

**Private and Confidential**  
CASCAIDr

**London Borough of Redbridge**  
Lynton House  
255-259 High Rd  
Ilford IG1 1NY

**Adult Care, Public Health and Wellbeing team**

**Please reply to:**  
Jackie Riviere  
Directorate Support Officer

[icw.information@redbridge.gov.uk](mailto:icw.information@redbridge.gov.uk)  
[www.redbridge.gov.uk](http://www.redbridge.gov.uk)

Our ref: 11519696

Date: 19 April 2021

Your reference: request-738866-84901cba@whatdotheyknow.com

Dear CASCAIDr

### **Freedom of Information Act 2000**

Thank you for your request for information received on 21 March 2021

Section 1 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 provides two distinct but related rights of access to information which impose corresponding duties on public authorities. These are:

- The duty to inform the applicant whether or not information is held by the authority and, if so,
- The duty to communicate that information to the applicant.

Please see below a copy of your request and the information being released to you.

### **Request**

1. *How many individuals is the local authority acting as an appointee for, please?* = 125

2. *How many of these individuals (in area or out of area) pays adult social care charges to the council for non-residential services?* = 100 people

3. *Which department is responsible for administering Appointeeship?*  
Appointeeship and Court of Protection falls under Adult Social Services

4. *Which department is responsible for assessing social care charges?*  
Revenue and Benefits Team assess social care charges

5. *How many officers in either department carry out an overlapping role with regard to Appointeeship and care charges?* = None

6. *How many times has the Appointeeship team responded to a consultation on behalf of individuals or any group of benefits claimants regarding a change in the council's charging policy, since 2015?*  
We do not hold this information

7. How many appeals about care charges has the Appointeeship team submitted to the financial assessment team since 2015? **Unknown, nil since 2020.**

8. How many complaints has the Appointeeship team submitted regarding care charges since 2015? **None**

9. How many times has the Appointeeship team sought or referred individuals they act for, to independent advice (whether third sector, legal aid or privately funded) about care charges, since 2015? **None. Care charges are not determined by the Appointeeship team, they are determined corporately.**

10. How many times has the Appointeeship team questioned the accuracy, fairness or legal validity of individuals' care charges or the council's charging policy, since 2015?  
**None, Charging Policy is set corporately.**

11. Does the council treat Appointeeship as a Care Act service? If so, does it charge for that as part of the Care Act charging system? = **No**

12. How much does it charge, if it makes a charge, per month or per week or per year, please? = **£5.23 per week**

13. If Appointeeship is not provided for through the Care Act, does the council allow for a DRE deduction from Disability Benefits income, for the charge it makes for Appointeeship (assuming a person is otherwise chargeable)? = **Yes**

14. If the council does not operate Appointeeships for adult social care clients, does the council permit a full DRE deduction from Disability Benefits income, for any charge levied by any other corporate or private appointee (assuming a person is otherwise chargeable)?  
**Not Applicable**

15. In respect of all council clients who are currently in receipt of adult social care services, regarded as liable to pay a charge for their adult social care services, for whom the appointee role is currently undertaken - how is the relevant department holding the appointeeship responsibility proposing to manage the conflict of interest presented by the judgment in the Norfolk CC v SH case in December 2020, given that the decision means that other similar policies are presumptively unlawful? Please answer with a sentence or a paragraph; it is suggested that it is not a proper response to say that no decisions have been made, as yet, because the problem already exists

**Redbridge Council is currently reviewing the outcome of this recent judgment and liaising with ADASS and seeking feedback from NAFAO. We have engaged legal services who are currently updating their advice on this matter.**

Please quote the reference number 11519696 in any future communications.

If you are dissatisfied with the outcome or the handling of your request, you have the right to ask for an internal review. Internal review requests should be submitted within **20 working days** of the date of receipt of the response to your original email or letter and should be addressed to:

Information Officer, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor (front), Lynton House, High Road, Ilford, IG1 1NY or sent to  
[icw.information@redbridge.gov.uk](mailto:icw.information@redbridge.gov.uk)

If you are still dissatisfied with the Council's response after the internal review you have a right of appeal to the Information Commissioner at:

The Information Commissioner's Office  
Wycliffe House  
Water Lane  
Wilmslow  
Cheshire SK9 5AF  
Telephone: 01625 545 700  
Website: [www.ico.gov.uk](http://www.ico.gov.uk)

Although the London Borough of Redbridge has considered your request strictly in accordance with the Act, if any or all of the information provided is to be published or broadcast, we would like the opportunity to comment on the information provided, in so far as that publication or broadcast refers to, or in any way identifies, the London Borough of Redbridge before the information is published or broadcast. The London Borough of Redbridge's Press Office can be contacted on [pressoffice@redbridge.gov.uk](mailto:pressoffice@redbridge.gov.uk).

Yours faithfully

Jackie Riviere  
Directorate Support Officer