

Q1 Do you think it is reasonable to remove the current maximum weekly charge for non- residential services?

Theme: Fairness and Equity

A bit unfair to lose all hard earned income. If you keep taking large amounts they will end up on benefits hence costing even more.

Absolutely disgusting! Yet again hard working people securing their future paying the price as always!!
Totally unfair and unjust!

Because the people who do have money it is because they worked hard, saved up and paid into pensions for their future. Those who don't have it may have squandered their money, never worked or owned a home.
It is unfair that they pay nothing and those who worked hard have to pay everything.

Feels unjust when others pay nothing towards care costs but those people that have saved or done without in the past pay full costs. Also, others that have shielded their assets have full council funding.

I disagree with this as it's not treating everyone as equal. If you choose to work and save, it doesn't benefit you.

I FEEL PENSIONERS WITH SAVINGS WILL GET BASHED WHICH IS UNFAIR WHERE I WORKED ALL MY LIFE TO GENERATE MY SAVINGS.

I strongly disagree. This unfairly penalises people who have worked hard and saved all their lives.

It punishes those who have worked, earned and saved!

It's disgusting that people that have saved for retirement are penalised.

No, why should people work hard and give everything to the Council and leave nothing for their children.

Once again Labour are targeting the old and vulnerable members of society who have in the past worked + paid their dues to the countries finances.

Penalising people who have worked and paid their way in life. This proposed new system rewards those who have lived on benefits and never worked.

People who don't own their own homes won't pay anything as they don't have a property as an asset. Those who own their own homes will pay more as they have that asset. How is that fair.

This is penalising people like me who have saved and worked hard all my life to subsidise those who have not bothered and have spent / wasted all their money.

You should not penalise people who are just above the threshold who have saved all their lives. The current charges are fair for those people.

Theme: Financial Hardship and Affordability

because this makes it too expensive and would then mean we wouldn't be able to access the service...
detrimental affect on my mental health and ability to carry on caring.

Charges are already high for some people, taking this away and introducing an admin fee will have great
impact on funds.

How are people expected to find the additional costs that may be involved?

I do not have a bottomless pot of money. My care package has cost me £100,000 over the last 3 years.

I would not be able to pay that much, if I needed the maximum weekly charge.

It is hard enough to live currently without an increase in charges.

Leave it as it is.

Many people are caught by the current low levels of savings thresholds and so struggle with this weekly
amount already. To remove this cap adds to their financial hardship and worry levels.

My hard earned savings are rapidly depleting, as you have already increased my bill by 26.8% this tax year.

People can't afford it.

People that already pay the maximum weekly charge for care will also have other needs that they have to
finance themselves.

Removing the maximum cap on weekly charges for non-residential services will potentially cost patients in
need of assistance... This is unreasonable and unsustainable.

Their money will only go so far. Once gone - who pays? It's just swings and roundabouts.

Unfair to charge more.

Theme: Discouragement of Saving

Hit would discourage people from saving for their old age... why work hard and save when you will be penalised in old age...

There has to be a cap / maximum charge. Raiding the finances of elderly who have worked hard to save for old age is grossly unfair and will just encourage people 'not' to save.

Theme: Need for a Cap or Alternative Approach

I disagree with moving the cap altogether... a cap, maybe linked to inflation and reviewed annually would be a more considerate option.

I think that the cap should be kept in place as the service that has been provided is not always as the plan / contract stated.

Should be capped still - maybe increase by inflation each year only.

There should always be a ceiling to control amount granted, however, the amount should not be an arbitrary figure and should be considered against needs not desires.

Maximum charge seems arbitrary. If it is not removed seems to be a good case to increase it in line with rising care costs.

My view is that the weekly maximum care charge should remain and increase by the percentage increase of care costs each year.

There are sometimes people who fall into this category by a very small margin... A sliding scale could be a fairer option.

Some people will be able to afford to pay the true cost of care. However I would hope that this is means tested as funds can quickly run out when paying for care. Maybe introduce a sliding scale?

They should come to some agreement.

Theme: Service Quality and Value

As a pensioner I think I pay enough. The service is not that good.

I have made a formal written complaint about RMBC - their standard of job performance and conduct.

I think that the cap should be kept in place as the service that has been provided is not always as the plan / contract stated.

Tried to access support from RMBC adult services and informed each time no support available for me aged 60. Disabled and chronic long-term health. Very poor.

Theme: Impact on Vulnerable Groups

Illness can happen to anyone and we should support all people as they get elderly to be able to remain at home with dignity.

No, because removing the current maximum weekly charge for non-residential care could disproportionately impact individuals with lower incomes and exacerbate financial hardship for vulnerable groups.

People are already penalised enough for being unwell or disabled.

Targets elderly - unfair proposal.

The people who require extensive services are those in most need. They should not be penalised any more.

The proposal is not fair because it discriminates against those people who need the most care.

Theme: Distrust of Council Motives

The Council mimicking the Government in its quest to hammer the poor, to hammer those less able to resist. Scandalous.

The council should pay all care fees, even for self-funders. They have paid into NHS their entire lives.

The number of people who exceeded the maximum weekly care charge rose from 9 to 25... Removing the maximum weekly care charge means that the council will financially benefit.

You currently charge residents extra to cover the cost of social care. If you start charging individuals more for their care, the savings won't benefit the rest of us as you will waste the money on a vanity project elsewhere.

There is no mention in this article as to what charges are - and how much the Council can charge. The charging scale must be made available and transparent.

Q2. Do you think it is reasonable to introduce an administrative charge for organising care for people who fund their own care?

Theme: Fairness and Equity

Again it is discriminating against people who have tried to benefit themselves.

Again, hard working people paying the price for everyone! Why should people who have worked hard all their life, secured a home then have to pay for everyone else who cannot be bothered or scam the system! So unfair!

Again, this penalises people who have worked and paid their way over those who have lived on benefits and never worked.

I strongly disagree, Self-funders already pay full costs of their care from a lifetime of savings and contributions. Adding an extra admin charge feels like punishing people for being independent and responsible.

Self funders have no contribution towards costs and are penalised for saving or living frugally so why should they be penalised again to fund administration charges.

Why should self-funders have to pay an extra cost it is not right or fair.

Unfair to target them.

Paid in all my life to the system I pay for my care but you always want more. Think it is disgusting.

It is taking money away from people who have worked hard all their life.

Punishes those who want to take responsibility and want their own choices.

We are hard working people who have strived all our lives to maintain a good standard of living. Obviously saving money does not help you later in life.

Theme: Financial Hardship and Affordability

Again too high amount per year. A cost every time the care act assessment has to be reviewed is better than a yearly cost.

As a self funder my care fees have already increased by 26.8% this tax year.

People just over the £23,350 threshold will struggle to find the funding and will be hit hardest.

In April this year, the hourly rate for care went up from £19.40 to £25.52 - an increase of 31.5%. The proposed fee of £350 represents a further 3.9% on my current annual bill of about £9000.

With the possible increase in future costs it is unfair to apply further costs on people who already pay for their own care.

Seems too much as a one off fair but annually too much.

Self funders may be only just over the threshold and in future may fall below the threshold.

She has been paying for her support from her saving. She will soon be under the £23,350. What happen then?

This increase is too much. People who need care already have extra demands on their money.

Theme: Discouragement of Saving / Planning

Again, I have worked hard and saved, I might as well spend it all on holidays etc before I need care, if it means I will then qualify for no charges... the whole scheme will discourage anyone from saving for their future.

Again, this is disgusting after people have saved for a happy and financially secure retirement.

I have worked full time all my life until past retirement age, as did my husband. We have always been careful with spending, not wasting money and saving. Other people who have squandered their money get their care for free whilst I am punished for saving mine by having to pay for my care.

Theme: Need for Transparency and Justification

I would prefer to see a one off payment, rather than an ongoing annual charge of that amount. It all rather depends on what admin is involved and if this something that is required each year to justify the charge.

In principle there should be an administration fee but cannot see and nor is there an explanation of how £350 is arrived at. This seems excessive.

The proposed administrative charge is effectively an additional tax on self-funders. No basis is provided for how a charging rate of £350 per year is in any way related to the actual administrative cost for arranging care per individual.

what do the self funders get for their annual fee. if nothing this smacks of stealth tax, do 'non self funders' get the same charge and how is that calculated.

this seems totally unfair as i can't see what this is needed for, other than making money for the council. I don't see why it is an annual cost either. Currently there is no transparency about charges or financial assessments.

Theme: Impact on Vulnerable Groups

Anyone requiring care is vulnerable... They need social services to guide them and it is unfair to charge them for this help just because they can't do it themselves.

Targets elderly - unfair proposal.

Some people are vulnerable and need care. RMBC and social care have a duty of care to support these people.

No, because introducing a £350 annual admin charge for people who fund their own care unfairly penalises individuals who are already bearing the full cost of their support... Targets vulnerable groups.

Theme: Distrust of Council Motives

RMBC is always out to make as money as possible from people, possibly to line their own pockets. Don't trust them.

The Council is there to work for its community - not make money from them. With several Council officials on highly oversized salaries - perhaps savings could be made there?

The Council mimicking the Government in its quest to punish the vulnerable, it really is quite pathetic. Chase the billionaires.

Unless the actual wages of said 'admins' will increase with reflection, then no. I just see this money lining company pockets. An admin fee is never for the admin.

You are putting barriers in the way.

Theme: Alternative Suggestions

A one off payment is acceptable.

I agree but would like this to be considered. After the initial cost for the first year, a lesser amount could be considered for the following years.

Think an annual charge is unreasonable. Perhaps a charge when care is arranged or revised at request of person receiving care.

If / when this fee is introduced, it would help if it could be paid monthly and added to the monthly invoice.

A better proposal may be to enable self funders to pay the care agency directly rather than via yourselves as an intermediary so that this charge is not needed.

Q3) Do you want to tell us anything else?

Theme: Fairness and Equity

That person who pays has saved their money - not blown it on holidays etc. Those who spend every penny get everything free - they have holidays, take aways, go out, do stuff. My dad worked - no holidays - no meals out - and he saved. He pays for everything - he doesn't complain but it's not a fair system that someone else gets free everything. Charging him more - his money will soon run out - so then what?

Why not try looking after people who work hard instead of constantly punishing and penalising them! It's shameful act, have working people not already paid enough!!!

Why work and save to be penalised in old age. This just encourages people to do nothing to better themselves. Might as well do nothing as better off on benefit! You are targeting the wrong people - absolute disgrace again.

I have two houses and some money in bank for my children. I saved hard. You pay your taxes and the state should look after you in old age.

Mum has been a UK citizen living in Rotherham for over 70 years. She has paid her rent and council tax in full on time. So at the age of 98 I think she has more than paid for the support she now needs.

Theme: Impact on Vulnerable Groups & Inclusivity

As these proposals affect the vulnerable, most likely elderly people who do not have advocates, are housebound, and rely solely on the care services provided via the council, how does the council believe it

I am completing this form on behalf of my mother, who is 85 years old and does not have the capacity to put

Husband 89 in December. Alzheimer's, deaf, incontinent. I'm 87 and housebound. I've not been out in 4

We also need to increase support given to family carers. In practical terms they should be treated with more respect by professionals. They are saving the public purse millions.

Theme: Distrust of Council Motives & Consultation Process

These proposals (especially the first) are unfair, at odds with Government aims to help keep patients in their own homes and place a huge burden on individuals... This looks like exploitation of Rotherham residents who need your care, not being treated as cash-cows. I am sure the decision to go ahead has already been made and this consultation is merely window dressing.

This "consultation" is a sham.

Maybe the Council should better consider where spending goes. Unnecessary large TV screens across the borough which have never been used. Unnecessary cycle lanes very rarely used.

On equalities collection and monitoring page: The Council would save enough money to pay for the core services if they stopped entertaining all this nonsense!

Try supporting British people before supporting others in hotels. Its a joke.
the council needs to be more accountable and transparent in their dealings with people.

Theme: Financial Hardship & Affordability

My mother has been made aware of the views expressed on this form and is in total agreement, as well as being worried now about spiralling costs that look likely to affect her.

If you have funds the council show little interest until you are running out of cash. Elderly people deserve better when they need a little help and support at a particularly difficult time in their life.

Theme: Service Quality & Accountability

I am the daughter - as my mum is unable to write due to her severe physical disability. We do not mind paying/contributing towards the cost of the care she receives. However trying to obtain detailed information of the actual care received is non existent. Would you pay for electricity/gas you had not received?

Please could you advise, if an admin charge is introduced by the Council, are they then to be the first point of contact? In the event of issues, we have to get them sorted and action taken to resolve them without the service user having to chase them and sort them out themselves.

some care companies used leave a lot to be desired.

The care service could be a lot better. Many times the carers come late due to the shortage of carers.

Tried to access the service. Told each time nothing available. Staff rude condescending and nonchalant to anything I say.

What you pay & what you receive means nothing. You are promised a service from numerous care companies, with no continuity. Necessary information is not passed to who it is needed... The service is not fit for purpose.

Theme: Need for System Reform & Better Prioritization

Councils should be lobbying Government to overhaul the entire care system, instead of looking to what I see is believed to be an easy money making exercise to wrongly charge these vulnerable people by cash strapped councils.

Funding of social care is a political misadventure; I would hate for it to become an issue that is dealt with as such with the avoidance of people who require the service.

There are far too many younger people within the Rotherham Borough already claiming far too many benefits - most of whom could and should be working. If these benefits were slimmed down there would be more funds available for those needing care in later life.

Row Labels	Count of E&D Religion	Count of E&D Carer	Count of E&D Refugee or Asylum Seeker	Count of E&D Ethnicity	Count of E&D Disability
no					
yes	61	61	61	61	61
Grand Total	61	61	61	61	61

Row Labels	Count of E&D Gender	
Female	40	66%
Male	17	28%
Other	1	2%
Prefer not to say	3	5%
Grand Total	61	

Row Labels	Count of E&D Sexual Orientation	
Bisexual	1	2%
Gay/lesbian	1	2%
Heterosexual/straight	48	79%
Prefer not to say	11	18%
Grand Total	61	

Row Labels	Count of E&D Pregnant	
No	55	90%
Prefer not to say	6	10%
Grand Total	61	

Row Labels	Count of E&D Ethnicity	
Asian or Asian British - Indian	1	2%
Asian or Asian British - Pakistani	4	7%
Black or Black British - African	2	3%
Prefer not to say	3	5%
White - British	51	84%
Grand Total	61	

Row Labels	Count of E&D Transgender	
No	57	93%
Prefer not to say	3	5%
Yes	1	2%
Grand Total	61	

Row Labels	Count of E&D Carer	
No	41	67%
Prefer not to say	4	7%
Yes	16	26%
Grand Total	61	

Row Labels	Count of E&D Baby <12 months	
No	54	89%
Prefer not to say	6	10%
Yes	1	2%
Grand Total	61	

Row Labels	Count of E&D Religion	
Christian (all denominations)	35	57%
Jewish	1	2%
Muslim	7	11%
No religion	12	20%
Prefer not to say	6	10%
Grand Total	61	

Count of E&D Disability conditions	Count of E&D Baby <12 months	Count of E&D Marital Status	Count of E&D Pregnant
44	61	61	61
44	61	61	61

Row Labels	Count of E&D Disability
No	13 21%
Prefer not to say	4 7%
Yes	44 72%
Grand Total	61

Row Labels	Count of E&D Refugee or Asylum Seeker
Neither	50 82%
Prefer not to say	9 15%
Refugee	2 3%
Grand Total	61

Row Labels	Count of E&D Marital Status
Civil partnership	1 2%
Divorced/separated	3 5%
Living with partner	4 7%
Married	17 28%
Prefer not to say	6 10%
Single	7 11%
Widowed	23 38%
Grand Total	61

Count of E&D Sexual Orientation	Count of E&D Transgender	Count of E&D Gender	Count of E&D consent	Count of E&D DOB
				34
	61	61	61	61
	61	61	61	95
	61	61	61	35
	61	61	61	95
	61	61	61	35

Row Labels	Count of E&D Disability conditions	
Blindness or partial loss of sight, Deafness or partial loss of hearing, Long-term illness or health condition, Developmental disorder	1	2%
Illness or condition that is not mentioned here	3	7%
Long-term illness or health condition	4	9%
Mental health condition	1	2%
Mental health condition, Learning disability, Developmental disorder	3	7%
Physical disability	9	20%
Physical disability, Blindness or partial loss of sight, Deafness or partial loss of hearing, Speech or verbal communication issues, Mental health condition, Long-term illness or health condition	1	2%
Physical disability, Blindness or partial loss of sight, Mental health condition, Long-term illness or health condition	1	2%
Physical disability, Deafness or partial loss of hearing	1	2%
loss of hearing, Long-term illness or health condition	4	9%
loss of hearing, Long-term illness or health condition, Illness or condition that is not mentioned here	1	2%
Physical disability, Deafness or partial loss of hearing, Mental health condition	1	2%
loss of hearing, Speech or verbal communication issues, Long-term illness or health condition	2	5%
Physical disability, Illness or condition that is not mentioned here	2	5%
Physical disability, Long-term illness or health condition	5	11%
Physical disability, Long-term illness or health condition, Illness or condition that is not mentioned here	1	2%
Physical disability, Mental health condition, Long-term illness or health condition	2	5%
Physical disability, Speech or verbal communication issues, Long-term illness or health condition	1	2%
Physical disability, Speech or verbal communication issues, Mental health condition, Long-term illness or health condition	1	2%
Grand Total	44	