long as he lives with us, which looks like it could be forever as there are no suitable housing, we will be doing this for as long as we live. As parents who are almost pensioners, we see a bleak future for our son and know that this will just be the start. His benefits back up his support. Without the benefits there can be no support as these expenses are essential. We have campaigned for years to give our son a good life and we are still contributing towards this ourselves. I, and all the other parents I have contact with, are in complete despair over what is to come.
- This money was to ensure that people who received it would be able to have support to live life as those without any disability. You are discriminating against the most vulnerable in society where we should be encouraging them to be supported in all aspects of their lives and not charged for it. Every single person and their families who receives support don't want to be disabled and be able to live life as every other person in society and with this charging policy you are ensuring that they are being treated as 3rd class citizens and that their rights do not matter. This was also shown by the lack of councillors who

attended the meetings, absolutely shocking that the majority of them are voting on this and have never spoken to those of us it affects.

- I think this policy needs to be reconsidered. People with disabilities are being disproportionately targeted with these cut and we are being affected in multiple ways. Now having to pay for more specialist and expensive after school care, holiday provision and clubs. All of these are more expensive due to the level of care my daughter needs. They have cut the school bus service to save money and are not providing school meals. Again this is not just one cut this is a death of a thousand cuts. I also know people have had their SDS accounts removed. What are families supporting to do? You are making it impossible for families to earn and care for their children. I would ask that this policy be reconsidered the cuts are discriminatory for children and adults with disabilities that don't have a voice. It's disgusting
- This is so incredibly unfair to an already marginalised group of people. If this is implemented my son will have the social opportunities he currently enjoys taken away to pay for his support. He is unable to travel or be in the community incident but is working towards this. We either choose to pay the cost so he can work towards some form of independent living in the future but he loses the finances to do any social activity so becomes isolated from his friends and society or we keep him within the network of community he has built up and stop his support so he ceases to have a way to work towards independence making him reliant on ERC funding for good. What a truly hellish set of options to choose between.
- I would need to put my son into full time residential care.
- The vast majority of adults with learning disability need carers to help them do the things most adults take for granted, they need support going food shopping so they can eat, assistance going to a leisure class so they are not so isolated, so they can lose weight, and not be a burden on the HSCP, to attend an education class so they can learn a skill. To pay for this if the only way they can get outside for a couple of hours a day in a month could amount to £2000, in 6 months any savings will be drained and then the HSCP will have an even bigger headache as the person with learning disabilities will be even more dependent on you as they won't have any money left at all, they will be overweight as they are no longer going to any exercise classes as they can't afford for a caterer to take them, they will be even more isolated as they don't get out the house as there is no money left, they fall into depression as there is no one that they see or speak to, so in the long run you aren't going to save much money as you will be effectively through the envisaged strategy be creating more dependency and totally robbing the most vulnerable members of society of any small savings they may of had for long term security and robbing them of any fulfilling life that most adults take for granted. You should be looking at other means of saving on services and not attacking people with LD. If you can't manage your budgets there should be a total freeze on pay rises from the top down, ask residents in area to contribute a small amount if you tell them what you are planning to do most people would be outraged and you should really look at yourselves in the mirror and take a long hard look and ask is this why you came into health and social work, you need to fight for the most vulnerable in society people with learning disability need your voice to help them.
- I am 54yrs old. I have a 13yr old autistic son. We earn less than 30k per year combined. We care for our son ourselves without a support package. If I or my wife were left to look

after our son alone and then fall ill we struggle then paying for carers would not be affordable. Also with the introduction of charges for care does this mean that council tax will now be reduced given that a significant amount was spent on social care? Somehow tells me that's not going to happen

- As usual, hitting the most vulnerable people in society. Disgusting!!!! What about the other proposals to take away SDS money which is used for paying a PA to assist vulnerable people to live a normal and independent life as much as possible. Is consideration given to people's mental health and isolation if they cannot afford to pay a PA?
- I think it's unfair to charge the most vulnerable people in society and take money from their benefit which will be detrimental to them in the long term. They have no life as it is.
- My concerns are that you are effectively removing essential benefits to fund the social care budget for East Renfrewshire. Benefits are vital to vulnerable people who are unable to be employed. As a family we are already using these benefits to fund shortfalls in SDS budgets which have been slashed to fund essential social interaction activities that social work refuse to fund
- How much will it cost the Council to implement these new changes? Assessing the financial contribution for service users is going to take a lot of time and the assessors and Social worker etc. involved shall all have to be paid. I have been a carer living in this Authority for over 30 years. I have used child and adult services. I am extremely concerned about the amount of time and money that is wasted. Every time we tried to access a service or funding it resulted in numerous meetings over weeks and even months. Meetings would be arranged and then cancelled because a social worker had left and had to wait for a replacement. First meeting with new Social worker was to give them all the information again. Then a follow up meeting would be arranged. We had meetings to discuss that funding maybe available but desks had to be made to determine who would provide funding was it Social care or Health Care or Education? We had to wait for an OT or a Physio to do an assessment. Then wait for the report. Etc. etc. There is no cohesive system. Staff leave or are long term sick and we have to wait for a replacement. Meanwhile we still have to manage the situation by ourselves. I believe that there are lots of kind and dedicated staff trying their best in a difficult financial climate. However instead of implementing (at a huge cost to this authority) a system to take money from the very people it is supposed to help why not look at the bureaucracy in the system and make changes to streamline and make it more efficient. In summary I strongly believe that charging service users is not the most cost effective
- Unfair. Again the neediest who don't have a voice get it in the mexky
- Charging for support provided to the person I care for is illegal as it provides respite for me and I believe that support to a carer should not be chargeable
- I have calculated, from the COSLA website and the little information we have from East Renfrewshire Council, that the charges my daughter may be eligible to pay will mean that she will be unable to continue horse-riding. The impacts of this are far reaching. She is very socially isolated only seeing family and paid support workers. Her trauma from the way she was treated at school has left her with a deep-rooted anxiety. Over the years we have realised that going horse-riding is one way that keeps her calm and regulated and more able to manage her behaviour. If she is unable to go horse-riding, the following is inevitable: • A decline in her mental health • A decline in the mental health of her closest

family members (4/5 of the family have required professional input for depression and anxiety in the past year already, not including the family therapist that we see under CAMHS) • Difficulty with staff retention as their job will become harder and less rewarding Long-term this will result in my daughter having to leave the family home earlier than we would have anticipated or desired.

- being a carer I feel extreme stress when there are changes in money matters , any rise and extra costs are huge people with small salaries or not working will have to give a second thought about asking for support and without support carer cannot manage alone .well it's a tough situation
- A service for some in any format is better than no service - loneliness can be so overwhelming
- We are asking the most vulnerable people in our community to contribute for essential care. These people receive their income for benefits and are unable to work. Also the cost to implement the assessment for one year. When the Scottish government are doing away with these charges in 2026 must be taken into consideration.
- Any money my mother has is to cover any funeral costs. She has made sacrifices to do so and at the age of 95 is surely entitled to some care.
- If the charge was pro rata to the time actually spent with the care user, then this would be affordable, but a base rate of £20 isn't
- If the council didn't have a black hole this charging policy wouldn't happen. It's an easy way to target the people who can least afford the assistance required. If the people could afford assistance they would not apply for assistance therefore everybody that applied cannot afford to pay for the assistance required.
- It is deeply disappointing to see the Council taking this step and expecting some of the most vulnerable people in our community to take additional cuts to their support. This group has already seen cuts to their SDS budgets, some of which were considerable and this second round of cuts to the same group is unacceptable. I am sure the costs of implementing this process have been factored into the decision. However, I think you are ignoring the costs that will inevitably be incurred when carers, such as myself, reach breaking point with the reduced support or families feel they can no longer support their loved one at home. The costs to the Council of additional carers support and to provide housing and support for individuals who can no longer live at home should be factored into the decision-making process.
- Why is the proposal even being considered, Surely it should not to split who can and who should base on a financial bases , Many people have been very careful with their financial commitments, not over spending, not gambling or drinking their money and yet these people are being penalised for doing the right thing, This is shameful of any Government or Council to play one against another, Why not then say anyone who uses , Schools, NHS, Prescriptions, Universities, Free bus travel, all of these areas is the fabric of our society, Do we really want to become like the USA, The majority of people have paid through the taxation in this Country, So we are having to pay for the misappropriation of money by our Government's, This is unfair unjust and the people should not accept this form of further taxation because they did the right thing.,
- It will affect main that I will have to stay at home as I will not be able to go out to clubs etc.

- I am the mother of a young adult who has just left school and requires 2:1 support 24/7. I had to give up my job and my husband can only work part time. My son's income helps to pay our bills because I no longer work due to caring for him. There are now 3 adults in our house and only a part time income. Financially this will be devastating for us.
 - This is a terrible proposal, it'll cause terrible stress. The administration will undoubtedly be a nightmare, disabled people further marginalised and pushed further into poverty. Most of the learning disabled and other disabled people have no way to work or ever generate any income. Already on my knees as it is
 - I didn't understand from the meetings, which aspect of care is free for all. Also if I have to pay, it's unfair if a client has very little done for them and takes e.g. half an hour, the same as a client who, unfortunately has to have everything done for them.
-
- The costs appear, in my opinion, way too high.
 - Receiving 4 hours personal care a day would equate to £80 a day £560 a week? The care company are paid £120 a day. Where does a pensioner find over £3000.00 a month extra? To be able to stay in their own home. A nursing home would be double that. Why are the elderly and people with disabilities the first to be targeted?
 - looking after anyone cost more any charges have an effect on budgets income savings help should be available not charged after all our time is free we should charge for our time
 - If a charge is introduced I would expect that the support is for the full time that we paid for .Not as is currently the case where often time is reduced due to staff shortage, illness, holidays, team meetings.
 - This survey is very confusing to me, I have a learning disability and this is very confusing. My clubs are all now starting to charge me money and my mum doesn't have a job so things are tough for money. Will you please make this information readable for me? I don't understand how much money will it be will I not be able to go out? My mental health is very poor and I don't need any more difficulties in my life. It's not my fault that I can't do out on my own I want to be in the world the same as everyone else and this just makes it harder. I have such little chance of ever being able to earn any more money that I have on my benefits. How can I save up money for getting a house of my own?
 - The financial stress already on non-paid carer families is already too high
 - This proposal is contrary to Government commitment to stop charging in the lifetime of this Parliament, and I am concerned of the costs of introducing charges when charges could be dropped soon. Also COSLA guidelines are quite clear that service users should be central in devising this policy, not just consulted after the proposal is announced, seems to have been proposed in a panic.
 - I think as a carer it would unfortunately force me to consider full time residential care for my son.
 - This proposed charging policy will have extremely serious consequences for people who rely on non-residential care. In very many instances it will mean that the individual will no longer be able to receive this care. This will be extremely detrimental to their wellbeing. This policy needs to be reviewed and reconsidered.
 - My son would end up in full time care sadly

- The impact of social care charges will be relatively small for many social work clients. The impact will be enormous for those that need it most. In particular, this proposal amounts to a tax on adults with learning disabilities. This is the group that are least likely to be in employment, and hence have the smallest income. This is not progressive: there is no need for the burden to be primarily borne by those with the greatest need. For example, in Ireland, there is a flat fee of £20, which is the same for all clients, regardless of how many hours clients are allocated. This would be a far fairer way to charge for care (analogous to prescription charges elsewhere in the UK). It is concerning that the proposed allowance for disposable income does not take into account the additional disability premium paid to people with severe disability (<https://www.gov.uk/disability-premiums/what-youll-get>). The allowance includes only the standard disability premium. Given that this premium is paid in acknowledgement of the additional costs associated with disability, it is hard to understand why East Renfrewshire HSCP (and indeed COSLA) would not include this premium in their calculation. This would still leave severely disabled people below pension age with an income some way short of those above pension age but it would at least help to narrow the gap. I would also like to express my disappointment at the very short time scale of this consultation. We received the letter on Friday 18th October for meetings the following week, and the meeting to discuss feedback from these meetings is today (Monday 28th 2024). This is too short generally but in particular this consultation process is inaccessible to people with learning disabilities and / or complex communication needs who need more time to understand and respond. At the very least, an Easy Read version of this proposal should have been made available so that the people most affected are able to understand what is being proposed and how it will affect them. It would have been better to offer a meeting at which the Easy Read version could be discussed and any questions addressed. These are reasonable adjustments and it is unfortunate that the HSPC have not thought about their responsibility to make this consultation accessible to their clients. I understand that the Council is under significant financial pressure, and that the HSCP faces a particular challenge due to the ring fencing of funding for personal care and healthcare, however, the Council has within its gift the possibility of adjusting the budget to avoid this tax on the most vulnerable residents in East Renfrewshire.
- This is a bad idea and the vulnerable are being made to pay
- Carers and people in need of care are already so disadvantaged. Their life can be quite intolerable at times due to stress, pain, confusion, loneliness and isolation .To add, on top of that, a financial cost is so unjust. Priorities are all wrong, budget cuts are needed, that I understand but to focus on the most needy and vulnerable is absolutely criminal.
- Times are hard but the vulnerable are getting hit too much and it's time the government sorted the sector out. It may start at £20 per hour but then by 2030 it will then be doubled or tripled.
- An utterly disgraceful proposal that will upset the most vulnerable people and those who love them. Back-of-a-fag-packet planning and embarrassing presentation to the public.
- Just feel the elderly requiring care are really getting penalised. They deserve to be cared for without charge
- Long overdue

- I worry that I may have to withdraw my sons support service. This would mean no access to the community and leisure activities (as there is very little in the ways of clubs, etc. he can access) resulting in detriment to his mental health and mine with little or no respite.
- I understand the need to charge to ensure continuity in the provision of non-residential care, but it's essential this doesn't create additional stress and anxiety in already difficult situations.
- There are other avenues that should be considered without choosing a route that penalises the most vulnerable in our society. The HSCP have yet to demonstrate a transparent and robust business case that they are putting forward for 05/12 and are also unable to demonstrate how this will viably work in practice for those who use Option 1 for care delivery. The last minute meetings being held for 'consultation on the proposal' should have been held some time ago and the answers to questions known, but all that's achieved is stress and fear for the future.
- The policy to include the additional supplement of UC and enhanced rate of ADP in your calculations is wrong and is penalising the most disabled for being the most disabled
- Surely the burden of care for families not using residential care is punitive enough. We (families) already subsidise ERC through providing free labour, free accommodation and cover other expenses, such as food, fuel and vehicle wear and tear. I agree somewhat with the charging policy though - but only for families substantially well off.
- Shocking that our young adults whom are living at home with parents are in this position. We would love nothing more than our son to be living independently but with these reductions in hours of support and now charging to be offered a chance of some independence
- This is morally corrupt. Communication and presentation of the facts around the implementation of this has been very poor. It appears that people are being asked to pay for a service that should be free and this ill thought out proposal is going to impact on the lives of vulnerable people and their families. The suggestion that this will make any significant difference to the shortfall in the budget is utter nonsense
- I feel that the public need to contribute, where they can, as there is not enough money in the HSCP funds
- Much clearer and more detailed information is needed on the affordability calculation during the consultation period to allow this questions to be answered properly. How can we understand the financial implication if detailed calculations can't be done until after it is approved by ERC? My husband had a stroke in August 2023 and has been left mentally and physically disabled. He cannot return to work, so we only have my salary and my husband's small ill health pension, plus ADP. We have a young son (3 years old). We chose to pay more for a home in East Ren to be in the catchment area for excellent schools. We therefore have a large mortgage. Moving to a smaller home but remaining in East Ren for schools looks to be unrealistic because we need a downstairs bedroom and bathroom (not many of them available). So we need to try making adjustments to our home to make it suitable for Our son's (bathroom, taking down a wall between kitchen and dining room and fitting an accessible kitchen to give him access/independence). All our savings will go towards this. Our ability to save going forward (for this and other projects) is severely curtailed because our outgoings haven't gone down (in fact they've increased due to Our son's's condition) but our income has gone down. Asking us to pay for part of Our son's's care reduces our chances of being able to afford the house alterations Our

son's needs, to even remain in our house (but move where?), to be able to save for our and our son's future. It restricts our lives and puts us at risk of becoming even more dependent on benefits/funding/support in the future. £20 is very expensive, especially for people already on reduced income. Yes it is less than HSCP can purchase for, but if my memory is right, it's not much less than the self-directed funding rate (£24 ph.?) so I think almost all of the cost is being passed on? Only 1 hour day = £7,300 p.a. or £600 pm. That's a massive addition to anyone's budget.

- I understand that the HSCP is working with a financial deficit. However East Renfrewshire council has one pot and money is being wasted on expenditure like planters at Clarkston Toll when there are already derelict hanging basket poles throughout this area. This is nowhere as viral as the care of our most vulnerable members of society which the council want to charge 60% not 50% or 40% keeping in mind service providers are making profits. The impact on essentials and extras will undoubtedly be a consequence of this proposal and the outcomes of this will undoubtedly be DETRIMENTAL and unnecessary
- The proposal is unfair and disproportionate, adding to the financial burdens of some of the most vulnerable in our society during a cost-of-living crisis. You are adding to this burden while the Council continues to fund luxury projects such as the new leisure centre. The proposals do not even allow increased costs for utilities to be counted separately, instead they are part of the MIG. People with disabilities relying on these services already face a higher cost of living due to their disability – they often need to engage cleaners and other services as well as purchase various support items for mobility not covered by government funding to maintain a quality of life which significantly restricts their actual disposable income. Nowhere is this reflected in the proposals. The lack of proper consultation and clarity regarding the proposals is upsetting and stressful to individuals relying on these services. For example, you are mentioning that the impact on the individuals will be calculated based on their specific circumstances and that services will not be cut. However, with a target of raising £1.5m from this change the impact will be significant given the number of service recipients. A proper impact assessment has not yet been carried out and there does not appear to be an opportunity for the public to comment on the EFRIA being prepared.
- First of all, I feel quite strongly manipulated by the multiple-choice questions. They are heavily loaded towards agreeing with the decision, rather than allowing for choices to be made that reflect an individual's point of view or situation. My mental health has already taken a serious blow, following this announcement and possible outcome. This must be the case for many other people. Although a key point in your argument for charging for care is that all other areas in Glasgow are doing this, why not be a shining example to what should be done and lead the way, showing how it can remain free at the point of use? In order to come up with a figure of £1.5 million targeted at some of the most vulnerable people in society, regardless of the so-called social status that seems to be based on postcode rather than actual circumstance, a decision must already have been made. Otherwise, you cannot have an idea of the calculation required without having data in place. Therefore, are you basing your figure on the review by Social Work in April 2024 or is there going to be another review in order to actually provide you with a number that takes into account care requirements and associated costs? These cuts to public sector funding made by the Scottish government have been made by the same government that has somehow managed to absorb an additional £1.5 billion given by the

Westminster government without necessarily stating how it has been spent apart from giving certain people in government employ, above inflation wage increases, despite the social contract of additionally having gold-plated pensions that none of the rest of us and society have the benefit of receiving. The same national government that also wasted hundreds of millions of pounds and is still wasting millions of pounds on building only two ferries and also missed out on over £450m of funding from the EU because they forgot to fill out paperwork. This is also true of the £29m that has just been wasted on abandoning Part 1 of the proposed National Care Service. Somehow they can always find money to fund everything except social care, it must be about time for someone to reject the cuts and show an example on how it should be done. Making savings in other places would make far more sense and immediate examples come to mind without even working in local government to know or else is sitting there that could be reduced in cost, for example: 1. Remove the reduction in council tax banding for disabled people above banding D. That would provide an immediate increase in banding for everyone living in bands E, F, G & H. 2. Remove free travel passes for the 16 to 21s. (If they are old enough to work, they are old enough to pay for travel) 3. Reduce obvious inefficiencies such as wasteful journeys and planning by companies that waste valuable resources. For example. Equipu, who store, maintain and deliver equipment to everyone in the community but use practices such as driving to a house with paperwork to inform someone an item had been forgotten, collecting an item such as a wheelchair to be taken to WestMarc at the QE, driving past the QE on the motorway to go to their warehouse in Yoker, offloading the item into the warehouse, storing it for other days delivery, then delivering it to WestMarc and then doing the process once again in reverse, etc. 4. Free prescriptions for low-cost items that could easily be sold over the counter such as paracetamol, ibuprofen and many other low-cost drugs and household remedies that are commonly used. This is not to suggest that people should purchase them in the supermarket but that pharmacies should not be forced to use expensive versions from Pharma companies. This way costs could be brought down and the safety of a pharmacist monitoring dosage, could still be maintained. 5. The population of East Renfrewshire is approximately 100,000. If you applied a policy as simple as asking for a £10 donation representing every member of the community

- People with additional needs shouldn't be charged as they are in most cases not capable to work. The financial impact on them would be terrible.
- Introducing this charge is very unfair to already struggling individuals and their families with additional support requirements. As a result of this change a vulnerable person may not seek support due to lack of money, therefore it puts a vulnerable person in danger of mental health problems and social isolation. Families who already support vulnerable people would be under more pressure as some already have jobs to help support a vulnerable person.
- This policy is discriminatory towards the elderly, disabled persons and carers. It goes against the ethos of self-directed support. This takes money away from service users for the purposes of integration into society and will result in isolation and increase in loneliness and mental health deterioration

- This policy is totally discriminatory towards the elderly the learning disabled, disabled persons and carers. It goes against the ethos of self-directed support and is flawed and morally wrong. It also goes in total opposition to the Scottish government's commitment to remove care charges for non-personal care. The financial implication of the policy to everyday living is enormous and extremely negative in terms of its impact. To consider asking disabled people many of whom have to survive on benefits, due to the appalling barriers to employment which exist, is totally unfair and you are asking a small number of individuals within the authority who receive a care package to make up for council deficit and it is unfair and not justifiable. The policy will result in greater isolation and loneliness, increased mental health pressures, distressed residents having to suffer the indignity of financial assessments. This policy in reality is only storing up bigger problems for later. The impact on unpaid carers is phenomenally negative and if all unpaid carers within ERC withdrew their support and services to their loved ones the council would face an even bigger challenge in terms of providing care and support to those within its boundaries that need it. The financial implications will leave people with very little money to live an adequate and satisfying life and will have a very negative impact on third sector organizations and clubs providing support who rely on their members making contributions. The consultation process has been hugely flawed with no one consulting adequately with the actual people impacted by this policy. To take money away from people who are in the lower social economic groups and living already on benefits is morally wrong and will leave many individuals facing hardship, social isolation, increased mental health issues
- The minimum income guarantee is set too low, especially for people under 60. No information has been provided as yet on the MIG. Most of the learning disability community fall within this group. This means you will be taking significant amounts of money from this group. The costs of carrying out the financial assessments, reviewing these annually, providing each affected person with access to a benefits advisor make this very inefficient, especially as the Scottish Government has stated they intend to abolish these charges.
- I am disabled and unable to work and so I rely on benefits to meet all my needs. This will result in me going without essentials, energy and food.
- It is very difficult to answer these questions when there are so many unknowns - see FAQs. It appears that all sectors will be treated the same i.e. an older person who has worked throughout their life and has a work pension, savings and investments would be charged the same 60% as someone with learning difficulties who has never had, and is highly unlikely to ever have, the opportunity to earn and save. This does not seem fair. The suggested charge would mean for example a person needing support to attend a fitness class would have to pay £40 on top of the cost of the class for him/her and the carer and possibly transport to/from the class. This will likely put people off attending to their fitness and health.
- This proposal impacts on the most vulnerable group in society who have little or no chance of income other than their benefits. Therefore it is morally wrong to be trying to introduce this policy.
- I feel this would have a severe effect on my abilities to undertake activities that benefit my mental health which has been a real struggle since Covid. I am also worried about the effect who unlike me, do not have parents who can help at times.

- It is very unfair picking on the most vulnerable in our society
- This is a disgraceful bill that could potentially put more adults with disability in poverty and in the long run will cost the local authorities even more money as it will result in care packages requiring more funding to suit their needs and to cover the cost of the charges.
- As someone who is disabled and unemployed I spend more time in my home and therefore I have additional energy costs to ensure my wellbeing. Energy costs are already impacting my benefits income and so this will be another expense I will struggle to meet.
- We could probably manage at the current rate but are slightly worried if the amount of care or cost of care went up
- I strongly feel this will affect the most vulnerable group of individuals who have limited capacity to earning any income. You are taking back a percentage of their only source of income
- I am extremely angry and disappointed to learn that East Renfrewshire Health and Social Care Partnership is considering introducing charges for non-residential care. This policy discriminates against the most vulnerable in our community and it completely contradicts the HSCPs strategic vision to “work together with the people of East Renfrewshire to improve lives”. This policy does not promote independence or resilience but instead causes significant anxiety and strain for families relying on social care support. Those targeted by this policy have already been subjected to horrendous treatment from the partnership following the flawed and chaotic review processes which took place following the implementation of the Supporting People Framework. They have already had essential support services withdrawn and I strongly believe that residents of East Renfrewshire have been severely let down. The consultation process for this charging policy has been atrocious and the extremely short notice which has been given for the meetings and information sessions has been ridiculous. This policy will affect people with a wide range of disabilities and the HSCP made absolutely no attempt to make these meetings accessible to those people. It highlights the complete disregard the HSCP has for people receiving support and has effectively excluded those individuals who are going to be affected by the policy from the consultation process. The figures which have been presented are flawed and the £1.3 million of savings does not justify the implications and associated stress this charging policy will have on vulnerable people and their families. Social support is essential for people with disabilities to lead healthy, enjoyable and fulfilling lives, and I do not understand why the partnership believes it is appropriate to financially discriminate against these individuals. I have absolutely no faith that individuals will be assessed fairly on their financial positions given previous experience with social workers from East Renfrewshire. I have been lied to as power of attorney for an individual who receives care. A social worker tried to suggest that an MDT would review the supports which were in place as part of the supporting people framework reviews last year. Fortunately, I was able to discredit this claim immediately due to my line of work by querying exactly what professionals would be involved in this ‘MDT’ to which the social worker admitted it would be a team of financial advisors and management. This was completely unacceptable and raises alarm bells as to the tactics which will be used during financial reviews if this policy is put in place. I have no confidence in the claim that additional costs which affect disabled people will be taken into account as I don’t believe the HSCP actually understands the financial burden associated with disabilities. If 60% of disposable income can be used to pay for social support where will the funds for

unexpected expenses that occur due to disabilities come from? The person I care for recently had to pay thousands of pounds for a wet room to be installed in rented accommodation due to mobility problems, which will continue to get worse, as there was no support from the council for this. If she had been unable to self-fund this installation she would have been forced to move out of her flat and as a consequence would have lost her care package which she relies on for all aspects of personal care. This does not align with the HSCP vision to support people 'to be independent, to be safe and healthy and to achieve the goals and outcomes important to them'.

- How can the partnership confidently say that they will accurately adjust for the increased cost of energy associated with mobility equipment such as a hoist and hospital bed which needs to be charged, an Alexa which needs to be plugged in to work the lights which have been fitted to promote independence by being voice activated, the increased costs of lightbulbs which are compatible with Alexa, the increased cost of running the washing machine and tumble dryer on a daily basis or more because of incontinence issues, the increased cost of heating and electricity for the lights/TV/chargers because people with disabilities can often be in the house for extended periods of time in contrast those without disabilities. This policy will mean these individuals will increase the amount time they spend in their homes as they will be unable to pay to attend support groups/classes/events. People with disabilities are already being hit financially, adding to this by charging for social care support is unjustifiable, especially when it is to claim such small savings. This policy focuses only on short terms goals and fails to recognise the future implications where people's funds will be depleted causing disengagement from the community which will contribute to physical deconditioning and worsening mental health problems as was seen during the Covid 19 pandemic. Furthermore, people reliant on and unable to transfer out of a wheelchair often have no option but to use Glasgow Taxis for transport as there are no wheelchair accessible taxis in East Renfrewshire. This carries an extra cost, compared to other individuals who can use any taxi company, because of the boundary charges associated with the cost of a taxi. Wheelchair users are unable to rely on buses as it is common for drivers to refuse to stop for them and often when they do stop, they refuse to assist with the ramp or advise it is out of use. The Mybus service is unreliable and has been known to leave people stranded. There is no help from the council with regard to this. What will happen to people's ability to pay for this increased cost of transport if a charging policy is put in place for social care support? Ultimately they will not be able to afford it and therefore will not be able to attend the classes and events they are currently supported to. This will reduce their quality of life and ability to access services such as specialist rehabilitation which are often a lifeline to the individuals and their families. I urge the HSCP to recognise that this policy discriminates against a population who use social care support to improve their quality of life and allow them to lead a 'normal' life. The families of, and the individuals relying on social are at breaking point.
- Name will be adversely affected by charging. She needs all the financial support possible and more to accommodate her needs. She shouldn't be put at a disadvantage because of her condition.