

INFORMATION SHEET

Frequently Asked Questions 2

Answered by the legal panel - Last updated: 11th February 2021

About the legal panel

Several years ago, CBF Trustees identified the need to make better use of the legal framework for enabling families to get the right support for their relatives.

An initial meeting was held including CBF, Mencap, Irwin Mitchell and Leigh Day and it was agreed that we would set up a “legal panel”, with a protocol to gain initial advice at an early stage. The legal panel is now made up of a number of law firms and barristers specialising in learning disability, enabling a co-ordinated approach to emerging issues. The panel is well placed to identify strategic issues and cases that will have the greatest impact, and is part of a wider approach to getting the right level of legal support for families at the right time (e.g. utilising template letters and other resources as appropriate to ensure early resolution to legal issues).

Over the past couple of weeks, legal panel members have been considering questions families have raised with us related to the coronavirus pandemic. The second set of answers they have put together are below.

To read the first set of questions answered by legal panel members, please see the Covid-19 Information and Resources page on our website [here](#).

With very grateful thanks to the lawyers, barristers, and others who have generously provided their time and expertise to produce this FAQ resource.

TOPICS COVERED BY QUESTIONS

Click the topic to be taken to the page

<u>HOME SCHOOLING A CHILD WITH AN EHCP.....</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>VISITING RIGHTS FOR FAMILIES.....</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>RIGHT TO APPROPRIATE MANAGEMENT OF BEHAVIOURS THAT CHALLENGE.....</u>	<u>22</u>
<u>GOING INTO HOSPITAL DURING COVID 19.....</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>EMPLOYMENT ISSUES</u>	<u>25</u>
<u>CARE ACT EASEMENTS.....</u>	<u>26</u>

*We know this is a very challenging time for families caring for loved ones with severe learning disabilities. These FAQs may raise further queries or you may have further questions that you would like answered – if so please let us know and we will do our best to address them. With the legal panel members we will be working on additional resources to address the issues raised so far. To share queries or further questions, please email info@thecbf.org.uk and include **LEGAL QUESTION** in the subject.*



HOME SCHOOLING A CHILD WITH AN EHCP

Q: MY CHILD HAS AN EHCP AND ATTENDS A SPECIAL SCHOOL. HE IS CURRENTLY BEING EDUCATED AT HOME, HOWEVER THE SCHOOL ARE INSISTING I COMPLETE A TWICE DAILY REGISTER SO THEY CAN CHECK HE IS SAFE, OTHERWISE THEY WILL INSTIGATE SAFEGUARDING / ATTENDANCE PROCEEDINGS. THIS IS DISPROPORTIONATE AND INEFFECTIVE AND DO I HAVE TO COMPLETE THE REGISTER?

A: The Department of Education's guidance "Coronavirus (COVID-19): safeguarding in schools, colleges and other providers" – last updated on 27 March 2020 - states that:

Local authorities and schools do not need to complete their usual day-to-day attendance processes to follow up on non-attendance. Schools/colleges and social workers should be agreeing with families whether children in need should be attending education provision – and the school or college should then follow up on any child that they were expecting to attend, who does not. Schools and colleges should also follow up with any parent or carer who has arranged care for their children and the children subsequently do not attend. To support the above, schools and colleges should take the opportunity when communicating with parents and carers to confirm emergency contact numbers are correct and ask for any additional emergency contact numbers where they are available. In all circumstances where a vulnerable child does not take up their place at school or college, or discontinues, the school or college should notify their social worker.

However, the guidance above relating to "following up" only relates to children where care or education has been arranged away from the home and they do not attend. There are no equivalent provisions for 'follow up' for children where it is agreed they will be educated at home.

In addition, the "Coronavirus (COVID-19): guidance for schools about temporarily closing" - updated

9 April 2020 - states that:

- *During this period, schools do not need to take an attendance register. For administrative purposes Code # (planned whole or partial closure) should be used.*
- *Parents will not be penalised if their child does not attend school.*

Accordingly, provided it has been agreed between the School and parent that the child should not attending School or any alternative setting that has been arranged; there appears to be no legal basis for a School to require completion of a register in this way.



Click to return to list of topics

Where such policies are being imposed by a School, the parent may want to raise this with their local authority, local MP or the Department of Education.

In relation to the threatened penalties if the register is not completed:

- Assuming there are no other safeguarding concerns, it is difficult to see how it would be lawful for a School to make a safeguarding referral to a local authority for this reason alone. Should a referral be made in these circumstances, legal advice should be sought.
- A School has no power to 'instigate' attendance proceedings. A School is only able to make a referral to a local authority. It is then for the local authority to decide whether any further steps should be taken. The local authority would not be able to impose any penalties for non-attendance because it has been agreed by the School. Any parent who is facing prosecution for non-attendance in these circumstances should take legal advice.



Click to return to list of topics

VISITING RIGHTS FOR FAMILIES

Q: CAN YOU CLARIFY WHAT THE NEW SUPPORTED LIVING GUIDANCE MEANS OUR FAMILY CARERS CAN AND CANNOT DO?

A: The supported living guidance was published by the government on 6 August 2020 and is available at the following link:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/supported-living-services-during-coronavirus-covid-19/covid-19-guidance-for-supported-living>

The guidance is aimed at managers, care and support workers and other staff in supported living settings as well as local authorities, clinical commissioning groups, primary care networks and community health services. The guidance covers the steps that care providers and local authorities are expected to take to maintain service delivery and manage infection risks in supported living placements. Guidance is also provided in relation to what a service should do if a staff member or a service user contracts covid-19.

The guidance does not set out in detail what family carers can and cannot do for their relatives in supported living placements, but does provide some guidance on visiting (please see question 6 above).

Q: MY SON'S CARE HOME SENT OUT INFORMATION WHICH IMPLIED THAT IF WE DO TAKE HIM OFF THEIR PREMISES, WE CAN'T BRING HIM BACK. IS THIS LAWFUL OR ACCEPTABLE?

A: First of all clarity should be sought from the care home as to what their policy is. It should be expressly set out and not be for families and residents to try and understand the position from an implication in other information.

If the care provider is operating a blanket ban on excursions off the premises during visits, and you consider that your relative's individual circumstances have not been taken into account, contact the CBF promptly who can refer you to specialist solicitors.

The current guidance advises care providers to consider "alternatives to in-person on-site visiting...including...arranged walks in the park or outdoor spaces". It also suggests that providers "offer support so people can find/go to outside spaces to see their relative in a safer environment".

Whether or not a particular excursion is seen as presenting an unacceptable risk to other residents and staff on return may depend on the exact circumstances, but you should receive a reasoned decision, taking into account individual circumstances and if not, legal advice should be sought.



Click to return to list of topics

Q: AS AN INDIVIDUAL WHO SHOULD BE SHIELDING, DOES IT VIOLATE RULES FOR ME TO SAFELY VISIT MY RELATIVE IN SUPPORTED LIVING? I WORRY THAT HE WILL STRUGGLE WITHOUT REGULAR CONTACT

A: During the height of the pandemic, individuals classed as ‘clinically extremely vulnerable’ to complications from COVID-19 were advised to take extra precautions in order to avoid infection. This is known as ‘shielding’. Individuals at higher clinical risk received a letter from a medical professional advising them to stay at home. This was advice only and was not enforced by the police.

The Government guidance for the extremely vulnerable was updated on 22 January 2021 [here](#).

It is stated that the clinically extremely vulnerable will get priority access to vaccination before the general population, but even after both doses of the vaccine they should continue to follow the shielding advice. The general premise of the shielding rules are the same:

- stay home as much as you can
- you can go out for exercise or to attend health appointments, but keep contact to a minimum and avoid busy areas
- still allowed to meet with support bubble inside or one other person for exercise outside
- Try and stay 2 metres away from other people within your household

The guidance covers medication, shopping, travel and education and there are links to register for additional support with local authorities.

Q: CAN PROVIDERS RESTRICT OLDER CARERS VISITING THEIR RELATIVES BECAUSE OF THE CARER BEING OVER 70 AND THEREFORE A HIGHER RISK GROUP?

A: The new [NHS visitor Guidance](#) states that the restrictions on visiting have now been lifted and is up to the discretion of local NHS trusts and bodies. It does stipulate that bedside visitors will be limited to one person. However, those who are there to support the needs of a patient, such as a familiar carer/supporter/personal assistant, should not be counted as an additional visitor. Patients may also be accompanied where appropriate and necessary to assist with the patient’s communication and/or to meet the patient’s health or social care needs. Where possible patients should contact the ward or department in advance to discuss local considerations and make appropriate arrangements.

The guidance does not include any additional restrictions where carers or relatives are in a higher risk group. If you are restricted from visiting your relative solely



[Click to return to list of topics](#)

because of your age, or because you fall in the “vulnerable” or “extremely clinically vulnerable” group, you should explain to the provider that neither the Government’s guidance nor the Regulations impose additional restrictions on your movement, and that it is your choice whether to accept the additional risk. If you are prevented from visiting your relative solely on this basis, contact the CBF who can refer you to specialist solicitors.

Q: I AM OVER 70 AND LOOK AFTER MY SON WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES AT HOME. HE NEEDS SUPPORT WITH EVERYDAY TASKS. I AM WORRIED IF I BECOME ILL WITH THE CORONAVIRUS I WILL NOT BE ABLE TO CARE FOR HIM, AND WORSE IF I GO INTO HOSPITAL WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO HIM, SHOULD THE LA BE PUTTING IN PLACE PLANS IN CASE I AM ILL?

A: Unless and until local authorities trigger the “easements” to their Care Act duties, they are under a duty to meet the social care needs of individuals in their area. If you become unable to provide care to your son, either because you are unwell or because you are in hospital, the local authority has a statutory duty to identify alternative care and support. Even if your local authority implements the Care Act “easements”, it is very likely that it will be required to provide care and support to prevent a breach of your son’s rights under the European Convention. It is strongly advised to contact the local authority to request that they prepare a contingency plan with you at this stage. If the local authority fails to identify a contingency plan, contact the CBF who can refer you to specialist solicitors.

Q: MY SON HAS CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR, AUTISM AND HAS IN THE PAST BEEN ADMITTED TO AN INPATIENT UNIT AS A 17 YEAR OLD. HE IS NOW DOING WELL BUT THE LAST LOCKDOWN HAD A HUGE IMPACT ON HIM CAUSING BEHAVIOUR THAT THE CARERS WERE UNABLE TO MANAGE. I AM TOLD BY THE MANAGER OF THE CARERS THAT THE SUPPORTED LIVING IS RUN UNDER THE SAME GUIDANCE AS THAT GIVEN FOR CARE HOMES AND THAT MANY HOMES ARE NOW CLOSING THEIR DOORS TO VISITORS. MY SON AND THE OTHER YOUNG PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN THE HOUSE ARE ALL YOUNG, HEALTHY INDIVIDUALS. IS THERE ANYTHING I CAN DO TO PREVENT THEM FROM STOPPING VISITORS IN THE EVENT OF FURTHER RESTRICTIONS TO CARE HOMES. I AM VERY CONCERNED THAT ANY RETURN TO THESE RESTRICTIONS WILL AGAIN RESULT IN A DETERIORATION IN MY SON'S ABILITY TO COPE.

A: You don’t mention whether your son lives somewhere with local restrictions. If so, you will need to check what requirements are in place.



Click to return to list of topics

Otherwise, the current guidance for supported living can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/supported-living-services-during-coronavirus-covid-19/covid-19-guidance-for-supported-living>.

It does recognise that supported living placements differ from care homes. The section on “Visitors and Support Bubbles” makes it clear that:

- There may be important reasons for having “in-person” visits because the loss of these may cause distress.
- The “rule of six” applies wherever you see your son: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-meeting-with-others-safely-social-distancing/coronavirus-covid-19-meeting-with-others-safely-social-distancing>
- You could be in a support bubble with your son, but only if you are a single adult household: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/making-a-support-bubble-with-another-household#who-can-make-a-support-bubble> if this is the case, you don’t need to socially distance from him.

If your son has capacity to make decisions about whether to have a visit, the care provider should advise him about the safest way to do this. If he lacks capacity decisions should be taken in his best interests.

Q: CAN I REQUEST TESTING SO THAT I CAN CONTINUE TO VISIT MY RELATIVE IN SUPPORTED LIVING?

A: The government published guidance on COVID-19 and supported living placements on 6 August 2020. The guidance recognises that: “*For some people, there are important reasons for having in-person visits, as not having these may be difficult to understand and lead to distress. Supported living managers and care/support providers need to work with the people they support to identify where following the government requirements for visiting and support bubbles will cause distress, and consider options for in-person visits.*” [Guidance](#) has been updated on 18 January 2021.

Accordingly the management of your son’s supported living scheme should discuss with you how you can safely continue to visit your son. The guidance sets out a list of precautions that should be taken in order for visits to happen safely, including for example for visits to take place in the garden and with the use of personal protective equipment (PPE). In terms of testing, the guidance provides that any resident or staff member who displays symptoms of COVID-19 will have access to a coronavirus test. In addition, employers of essential workers are able to request tests for employees who are self-isolating due to having symptoms, or due to a member of their household having symptoms.

There is unfortunately so provision in the guidance for tests to be provided to visitors of supported living placements. Testing is currently only available to individuals who are displaying symptoms of COVID-19. Please see guidance at the following link: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/coronavirus-covid-19-getting-tested#who-can-be-tested>



Click to return to list of topics

Q: I KNOW OF AN OLDER CARER WITHOUT ACCESS TO THE INTERNET WHO HAS NOT BEEN MADE AWARE OF THE GOVERNMENT GUIDELINES AROUND CORONAVIRUS. WHAT CAN I DO?

A: There is no general requirement for the Government and NHS to ensure that the guidance reaches everybody in the country. However, all public bodies will need to consider their duty under the Equality Act 2010 to make reasonable adjustments for disabled people, and this may include making coronavirus guidance accessible to all. It is arguable also that the government has a positive duty under Article 2 of the ECHR to take proactive steps to preserve life, which may mean an assertive communications plan to those difficult to reach.

The Government's coronavirus guidance has been primarily published online, as well as broadcast on television and radio, and in some instances sent by post. There will be some people in the country who do not have access to the internet and for whom up-to-date guidance will be more difficult to access (over 90% of households in the UK are thought not have internet access of some kind). Where these individuals are carers, it is likely that meeting the individual's needs for care and support will require ensuring that the carer is aware of the Government and NHS guidance, for instance the guidance on social distancing.

Q: NOW THAT LOCKDOWN RESTRICTIONS ARE EASING, HOW CAN WE BE ASSURED THAT CARE HOMES FOR PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES WITH NO UNDERLYING HEALTH PROBLEMS WILL NOT BE TREATED THE SAME AS CARE HOMES FOR VULNERABLE PEOPLE WHO MAY BE ISOLATED FOR LONGER WITH RESTRICTIONS ON VISITING FOR A LONG PERIOD? WE NEED TO BE ABLE TO VISIT OUR RELATIVES AS SOON AS POSSIBLE AND NOT BE IMPOSED TO ANY ADDITIONAL UNNECESSARY RESTRICTIONS WHEN LOCKDOWN IS EASED

A: When a care home decides to restrict visitors, this decision interferes with their residents' right to enjoy their private and family life. Public bodies (which can include care homes, even if their fees are paid for privately by residents or their families) are not allowed to interfere with that right, which is protected by Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights ('ECHR') - unless they have a lawful reason for doing so. There is also a prohibition on 'blanket bans', which means that public bodies are not allowed to apply policies to everyone indiscriminately irrespective of an individual's specific circumstances. We are aware that these restrictive practices are being used during the lockdown: please take a look at [these FAQs](#) from the Challenging Behaviour Foundation. Elsewhere in this guide we listed some alternatives that care homes can use instead of restricting visits.



Click to return to list of topics

Once the UK government has ended the lockdown, it will be even harder for care homes to keep these restrictive measures in place without proper evidence that, for example, they have done so only after consulting medical experts who have confirmed that their residents remains at a particularly high risk of becoming infected. Even in those circumstances, we would expect the care home to take all possible measures to avoid a breach of Article 8 such as providing PPE to visitors or facilitating visits in a wing or building that is separate from the rest of the care home and can be disinfected quickly and thoroughly between visits.

If, after the lockdown, you or your relatives find yourselves in a situation where you are still being prevented from visiting a loved one in a care home then you should ask the care home manager why that decision has been taken. If you believe the decision may be unreasonable, or if you do not receive a response, then you should contact a solicitor promptly for advice about a potential judicial review challenge against the care home's blanket ban.

Judicial review is the process by which a High Court judge sitting in the Administrative Court considers the lawfulness of a public body's action, inaction, guidance or decision. This type of challenge is governed by Civil Procedure Rule 54 which prescribes the time limit for filing such a challenge as "promptly, and in any event not later than 3 months after the grounds to make the claim first arose" [CPR 54.5(1)]. The first step of a judicial review challenge is to send a legal letter in accordance with the Pre-Action Protocol for Judicial Review (known as a 'pre-action letter'), putting the care home on notice that their blanket restriction may amount to an unlawful interference with your family's Article 8 rights. Many judicial review challenges settle at the pre-action stage because a letter from a solicitor's firm is often enough to force the decision maker to review and revoke an unlawful policy, or to obtain a detailed Letter of Reply which provides evidence and proper reasoning for the implementation of a policy.

Q: ARE PEOPLE IN SINGLE PERSON SUPPORTED LIVING SERVICES NOW ABLE TO FORM A BUBBLE WITH ANOTHER HOUSEHOLD? THIS IS REALLY IMPORTANT TO MANY FAMILIES THE CBF IS SUPPORTING AND COULD MEAN THEY CAN NOW VISIT THEIR RELATIVE WITHOUT SOCIAL DISTANCING.

A: The current guidance is here: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/making-a-support-bubble-with-another-household>

Essentially any single person in supported living services is allowed to form a support bubble, **but** the guidance is different for those who live in carers as opposed to those who have carers visit.

If you live in carers you can only form a support bubble with a household consisting of one adult.



[Click to return to list of topics](#)

If your carers come to visit you, you can form a support bubble with another household of any size.

Depending on the nature of the supported living this might be a difficult distinction to make, however it is arguable that given the importance of family visits a generous interpretation should be given and those for example who have carers live on site but not within their home should be allowed to form a support bubble with a household of any size.

Q: I AM WORRIED MY SON'S CARE HOME WILL NOT ALLOW HIM TO LEAVE TO ATTEND A CLOSE FAMILY MEMBER'S FUNERAL AND THEN RETURN AGAIN. I BELIEVE THIS WOULD BREACH HIS HUMAN RIGHTS BUT HAVE BEEN TOLD THAT IN SOME CIRCUMSTANCES THESE BREACHES WOULD BE ALLOWED. IS THIS RIGHT?

A: Taking steps to prevent someone from being able to attend funeral (either through not letting them go, or saying they cannot return if they do) would be an interference with a person's right to a private and family life under Article 8 European Convention on Human Rights. However, Article 8 is a 'qualified' right, which means that a public body can interfere with your rights where it is lawful, necessary and proportionate in order to protect:

- national security
- public safety
- the economy
- health or morals
- prevent disorder or crime, or
- the rights and freedoms of other people.

Action is 'proportionate' when it is appropriate and no more than necessary to address the problem concerned. It isn't possible to provide general advice on when a particular interference might be considered necessary and proportionate as every case will turn on its individual facts. Where there is a concern that human rights are being breached, advice should be sought.

Q: I'M CONCERNED THAT MY RELATIVE'S CARE PROVIDER WILL PREVENT ME FROM CONTACTING HIM/HER VIRTUALLY DUE TO CONFIDENTIALITY ISSUES. WHAT SHOULD I DO?

A: During the Covid-19 lockdown, many residential/care homes are using a variety of technology, such as FaceTime, Skype and WhatsApp, to allow residents and their families to stay in touch.

Using this technology raises a number of legitimate security and confidentiality concerns (for the resident, other residents as well as staff) and so it is vital that care



Click to return to list of topics

homes perform a proper risk assessment and then have procedures in place to ensure that the use of this technology is compliant with the GDPR. However, the fact that so many care homes have taken steps to enable these virtual visits would suggest that, with suitable safeguards, these issues are far from insurmountable.

The British Geriatrics Society has recently recommended that *“Care homes should take advantage of videoconferencing software on smartphones, tablets and portable computers as much as possible to maintain human contact for residents. They, and healthcare professionals supporting them, must recognise and respond to the strain that social isolation puts on residents and their families.”*

<https://www.bgs.org.uk/resources/covid-19-managing-the-covid-19-pandemic-in-care-homes>

Therefore, if a particular care home is seeking to argue that they are unable to arrange virtual visits as it would breach ill-defined “data protection” requirements then they should be requested, in an email or letter to the home’s Data Protection Officer (they are required to have one), to set out these concerns in more detail and why they cannot be satisfactorily addressed, particularly as they appear to have been addressed elsewhere. If you remain unhappy with the response, then you should then complain to the Information Commissioner’s Office (ICO) and / or the Care Quality Commission (CQC) or seek legal advice.

It is likely that a different approach may be taken in relation to different methods of virtual communication and those with ‘drop in’ capability for example, may require a tailored agreement in terms of using that facility covering for example security measures to prevent unwanted requests, scheduled times for use of ‘drop in’, management of notifications etc.



Click to return to list of topics

Q: A YOUNG MAN, WHO PREVIOUSLY LIVED IN SUPPORTED LIVING FROM MONDAY-FRIDAY EACH WEEK, AND WENT HOME TO HIS FAMILY HOME AT WEEKENDS. HE IS ABLE TO STAY AT HIS SUPPORTED LIVING HOME AT WEEKENDS, BUT HIS PREFERENCE IS TO VISIT HIS FAMILY. AT THE START OF THE OUTBREAK, HE MOVED HOME TO HIS FAMILY HOME, AS HIS SUPPORTED LIVING SERVICE (UNDERSTANDABLY) DID NOT WANT RESIDENTS MOVING FROM ONE HOUSEHOLD TO ANOTHER. WE HOPED AT THE TIME THIS WOULD BE A TEMPORARY MEASURE UNTIL THE LOCKDOWN ENDED AND THINGS WENT BACK TO 'NORMAL', BUT IT'S NOW CLEAR THAT WE WON'T BE RETURNING TO 'NORMAL' ANY TIME IN THE NEAR FUTURE. HE'S KEEN TO MOVE BACK TO HIS SUPPORTED LIVING NOW – LEGALLY, CAN HE RESUME HIS PREVIOUS PATTERN OF SPENDING WEEKDAYS AND NIGHTS THERE, AND WEEKENDS AT HIS FAMILY HOME?

A: If this young man has carers who live with him, he is only able to form a support bubble with a single adult household. A support bubble enables two households to 'join up' and visit each other without the need for social distancing.

If there is more than one adult living within the young man's family home, and the home is not within an area which is subject to local restrictions (list available here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/local-restrictions-areas-with-an-outbreak-of-coronavirus-covid-19>), then he is able to return to his supported living placement and visit family at the weekend, as long as he complies with the so-called 'rule of six'. The family can only meet in a group of six or less. He can stay overnight at the family home if there are less than six people there, but social distancing should be maintained. Additional guidance on the 'rule of six' is available here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-outbreak-faqs-what-you-can-and-cant-do/coronavirus-outbreak-faqs-what-you-can-and-cant-do>



Click to return to list of topics

Q: MY SON LIVES IN A SUPPORTED LIVING PROVISION RUN BY A CARE PROVIDER. I NORMALLY SEE HIM THREE OR FOUR TIMES A WEEK. I HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO VISIT DURING LOCKDOWN BUT I AM NOW ALLOWED AFTER SOME PUSHING TO MEET HIM OUTDOORS TWICE A WEEK IN A LOCAL PARK WITH HIS CARERS. I AM TOLD THAT THE OTHER YOUNG PEOPLE ARE STILL NOT ALLOWED THIS EVEN THOUGH THE LOCKDOWN HAS EASED TO ALLOW SUCH MEETINGS FOR THE WIDER POPULATION. I HAVE ASKED FOR MORE FLEXIBILITY AND TO BE ABLE TO SEE HIM OUTSIDE MORE FREQUENTLY. HE IS STRUGGLING AT THE MOMENT WITH HIS MENTAL HEALTH AND HIS CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR HAS INCREASED DRAMATICALLY OVER THE LAST SEVEN WEEKS. WHY DOES HE NOT HAVE THE SAME RIGHTS AS OTHER PEOPLE HAVE TO MEET A FRIEND OR FAMILY MEMBER AS OFTEN AS HE WOULD LIKE OUTSIDE THE HOUSE TO TAKE EXERCISE WHILST MAINTAINING SOCIAL DISTANCING? THE PROVIDER IS TELLING ME THAT IT IS TO PROTECT STAFF AND MINIMISE THE CHANCE OF INFECTION TO STAFF AND THE OTHER YOUNG PEOPLE WHO LIVE THERE. DOES HE HAVE LESS RIGHTS HERE?

A: Unfortunately the Supported Living guidance is very vague, and we are trying to speak to Supported Living providers to seek to challenge it.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/supported-living-services-during-coronavirus-covid-19>

In relation to contact it says as follows. Note in particular:

For some people, there are important reasons for having in-person visits, as not having these may be difficult to understand and lead to distress.

Supported living managers and care/support providers need to work with the people they support to identify where following the government requirements for visiting and support bubbles will cause distress, and consider options for in-person visits.

I suggest that the questioner quotes the guidance and tells the SL provider that they are being too restrictive, contrary to their son's best interests, and that visits should be increased in accordance with his views and wishes and best interests.

Q: MY BROTHER IS SEVERELY LEARNING DISABLED AND LIVES IN A HOUSE WITH TWO OTHER DISABLED ADULTS. HE LACKS CAPACITY AND MY SISTER AND I WERE GRANTED A WELFARE DEPUTYSHIP BY THE COURT OF PROTECTION LAST WEEK. MY BROTHER HAS BEEN ASKING FOR WEEKS TO VISIT ME. AS I LIVE 130 MILES AWAY, MY SISTER WOULD NEED TO BRING HIM IN HER CAR. MY SISTER AND I



Click to return to list of topics

BELIEVE THAT THIS IS PERMITTED UNDER THE 'REASONABLE EXCUSE' EXCEPTION OF THE CORONAVIRUS REGULATIONS. HOWEVER, THE CARE PROVIDER DOES NOT AGREE. THEY WILL NOT ALLOW MY BROTHER TO VISIT AS HIS CIRCUMSTANCES DO NOT MATCH THE BLACK AND WHITE LETTER OF THE LAW. ARE THEY RIGHT IN THIS RESPECT AND THAT THERE IS NO FLEXIBILITY TO ALLOW A VISIT? I FEAR THAT THE RESTRICTIONS WILL NEVER MEET OUR EXACT SITUATION AND SO HE WILL HAVE TO WAIT FOR LOCKDOWN TO BE LIFTED, WHICH WILL HAPPEN WHO KNOWS WHEN. MY SISTER AND I BOTH LIVE ALONE AND WE BELIEVE PRESENT LESS OF A RISK THAN MULTIPLE CARERS WHO COME INTO THE HOUSE TO PROVIDE CARE.

The law and guidance in relation to support bubbles and number of households mixing does vary considerably between regions, and the care provider should be required to set out in writing how it has reached the decision to refuse the visit, including:

- Details of any risk assessment completed
- Consideration of infection minimisation measures (such as your sister wearing a mask in the car); and
- Assessment of what is in your brother's best interests.

If you do not agree with the reasons it is likely an application will be required to the Court of Protection and you should contact CBF to enquire about specialist lawyers.

Care providers are required to follow local lockdown guidance but they remain required to make decisions about visits for people without capacity to make the decision themselves using the Mental Capacity Act framework, and no blanket decisions not considering your brother's individual needs and the circumstances of the planned visit should be made.

Q: ONE FAMILY HAVE BEEN TOLD THEIR SON NEEDS TO SELF-ISOLATE BECAUSE OF POTENTIAL COVID AT HIS SCHOOL. WHAT IS THE POSITION ON PAS NOW GOING INTO THEIR HOME TO SUPPORT THEIR SON WHILE HE IS SELF-ISOLATING?

A: The PAs should continue to visit but should follow guidance on providing care: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-providing-home-care/coronavirus-covid-19-provision-of-home-care> .

Updated guidance has been published (18th November) for using direct payments or personal health budgets and personal assistants. You can find the guidance here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-guidance-for-people-receiving-direct-payments/coronavirus-covid-19-qa-for-people-receiving-a-personal-budget-or-personal-health-budget>.



[Click to return to list of topics](#)

This guidance should be read in full by anyone who has a Direct Payment or Personal Health Budget.

From this it seems clear that the expectation is that PAs will continue to provide a service. They are regarded as key workers and are entitled to free PPE, Covid-tests and flu vaccination. If PAs have increased costs because e.g. they are not using public transport but driving instead, this may be possible. If there are problem's you're encouraged to speak to the local authority or CCG making the payment.

Q: MY SON IS ON THE AUTISTIC SPECTRUM AND LIVING AT HOME. HE GETS 2:1 SUPPORT FROM A CARE COMPANY FUNDED BY CHC. FOR AROUND 9 HOURS A DAY. THIS INCLUDES PERSONAL CARE. AND HAS CHALLENGING BEHAVIOURS.

UNFORTUNATELY, ME AND MY DAUGHTER WERE TESTED POSITIVE WHEN TESTED ON 11 SEPTEMBER. MY WIFE AND SON WERE NEGATIVE (THANKFULLY).

IMMEDIATELY THE CARE PROVIDER STOPPED CARE AND RESUMED AFTER 14 DAYS ISOLATION. NO OTHER SUPPORT WAS OFFERED. WE EVEN SUGGESTED IT WOULD HELP EVEN IF 1 STAFF MEMBER CAME IN THE MORNING FOR A COUPLE OF HOURS TO HELP WITH PERSONAL CARE. BUT THIS WAS IGNORED/ DECLINED.

WE HAVE SOUGHT CLARIFICATION FROM CHC AND THE CARE PROVIDER AND THEY SAY THIS IS THE GOVERNMENT GUIDELINE.

WHY IS THERE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST SOMEONE LIVING WITH FAMILY AS OPPOSED TO IN A CARE HOME, OR HOSPITAL OR SUPPORTED LIVING WHERE SUPPORT WOULD NOT STOP?

WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF THREE OF US WERE POSITIVE AND MY SON WHO NEEDS 24/7 CARE WAS NEGATIVE? WHO WOULD SUPPORT HIM? WILL CARE STOP FOR 14 DAYS EVERY TIME MY SON COMES INTO CONTACT WITH SOMEONE WHO HAS TESTED POSITIVE?

THE CARE COMPANY WHO WORKS ON ZERO HOURS CONTRACTS WITH CARERS STILL GET FUNDING FROM CHC.

PLEASE NOTE: The legal panel are in the process of reviewing the answer below and it may be updated soon.



Click to return to list of topics

A: I am not familiar with any guidance that states that CHC support / private agency support must be halted the moment a person in the household tests positive – especially if the person needing care has not so tested (and the ‘positive’ members are self-isolating).

The duty on the CCG and the care agency is to act reasonably and to have appropriate health and safety measures to protect care staff. As far as I am aware there is not any relevant guidance concerning what care agencies should do / must do in such cases. I have tried to find this – but without success. (Please note: the legal panel continue to look for this guidance and the answer will be updated accordingly) In the absence of guidance to this effect the CCG has a duty to deliver the assessed support needs of the disabled person (probably a ‘best endeavours’ duty). This means they must act reasonably, flexibly and explore alternatives (and explain why alternatives suggested by the family are not possible). It would also mean that a blanket ban on providing support in such cases would be unlawful.

Q: MY DAUGHTER’S CARE PLAN SAYS THAT SHE COMES HOME TO VISIT US ON A THURSDAY, DURING HER VISIT I CUT HER NAILS AND WASH HER HAIR AS SHE WILL NOT LET CARE HOME STAFF SUPPORT HER WITH THIS.

IS IT THE CASE THAT VISITS OUT OF CARE HOMES MAY BE POSSIBLE WHERE THIS IS NECESSARY TO MEET ELIGIBLE NEED UNDER THE CARE ACT 2014? IF NOT, WHY NOT AND ON WHAT BASIS WOULD VISITS OF THIS SPECIFIC NATURE BE PROHIBITED AS THE GUIDANCE SUGGESTS GIVEN THAT THERE IS NO SPECIFIC BASIS IN LAW?

We are approaching this question on the basis that “visits” refer to visits to family and friends in another household.

As a result of the January 2021 lockdown, restrictions on leaving home and on gatherings were imposed across England. The Tier 4 restrictions which now apply to every area in England are set out in Schedule 3A of The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (All tiers) (England) Regulations 2020 (as amended).

Restrictions on gatherings

An exhaustive list of general exceptions to the restriction on gatherings are set out in paragraph 6 of Schedule 3A.

This list includes an exception where the gathering is “reasonably necessary to provide care or assistance to a vulnerable person or a person who has a disability, including relevant personal care within the meaning of paragraph 7(3B) of Schedule 4 of the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006” (Exception 3 – set out in paragraph 6(4)(d)).



[Click to return to list of topics](#)

Therefore if it is reasonably necessary for a visit out of a care home to take place for a vulnerable person in a care home to receive care and assistance then it is arguable that a gathering may be lawful under this exception.

This interpretation of the exception has not yet been tested in court, but if it is correct then it would be possible for a care home resident to visit their family in the family home but only if this is reasonably necessary for the care home resident to receive care and assistance.

However, even if this interpretation of the Regulations is correct, the question of whether a visit is **reasonably necessary** will depend on the facts of each individual case including the care needs of the care home resident and the nature of the gathering taking place as a result of the visit.

Restrictions on leaving home

The Regulations state that no person may leave or be outside the place they live without reasonable excuse (paragraph 1(1) of Schedule 3A). The circumstances in which a person will have a reasonable excuse to leave home include those set out in paragraph 2 of Schedule 3A.

The non-exhaustive list of reasonable excuses for leaving home set out in paragraph 2 does not include leaving home for the purpose of **receiving** care (as opposed to visits **to** a care home or **to provide** care or assistance, both of which are included on the list as being reasonable excuses).

However, if as outlined above, it is right that a gathering is lawful where the purpose of the gathering is for a person to receive care and assistance **that is reasonably necessary**, then it is arguable that leaving home to attend such a gathering made lawful by the exception in paragraph 6(4)(d) is a reasonable excuse for leaving home. That is because if it were not considered to be a reasonable excuse then no one would be able to make use of the exception in relation to gatherings in paragraph 6(4)(d) because they would not be able to leave their home to receive the care and assistance.

This is not the most straightforward interpretation of the Regulations and has not yet been tested in court. The recent case of *NG v Hertfordshire County Council* [2021] EWCOP 2 considered whether parents leaving home to provide care to their son had a reasonable excuse for leaving home in circumstances where their son was receiving care at home from paid carers who came to his flat. The case concerned an earlier set of restriction Regulations, the wording of which closely reflects the current Regulations.

At paragraph 47 the judge noted that while the Regulations place a very great emphasis on the importance of people staying at home and not mixing unnecessarily and without very good reason, it is also clear that the Government intended to ensure that people who needed to leave their home to provide care and assistance to a vulnerable person should be allowed to do so. The judge went on to state that it



[Click to return to list of topics](#)

was important to have in mind the enormous number of family carers providing care to persons outside their household and that it is essential that care can continue to be provided throughout the course of the pandemic. The fact that it would be possible for unpaid family care to be replaced by paid care did not mean the family care was not meeting a need.

NG concerned the issue of whether the carer had a reasonable excuse to leave home to **provide** care rather than whether a person leaving home to **receive** care have a reasonable excuse to leave home. Nonetheless, the comments of the judge about the intention of the Government and importance of family members being able to continue to provide care and assistance during the pandemic suggest that it is arguable that leaving a care home to **receive** care and assistance from a family member would be a reasonable excuse for leaving home within the meaning of paragraph 1(1) of Schedule 3A. However, this argument has yet to be tested in court.

Care Act 2014

Local authorities have duties under the Care Act 2014 to meet an adult's assessed eligible needs for care and support. In assessing these needs one of the "outcomes" which will be considered is the person's ability to make use of facilities in the local community, and maintaining family relationships, and the impact on the person's wellbeing if they are not able to do this (see the Care and Support (Eligibility Criteria) Regulations 2015). However a local authority cannot meet these needs in a manner which is unlawful.

If, as outlined above, care home residents are permitted under the Regulations to participate in visits out of care homes for the purpose of receiving care and assistance then there is no conflict between the Regulations and the duties arising under the Care Act.

However, it is possible that a court might not accept this argument and instead conclude that the Regulations make it unlawful for a person to leave a care home for the purpose of having their care needs met by someone else.

Instead the local authority or provider would need to meet the care needs of the individual in a manner which is lawful, and as a result they would need to think about how they can meet those individual's particular eligible needs by means other than 'visits-out'.

In organising and providing social care for adults in the circumstance where COVID-19 is impacting on the service provided, local authorities and providers may wish to have regard to the guidance "[Responding to COVID-19: the ethical framework for adult social care](#)" (published 19 March 2020) which identifies ethical values and principles which should be taken into consideration when making decisions,



[Click to return to list of topics](#)

alongside consideration of individual wellbeing, overall public good and the resources that are available.

Of course difficulties can arise when care homes refuse to take an individualised approach and simply refuse visits out in all circumstances. You may wish to refer to the letter [from the Joint Committee on Human Rights to Matt Hancock of 3 February 2021](#).

Q: MY SON'S CARE PLAN SAYS THAT HE SHOULD COME HOME TO STAY WITH US (HIS MUM, DAD AND BROTHER) EVERY OTHER WEEKEND TO TAKE PART IN SPORTING ACTIVITIES WITH HIS OLDER BROTHER. HIS CARE HOME CLAIM THAT THIS IS NOW AGAINST THE LAW, BUT I THOUGHT HIS CARE PLAN WAS A LEGALLY BINDING DOCUMENT AND THAT THE LA HAVE A DUTY TO MEET HIS ELIGIBLE SOCIAL CARE NEEDS.

IF 'VISITS-OUT' ARE IN AN INDIVIDUAL'S CARE PLAN, HOW DO THE GOVERNMENT INTEND TO SUPPORT LOCAL AUTHORITIES AND PROVIDERS IN MEETING CARE ACT AND EQUALITY ACT RESPONSIBILITIES GIVEN THE CONFLICTING NATURE OF GUIDANCE AND REGULATIONS? WILL STEPS BE TAKEN TO ENSURE THAT THE GUIDANCE IS REDRAFTED TO REFLECT RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER CARE ACT AND EQUALITY ACT?

As outlined in response to the question above, the Tier 4 restrictions which currently apply to every area in England and set out in Schedule 3A of The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (All tiers) (England) Regulations 2020 (as amended) place restrictions on leaving home and on gatherings.

However, they do allow a person to leave or be outside the place they live if they have a reasonable excuse (paragraph 1(1) of Schedule 3A) or to take part in a gathering if it falls within the exhaustive list of general exceptions to the restriction on gatherings set out in paragraph 6 of Schedule 3A.

For the reasons given above in respect of question 5, it is arguable that the Regulations do permit 'visits-out' where this is "reasonably necessary to provide care or assistance to a vulnerable person or a person who has a disability, including relevant personal care within the meaning of paragraph 7(3B) of Schedule 4 of the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006" (Exception 3 – set out in paragraph 6(4)(d)). However, this argument has not yet been tested in court.

The UK Government '[Visits out of care homes guidance](#)' (updated 12 January 2021) does not seem to adopt this interpretation of the Regulations and instead suggests that visits out should only take place "in exceptional circumstances, such as to visit a friend or relative at the end of their life". "Death bed visits" are one of the exceptions in the Regulations to the restrictions on leaving home and it is likely this is why the guidance identifies this as being one exceptional circumstance in which a visit out of



Click to return to list of topics

a care home may be facilitated. The guidance also recognises that some care home residents may be able to form a “support bubble” with another, single person household. This “is not recommended”, but it is not prohibited.

Care Act 2014 and Equality Act 2010

If the Regulations make it unlawful for a person to leave a care home for the purpose of meeting their care needs then the Care Act and the Equality Act would not assist. That is because while local authorities and providers have duties under the Care Act to meet an adult’s needs for care and support, and to comply with the Equality Act the local authority cannot do this in a manner which is unlawful.

Instead the local authority or provider would need to meet the care needs of the individual in a lawful manner, and as a result they would need to think about how they can meet those individual’s particular care needs by means other than ‘visits-out’.

As outlined above in respect of question 5, local authorities and providers may wish to have regard to the guidance “[Responding to COVID-19: the ethical framework for adult social care](#)” (published 19 March 2020) which identifies ethical values and principles which should be taken into consideration when making decisions in respect of the provision of adult social care during the pandemic.

Of course difficulties can arise when care homes refuse to take an individualised approach and simply refuse visits out in all circumstances. You may wish to refer to the [letter from the Joint Committee on Human Rights to Matt Hancock of 3 February 2021](#).



Click to return to list of topics

RIGHT TO APPROPRIATE MANAGEMENT OF BEHAVIOURS THAT CHALLENGE

Q: I AM WORRIED THAT THERE IS NO APPROPRIATE MANAGEMENT IN PLACE IN CASE MY RELATIVE'S BEHAVIOURS CHANGE.

A: There is no reason why your loved one should not continue to receive appropriate care and behaviour management during the pandemic. The NHS has also provided [guidance](#) on the specific needs of those with autism and learning disabilities. You can read this guidance here, and the Government has also advised those working in the social care sector to take account of it. Importantly, the NHS guidance refers to the need to listen to families and carers and to make reasonable adjustments.

The Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) has recently provided guidance for families, care staff as well as social workers/OTs on supporting people with learning disabilities and autism through the pandemic and you can find this [here](#). SCIE stresses the need to promote the human rights of those with learning disabilities and autism. Even if your local authority has decided to operate the Care Act [easements](#), it is still required to take a person-centred approach.

If you are concerned about the way in which your loved one's behaviour is being managed you should raise your concerns with the provider and commissioner of their care. You may wish to draw some of the guidance above to their attention. If you are not able to agree a way forward, please contact the CBF and ask for a referral to the legal panel.



GOING INTO HOSPITAL DURING COVID 19

Q: MY SON WAS ADMITTED TO HOSPITAL, AND I NOTICED THAT “NOT FOR ESCALATION” WAS WRITTEN IN HIS NOTES- WHAT CAN I DO?

A: The first thing you should do is speak to the healthcare professionals treating your son and ask for clarification of what you have seen, and for an opportunity to discuss it.

“Not for escalation” is a term often used to mean that a patient will receive palliative or ward-based care only, and will not be escalated to the High Dependency Unit or Intensive Care Unit even if their health declines.

Any decision about a patient’s care and treatment should be based on their individual needs and wishes, however it is lawful for healthcare professionals to consider what resources are available when considering what treatment they can offer to their patients.

You should speak to the healthcare professionals to confirm what decision has been made and on what basis. Any decisions based on blanket policies, such as the age of your son or that he has a particular disability may be unlawful and if that is why your son has been designated “not for escalation”, you should consider seeking formal legal advice.

If the decision has been made due to your son’s specific circumstances, then although you should have been consulted so that your son’s wishes could be taken into account, if the medical experts consider that more invasive/a higher level of treatment would be futile in that it would not likely to lead to him recovering, this is very difficult to challenge. You should ask for a fresh decision to be made if you were not previously consulted and listen carefully to the reasons given if the only option being offered is “not for escalation”.

If you disagree with the clinical judgment of the healthcare professionals you can ask for a second opinion and this should be provided. Again you and your son if appropriate/possible, should have the opportunity to provide your views. A second opinion may be from a doctor in the same hospital but should be someone not previously involved. If they too reach the view that your son would not benefit from a higher level of care and/or that it is in his best interests not to receive more invasive painful treatment when prospects of recovery are very low, then although there may be an option of seeking further opinions, any legal challenge to the decision is unlikely to succeed.

If there is a dispute about what is in a person’s best interests who does not have the mental capacity to make it themselves, proceedings can be brought in the Court of Protection and specialist legal advice is recommended. It is worth remembering however that the Court will not compel any doctor to take action which they consider may harm their patient and so having a supportive medical expert is usually crucial



[Click to return to list of topics](#)

to succeed. Often having had further discussions and consultations with the treating team an agreement can be reached which may for example include having a timescale for review or a more specific approach to further interventions.



EMPLOYMENT ISSUES

Q: CAN YOU PROVIDE MORE CLARITY AROUND THE 80 PERCENT OF PAY WHEN THE USUAL PAY IS SO VARIED DUE TO THE HOURLY PAY?

A: How much pay an employee is entitled to depends on what the employer has agreed with them to pay, or what the employer has varied their entitlement to, if you have a variation clause in your employment contract. Please remember the Scheme does not change employment law, so existing contractual rights remain.

The Scheme sets a minimum of the lower of 80% of their regular wage or £2,500.

On 17 April 2020 HMRC issued Guidance to help calculate pay for employees whose pay varies: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/work-out-80-of-your-employees-wages-to-claim-through-the-coronavirus-job-retention-scheme>

For employees whose pay varies and who were employed from 6 April 2019, the Government advice is that the employer can claim the highest of either:

- 80% of the same month's wages from the previous year (up to a maximum of £2,500 a month)
- 80% of the average monthly wages for the 2019 to 2020 tax year (up to a maximum of £2,500 a month)

To calculate 80% of the same month's wages from the previous year:

- Start with the amount earned in the same period last year.
- Divide by the total number of days in this pay period including non-working days.
- Multiply by the number of furlough days in this pay period.
- Multiply by 80%.

Employees whose pay varies and who started employment after 6 April 2019, the Government advice is to claim for 80% of their average monthly wages since they started work until the date they are furloughed, up to a maximum of £2500 per month.

To work out 80% of an employee's average monthly earnings:

- Start with the amount they earned in the tax year up to the day before they were furloughed.
- Divide it by the number of days they've been employed since the start of the tax year – including non-working days (up to the day before they were furloughed or 5 April 2020 – whichever is earlier).
- Multiply by the number of furlough days in this pay period.
- Multiply by 80%.

Every day or period after the employee commenced employment with the employer is counted in making this calculation. This includes days when no work was undertaken.



Click to return to list of topics

For employees who have been employed for less than a month, their earnings so far should be pro-rated.

Some employers may take the view that those casual or zero hours workers and employees who are not guaranteed work from the employer do not need to be put on furlough leave at all because the employer can instead simply refrain from offering them work. However, this approach is not in the spirit of the scheme which intends to ensure that employees and PAYE workers retain a basic income during the crisis stages of the pandemic and if you are in this situation, you should seek further legal advice.

Q: WHAT IS THE SITUATION IF AN EMPLOYEE REQUESTS THAT RATHER THAN RECEIVE SSP THEY WANT TO RECEIVE 80% OF THEIR USUAL SALARY AS THAT IS THE HIGHER AMOUNT? WE (THE PROVIDER) ARE CLEAR THAT THE 80% IS ONLY AVAILABLE FOR THOSE INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE LOST THEIR JOBS AS A RESULT OF THE CORONAVIRUS SITUATION BUT UNDERSTANDABLY, 80% IS A MUCH MORE ATTRACTIVE OFFER TO THE SSP AMOUNT OF £94.25 PER WEEK.

A: The precise application of the Job Retention Scheme is untested and Government Guidance is constantly evolving. To afford yourselves some protection, we advise those making decisions in relation to furlough, to record the date you make your decision and that you review it regularly. The Government are fine tuning the policy and issuing regular updates – the last one in respect of SSP the 19 April 2020.

For an employee **in receipt of SSP** the answer is ‘no’ they cannot be furloughed. The Revised Guidance states that *‘you cannot claim for employees while they are getting SSP, but they can be furloughed and claimed for once they are no longer receiving SSP’*

The eligibility criterion appears to be ‘receipt of SSP’ and not absence by reason of ill-health, which suggests to us, that an employee who is on long term sickness absence, but who has exhausted their SSP entitlement, might be entitled to furlough pay. The Government has been asked to clarify this issue.

The recent Government update has confirmed that employees who are furloughed and who then become unwell are not entitled to SSP. This is important clarification and we assume has been given to ensure that employers do not fall foul of the 3 week minimum furlough period.

CARE ACT EASEMENTS



Q: I HAVE HEARD THAT MY COUNCIL DOES NOT NEED TO MEET THE NEEDS OF DISABLED ADULTS DURING THIS PANDEMIC, IS THAT RIGHT?

A: It is correct that the Coronavirus Act 2020 downgrades a wide range of Adult Social Care duties under the Care Act 2014 by introducing what it calls 'easements'. Most significantly it could include converting the duty to meet someone's needs into a power to do so, unless failing to meet those needs would result in a breach of a person's human rights.

However the guidance published by the Department of Health and Social Care states that any local authority should only be operating under the 'easements' as a matter of last resort, and prescribes a very detailed process before any decision can be taken, which in effect mean that the 'easements' should have least impact possible and for the shortest period of time possible.

The guidance states:

A Local Authority should only take a decision to begin exercising the Care Act easements when the workforce is significantly depleted, or demand on social care increased, to an extent that it is no longer reasonably practicable for it to comply with its Care Act duties (as they stand prior to amendment by the Coronavirus Act) and where to continue to try to do so is likely to result in urgent or acute needs not being met, potentially risking life. Any change resulting from such a decision should be proportionate to the circumstances in a particular Local Authority.

This means that your local authority would have to be able to show that the 'workforce is significantly depleted, or demand on social care increased, to an extent that it is no longer reasonably practicable for it to comply with its Care Act duties' and also that 'to continue to try to do so is likely to result in urgent or acute needs not being met, potentially risking life.' We would therefore very much expect this to be the exception, rather than the norm.

Local Authorities have to keep a record of the decision, with evidence that was taken into account. Where possible the record should include the following:

- The nature of the changes to demand or the workforce
- The steps that have been taken to mitigate against the need for this to happen
- The expected impact of the measures taken
- How the changes will help to avoid breaches of people's human rights at a population level
- The individuals involved in the decision-making process
- The points at which this decision will be reviewed again



[Click to return to list of topics](#)

Importantly, this decision “should be communicated to all providers, service users and carers. The accessibility of communication to service users and carers should be considered...” and that “The provision of information and advice for public reassurance will be particularly important during this period.”

If anyone has had their care cut as a result of these easements, we would advise them to seek immediate legal advice.