

22 April 2016

# Our Ref: e18867

# Re: Request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000

Your request for information which was received on 24 March 2016 has been considered.

Please find our response below.

## Your request:

1. Who within the Local Authority, has commissioning responsibility for adults over 65? Please provide

- a. Name
- b. Job title
- c. Telephone number
- d. Email address
- 2. The gross total expenditure on older person's services
- a. Total
- b. Allocated to residential care
- c. Allocated to nursing care
- d. Domiciliary care

Please supply this information by financial year for 2009/10 to 2015/16 (give budgeted spend for 2016 if figures are unavailable)

3. The number of older people (age 65+) the council has placed and funded in

- a) In residential care
- b) In residential EMI care
- c) In nursing care
- d) In nursing EMI care
- e) In domiciliary care

Please supply this information by year for for 2009/10 to 2015/16 (give predicted figures if not yet known)

4. The number of older people (age 65+) the council has assessed and are privately funded in

a. In residential care

www.richmond.gov.uk

- b. In residential EMI care
- c. In nursing care
- d. In nursing EMI care
- e. In domiciliary care

Please supply this information by year for for 2009/10 to 2015/16 (give predicted figures if not yet known)

5. The number of older people (age 65+) the council has placed and have LA funding, but are also subject to a third party top up

- a. In residential care
- b. In residential EMI care
- c. In nursing care
- d. In nursing EMI care

Please supply this information by year for 2009/10 to 2015/16 (give predicted figures if not yet known)

6. The number of older people age (65+) in the council area who are completely privately funding their care

- a. In residential care
- b. In residential EMI care
- c. In nursing care
- d. In nursing EMI care

Please supply this information by year for 2009/10 to 2015/16 (give predicted figures if not yet known)

- 7. The number of care homes in the council area registered to cater for
- a. Older person's residential care
- b. Older person's nursing care
- c. EMI care
- 8. Does the Local Authority have a banding system for fee rates? (Yes or No)

9. If 'no' to question 8, what are the Local Authority fees for

- a. Older person's residential placements
- b. Older person's residential EMI placements
- c. Older person's nursing placements
- d. Older person's nursing EMI placements

10. If 'yes' to question 8, how are fee bands defined/structured for (Example- Band

- 1, Band 2, Band 3; or Gold, Silver, Bronze; etc)
- a. Older person's residential placements
- b. Older person's residential EMI placements
- c. Older person's nursing placements
- d. Older person's nursing EMI placements

11. What are the current fees associated with each band for (Example Band 1 - £378)

- a. Older person's residential placements
- b. Older person's residential EMI placements
- c. Older person's nursing placements
- d. Older person's nursing EMI placements

Please supply this information by year for 2009/10 to 2015/16 (give predicted figures if not yet known)

- 12. Who are the Local Authorities preferred providers for
- a. Older person's residential placement
- b. Older person's residential EMI placement
- c. Older person's nursing placement
- d. Older person's nursing EMI placement
- e. Domiciliary care

## Our response:

1) Please see online:

http://www.richmond.gov.uk/adult\_and\_community\_services\_structure.htm

2, 3) Please see Excel sheet (18867\_2)

4) We cannot retrieve this information within the time/cost constraints of the Freedom of Information Act. Please see Appendix 1 for further details.

5) Please see attached Excel sheet as above. Please note that we have not provided exact numbers where there are fewer than 5 relevant individuals. Please see Appendix 1 for further details.

6) We do not hold this information.

7) Please see online (page 18) http://www.datarich.info/resource/view?resourceId=148

8-12) Please see attached Excel Sheet as above.

Kind regards

Data Protection & Information Officer

### Appendix 1

### Q4) Costs Refusal

#### 12 - Exemption where the cost of compliance exceeds appropriate limit

(1)Section 1(1) does not oblige a public authority to comply with a request for information if the authority estimates that the cost of complying with the request would exceed the appropriate limit."

The appropriate limit has been set at £450 and may include working hours of any person acting on our behalf at a rate of £25 per hour. This equates to 18 hours to locate and extract the relevant information.

We are unable to differentiate this specific information without considerable analysis. We consider this would exceed the appropriate limit.

#### Q5) Fewer than 5 figures

#### Section 40(2): Personal Data

Specifically in terms of the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this information is exempt under Section 40(2) as "personal data other than that of the requestor"

The definition of personal data is set out in Section 1 of the Data Protection Act 1998 and provides:

"Personal data" means data which relate to a living individual who can be identified—

(a) from those data, or

(b) from those data and other information which is in the possession of, or is likely to come into the possession of, the data controller,

and includes any expression of opinion about the individual and any indication of the intentions of the data controller or any other person in respect of the individual;

Richmond Council has applied the reasoning in the following Information Commissioner Decision <u>FS50543792</u>

Paragraphs 15 &16:

15. The Commissioner has considered the information and the number of individuals involved and has concluded that if the Council were to disclose the exact number in each category, particularly if the numbers for any were one, it could be possible to identify the individuals concerned. By aggregating the information the Council has minimised the possibility of identification.

16. The Commissioner does however note that the chances of any member of the public being able to cross-reference this information to identify specific individuals is not high but given the low numbers involved there is a risk that specific individuals could be identified by a person with knowledge of special educational needs and appeals in the area. The Council has stated that the complainant in this case is an individual who has knowledge of this. In addition, the Commissioner recognises that other individuals, such as parents at schools or Council employees may be able to identify individuals.

Therefore, on the balance of probabilities, the Commissioner accepts the information is personal data.

Similarly, we consider a determined individual with other knowledge of this matter may be able to use the specific figure to attempt to identify the individuals involved. We therefore consider that this information constitutes personal data.

Further, we consider that providing the information may identify an individual's sensitive personal data as defined by Section 2(e) of the Data Protection Act:

*In this Act "sensitive personal data" means personal data consisting of information as to— (e) his physical or mental health or condition,* 

Schedule 3 of the Data Protection Act states that sensitive personal data can only be processed if at least one of the following conditions is met:-

Explicit consent has been received from the data subject; Processing is required to comply with employment legislation; Processing is necessary to safeguard the vital interests of the data subject or another person; The information has already been made public by the data subject; Processing is necessary in connection with legal proceedings; Processing is necessary for the administration of justice; Processing is necessary for medical reasons; Processing is necessary for ethnic monitoring.

I do not consider that any of the above conditions are satisfied in this case

In reaching a view I have taken account of the individuals reasonable expectations of what would happen to their personal data, whether disclosure would be incompatible with the purposes for which it was obtained and whether disclosure would cause any unnecessary or unjustified damage to the individuals.

In this instance the data subjects would not have any reasonable expectation that the details would be made public. I consider that the disclosure of this information to members of the public could cause damage or distress to the data subjects.

I have concluded overall that it is neither in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998 principles nor in the public interest to release this specific data

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a partial Refusal Notice

You have the right of appeal against the decision. If you wish to appeal please set out in writing your grounds of appeal and send to:

Corporate Complaints and Access to Information Manager Community Engagement and Accountability Team Adult and Community Services 3rd Floor Civic Centre 44 York Street Twickenham TW1 3BZ

E-mail: foi@richmond.gov.uk

If you are dissatisfied with the outcome of the internal appeal you may appeal further to the Information Commissioner's Office at:

Wycliffe House Water Lane Wilmslow Cheshire SK9 5AF fax: 01625 524 510 DX 20819 www.ico.org.uk