

The reasons for the call in are these:

Proportionality

The decision as written implies the ending of the residential respite service - it doesn't exclude it, therefore it is a possibility. This would hit hardest on the families with an adult with severe and multiple disabilities. It's expensive to cater for such people, and not attractive to the private sector. People could be left with nothing to spend their personal budget on.

Respect for Human Rights

Carers are reporting they feel pressurized / arm-twisted to accept the Shared Lives scheme, when they don't want to. They are supposed to have choice and control.

A Presumption in Favour of Openness

The way the decision is worded means it is a huge grey area. Carers feel they are not being told everything. The wording leaves open the possibility of a hidden agenda when what is needed is certainty and openness.

Clarity of Aims and Desired Outcomes

The decision states "permanent" in relation to a Council facility. But then goes on to instruct more work to be done on the alternatives and then to review the service. The aims are therefore not clear and an interpretation that the wording contradicts itself is justified. As currently worded, the decision can mean whatever you want it to. It needs to be made clear and unambiguous.

Where Relevant Issues Do Not Appear To Have Been Taken Into Consideration

If everyone has to use "Shared Lives", then who pays for the adaptations to the homes of paid carers? Disabled Facilities Grant? There is already a long waiting list for people needing their full-time homes adapted. Surely DFG should be targeted at full-time homes of disabled people, not on homes where they may spend a few days per month.