

## **Written evidence submitted by Max White, uncle of Gabrielle Werth, a learning disabled resident [SOC 186]**

### **The Destruction of Botton, a Camphill Intentional Community, by Camphill Village Trust and the Failure of the Regulatory and Commissioning Bodies to Protect the Learning Disabled Residents**

- 1 **Background of Camphill** (modified extract from Camphill.org.UK website)
  - 1.1 The innovative communities that make up the Camphill Movement have, for over 70 years, been creating new ways of supporting people with learning disabilities and other special needs so that their full potential can find expression.
  - 1.2 The first community was founded at Camphill House, just outside Aberdeen, Scotland, in 1940, to educate mentally handicapped children. At that time, such children didn't usually receive an education, either staying at home or being placed in a hospital.
  - 1.3 Camphill's founders, led by Dr Karl König and inspired by the Austrian thinker Rudolf Steiner's philosophy of anthroposophy, wanted to make a real difference in the lives of these people who were marginalised and excluded from society. They believed that those with mental handicaps had much to contribute if only their inner self could find expression.
  - 1.4 Refugees from Nazi oppression in Austria, Dr König's group included doctors, medical students and creative young people who had come together in pre-war Vienna to explore anthroposophy. After fleeing Austria, the group came together in 1939 at Kirkton House, near Aberdeen, to begin putting their ideas for a new kind of life into practice. The first two children with disabilities joined them that May.
  - 1.5 The group chose to do their work, not as a job or career but as a way of life, with social rather than personal values taking priority. Through curative education they aimed to stimulate each child's developing individuality, giving them the freedom to grow to their full potential. Such a task could not be achieved in the classroom alone. By living in a community with the children 24-hours-a-day, what today is called an 'holistic approach' could be followed, educating the children in all aspects of life. The benefits of this new approach appealed to many parents and, a year later, Camphill came into being when a move was made to larger premises at Camphill House in Aberdeen.
  - 1.6 The community soon established a good reputation and local authorities began seeking places for children. By 1945, the Camphill schools occupied four large properties with around 250 acres of land and by 1949, 180 children were being cared for and there was a long waiting list.
  - 1.7 By the 1950s Camphill was ready to create communities away from its base in Aberdeen. Parents in England wanted opportunities for their children with disabilities and Camphill schools opened near Bristol and in Hampshire in 1951. A lecture tour of Ireland by Dr

König in 1953 brought an invitation from parents resulting in the establishment of a community at Glencraig, near Belfast.

- 1.8 Soon a community for adults was requested so that those who had benefited from the schools could continue to develop through the Camphill philosophy of mutual care. So in 1955 a working community was established at Botton (the Macmillan family's country estate), North Yorkshire, which would grow to become the largest Camphill Intentional community.
- 1.9 Today, Camphill consists of a world-wide network of more than 100 communities in over 20 countries where people of all abilities - including some 3,000 children and adults with learning disabilities, mental health problems and other special needs - live, learn and work together in an atmosphere of mutual respect.
- 1.10 Camphill succeeds because it integrates those with disabilities into caring communities that recognise all people as equals with each capable of making valued contributions to community life. This special way of life has captured the imagination of people around the world and has attracted generous donations and legacies, allowing CVT to buy land and buildings and over the years, and as at Botton, create the iconic architectural style of its houses, hall and church.

### **Camphill Village Trust and the destruction of Camphill's inspirational concept**

## **2 Pre-Central Control**

- 2.1 The charity was created in 1954 to enable Intentional Communities to be established, growing to eleven in England and Scotland. The number reduced to nine with the demerger of the two Scottish communities in 2012.
- 2.2 The CVT communities of vocational volunteer co-workers and learning disabled adults were run by the co-workers and overseen by Local Management Committees (LMC's). The LMC's comprised co-workers and local people in approximately equal numbers giving transparency to the way the CVT communities were run and benefiting them from knowledge and integration within the wider-communities. The Charity Commission considered this to be "***a very sound and practical model***"<sup>1</sup>.
- 2.3 As an Intentional Community, potential villagers of Botton were given a trial period, which, if successful, resulted in the applicant having the choice or otherwise of accepting a place.
- 2.4 In 2009 the trustees of CVT commissioned a review which, amongst a number of innovative suggestions including independence for Botton, noted a lack of adequate governance of the charity.

## **3 Introduction of Senior Management**

- 3.1 In a letter to co-workers in 2010 Chris Cook, the Chairman, announced that the decision had been taken to recruit an executive officer. He explained that a governance audit review, commissioned from Aspire & Transform, had ***“thought that a lack of good governance had lead to the difficulties experienced in some communities”***. An executive officer would be recruited for a three year period who would ***“lead a process involving as many people as possible to develop a shared vision and sense of direction across the Trust”***... and for those who had expressed ***“ a desire for their communities to break away”***... ***“can be explored as part of this process”***.
- 3.2 Frances Wright, a lawyer and Director of Learn to Lead since 2008<sup>2</sup>, a company that has for years been employed by CVT, was, prior to her full time appointment, a consultant to CVT. In 1999 she was, as part of the New Leadership team, advising Botton about potential management structures and employment of co-workers, an approach they chose not to adopt. In 2010 it transpires that she shared the view that each community should have an employed general manager, that the house community/shared living and vocational co-worker model should be ended and that the guest volunteers (short term co-workers on pocket money) should cease.
- 3.3 Since the employment by CVT in 2011 of the Chief Executive, Huw John and the HR Director, Frances Wright, this predetermined drive to change the direction of the Charity from the Memorandum of Association<sup>3</sup> and inspirational Camphill traditions, is turning Botton it into a standardised urban mainstream social care facility. The changes have been carried out by the systematic dilution of the culture of Camphill intentions and traditions in communities, and the persistent persecution of co-workers - **these are totally contrary to the Memorandum agreed with the Charity Commission in 2005**. Most of the other CVT communities have already lost their Camphill identity.
- 3.4 Neither the members nor, more particularly in our cases, the Families, have been consulted about plans to modify the direction in which the charity is being led, to the point that there has been a denial, by CVT, of the motives behind the changes being introduced. Chairman’s undated letter of April 2012 to Max White<sup>4</sup> refers.
- 3.5 From the initial actions, letters to families and the first meeting in 2011 with Huw John, who admitted his inability to understand what Camphill stood for, it was evident that the foundation of Camphill, villagers living, working and socialising together with vocational co-worker families, was under attack. Huw John had been the CEO of Manchester Care until its financial collapse in 2008. This serious mismanagement should have excluded his application for the CVT post under Regulation 5.3.d of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014 - ***“The intention of this regulation is to ensure that people who have director level responsibility for the quality and safety of care, and for meeting the fundamental standards are fit and proper to carry out this important role”***. That this was not picked up seriously questions the competence of the Trustees and their advisors and his ongoing management failures confirm his unsuitability for this role.

## 4 Sudden and Dramatic Changes

- 4.1 Within three months investigations of Botton by the CQC and the NYCC were underway. On the 15<sup>th</sup> June 2011 Huw John notified the leading co-worker and Charity trustee that he was suspended from his registered manager role and advised him to consider carefully if he wished to attend board meetings<sup>5</sup>. The Botton LMC was also stood down. No prior indication, explanation or justification for these actions was ever given. On the 22<sup>nd</sup> June, in a briefing document<sup>6</sup>, this was notified to all communities and that NYCC would start individual reviews and have its final audit report the following week. The impact on the village was devastating. The outcome of the eventual reports, identifying procedural shortcomings, by the CQC and NYCC were greatly inflated by CVT, despite both acknowledging that the villagers were safe and happy in their community. Such actions do not happen overnight and had clearly been in preparation for some time.
- 4.2 Later in 2011 another co-worker couple were suspended and with their family removed from the village the same day. Their isolation further traumatised the village. Months later they were advised that NYCC had confirmed that they had no case to answer<sup>7</sup>, however this was not sufficient for CVT who took further action and extended the period of separation, increasing anxiety both to the family and the village. Since that time there have been and still are today ongoing safeguarding alerts raised against volunteer co-workers which, under the cloak of confidentiality, they are not allowed to discuss but suffer the inference that they are at fault despite being unfairly or even falsely accused. CVT use these to their advantage to discriminate against the co-workers. Complaints raised against CVT employees are swept under the carpet.
- 4.3 In October 2011 CVT installed a General Manager in Botton. She proved to be totally unsuitable and three months later was sacked. Her replacement lasted until December 2012 when he left for "personal reasons". The General Manager from another CVT community, where co-working had been extinguished, was transferred to Botton, contrary to requests by families for a considered appointment process. After a significant list of failings and abusive behaviour he was removed from Botton. After another unannounced member of the management, the so called Housing Officer, acted as General Manager, in the Spring of 2015 the current manager was installed.

## 5 Families Discomfort and Misgivings

- 5.1 Families started to recognise the pressures that were being exerted and question the Trustees' and senior managements' motives and intentions. At the beginning of 2012 the Botton Village Families and Friends Support Group (BVFFSG - now the Botton Village Families Group, BVFG) was formed, but CVT later refused to acknowledge its existence. At a meeting arranged by CVT and NYCC in January it was confirmed that the GM had been dismissed and the Care Manager was introduced as interim GM. A redacted version of the NYCC report was issued immediately before the meeting and NYCC explained issues in more detail. The families raised many questions including CVT's intentions for maintaining the Camphill principles and values and support for co-workers.

- 5.2 In March 2012 the CQC carried out an unannounced inspection and confirmed that Botton was considered compliant.
- 5.3 A meeting was requested of the CVT Chairman by two founder members of BVFFSG but he would only attend with the Chief Executive present and he was on holiday<sup>8-9</sup>. Since then the Trustees have refused all requests for them to meet Botton families.
- 5.4 Further distress to the community was caused when the General Manager removed, for approximately two months, the houseparent of Skylark “in the best interests of the residents”. This proved to be more distressing to the residents as the care workers did not understand how to deal with their individual needs and this resulted in a serious incident. Only with the reinstatement of the houseparent were matters resolved, showing CVT Management’s lack of understanding and the necessity of advising and consulting the residents’ parents and holders of power of attorney.
- 5.5 A second CVT/NYCC meeting was held in September 2012. After this meeting HJ wrote to families recognising the importance of co-working and shared living<sup>10</sup>. Not only does he **“reconfirm the message that there is no plan or desire by CVT trustees or managers to create a Botton community without co-workers”** but he ends with the commitment that **“Botton can and must have a future that continues to recognise the needs and aspirations of those for whom it was created - some of the most vulnerable in society.”** If it was his genuine view at that time it was not shared by his Chairman and senior management colleagues.

## 6 The CVT Review

- 6.1 Earlier that year CVT announced that a wide ranging review would be carried out by Groundswell/In Control. Regional and community meetings were arranged in 2013 for families to hear and participate in the outcome of the review. The review, which excluded financial evaluation, set out options for the future direction of the charity. The Trustees committed to the review before any meetings with families were held. However, at a meeting at Botton Huw John admitted that no cost assessment had been made of the financial impact of the proposals. At the London meeting it also transpired that the review team had not been directed to take into account the Charity’s Memorandum. At all meetings the families expressed their overwhelming support for the vocational co-workers and shared living but CVT would make no commitment to abide by the traditions of the charity.
- 6.2 On 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2012 the Commission wrote to CVT. It noted that **“The communities are described as ‘life-sharing’ with ‘career volunteers’ or co-workers who live with the beneficiaries and provide them with care and support. This is a key feature and one which is valued both by beneficiaries and their families.”** A fact that CVT refuse to recognise.

6.3 Generous donations and legacies over the years, funding land and buildings, led to a financially robust Charity. However a re-currant theme from Huw John from 2012 was the government's plan for a reduction of 43% in funding to local authorities, that most commissioners were seeking further reductions for the following year and legacies were falling. This was in the year when, with the demerger of the Scottish Communities, villager and co-worker numbers had dropped significantly whilst employee numbers increased and salaries and wages increased disproportionately and have continued to do so since.

## 7 **The Cost of Co-workers Compared with Employees**

7.1 The Charity Commission stated in 2005 that the level of benefits accruing to co-workers should not normally be greater than the cost of wages would be if a "volunteer" was not available. Over the years CVT have been asked repeatedly to explain why, when co-working was clearly more cost effective, were they employing more care workers and managers. They have refused to provide the information that would clarify the situation. This is dealt with in detail in the letter Messrs Knight and White wrote to CVT on 31st May 2015<sup>11</sup>.

7.2 In the same letter to CVT they are challenged about the manipulation of the Charity Commission. It is clear from the timing of correspondence between CVT and the Commission that CVT had raised matters that they knew would be of interest to the Commission resulting in their letter of 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2012<sup>12</sup>. Despite CVT failing to provide honest explanations, it was confirmed in the Commission's letter 25<sup>th</sup> October 2013<sup>13</sup> that the case was close.

7.3 The 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2015<sup>14</sup> reply to Messrs Knight and White from Felicity Chadwick-Histed, the Chair at that time, made no attempt to deal substantively with the subjects raised.

## 8 **Membership**

8.1 In December 2012 the Trustees briefly re-opened the membership, which had been closed for approximately two years apparently for the reason that CVT had no membership secretary. A number of relatives applied and many were subsequently notified that their applications had been deferred for various reasons and remain on hold. CVT insisted on the acceptance of a 'Membership Policy' by all who applied, even where they did not fit the criteria. This would tie applicants to a future for the charity contrary to the Governing Document. Prior to the 2014 CVT AGM it became apparent that the membership had increased significantly at a time when relatives' applications were being denied. It is notable that since the stormy AGM where attempts were made to open discussion the subject of membership this was put on hold for review for a period of 12 -18 months. The M Barnish letter of the 15<sup>th</sup> March 2015 refers<sup>15</sup>. The trustee responsible for membership, Di Parrish, has since resigned. See also the following link to the Action for Botton article sets out the manipulation of membership <http://www.actionforbotton.org/Betrayal-of-Trust/hijacking-a-charity>

## 9 Trustees

- 9.1 The dialogue between CVT and the Commission on the subject of the Commission's statement that the majority of trustees should be independent CVT have carried out a process of preventing co-worker trustees from having an influence on the board's decisions and forcing them to leave. There are now no co-worker trustees<sup>16-17</sup>. CVT have also imposed gagging orders to prevent relevant information becoming available even to the membership.
- 9.2 In 2015 it became apparent that new Trustees were being sought. The Articles of Association state that to be a trustee one has first to be a member. Why then was the Membership not notified? Frances Wright, at a Camphill Families and Friends meeting, stated that the process was in hand and was asked whether the position had been advertised in the Anthroposophical Society's journal. She replied ***"that it had not because waiting for the publication of the next edition would have delayed the process. The focus for the recruitment this time had been on the skills and experience recommended in the Strategic Review"***. It is inconceivable that it is acceptable within CVT for anyone, especially in a position of authority, whether Trustee or manager, to hold such a position without a thorough knowledge and understanding of Camphill.
- 9.3 In September 2012 the two Scottish communities demerged and a new community, Berith, was added, the announcement about Berith coming four months after completion. Berith was independent of CVT but due to Local Authority pressure became absorbed and now has no connection with fundamental Camphill traditions. Surely such important matters should be put to the membership before being carried through and how was it that CVT could ignore the essential object of maintaining in communities the principles of Dr Rudolph Steiner, as set out in the Appendix to the Memorandum? Did the trustees have the authority to make such significant financial and structural changes without ratification by the membership?
- 9.4 In January 2013 members of the International Camphill Community held a facilitation process to attempt to bring consensus and understanding to the increasing disagreement between CVT and its stakeholders. This endeavour to increase awareness and understanding failed to reach any positive outcome. This was followed by a form of mediation with co-workers, proposed by CVT, comprising a small number on either side in what was described as the 'Interface Group'. CVT insisted that discussions should be confidential. After a protracted period and as with the Facilitation process, it eventually came to nothing.

## 10 The Charity Commission

- 10.1 In September 2013 a group of families brought their concerns to the Charity Commission in an extensive formal complaint<sup>18</sup>. In response to the complaint the Commission stated that they could not ***"determine matters of ethos and doctrine"***. It also became apparent from Freedom of Information that the HR Director seriously misled the Commission stating that

there were **“many factual inaccuracies”** in the families’ complaint. Frances Wright was challenged and had to concede that it was untrue. However the damage had been done and although this fact was brought to the Commission’s notice in the Notice of Dissatisfaction they neither acknowledged it nor followed it up.

- 10.2 Following the letter of dissatisfaction in January 2014 a second formal complaint was submitted on the 14<sup>th</sup> May 2014 and a further Freedom of Information request.
- 10.3 The Commission’s reply dated 24<sup>th</sup> July 2014<sup>19</sup> explained that they had variously advised the trustees of their responsibilities, pointed out that the trustees were responsible for the day to day running of the charity and simply not be taking any further action. Lucy Breakspere’s email concluded **“I am satisfied that your complaint has been considered in line with the Commission’s policies and procedures. You have now completed the process available for the consideration of your complaint and there are no further routes through which the outcome of the case can be reconsidered by the Commission.”** The outcome proved to be yet another failure by the Commission, relying on CVT’s responses without proper investigation. Strong similarities arise from their failure to act over the Kid’s Company despite, in the case of CVT, there being, many complaints.

## 11 CVT Ultimatum to Co-workers

- 11.1 A postscript was added to the second formal complaint – **“With only a day’s prior notification, CVT yesterday held meetings at Botton, Delrow and the Grange and served any volunteer co-workers remaining at the end of this financial year with what is in effect an eviction notice. Neither the beneficiaries nor we as families of the beneficiaries have been consulted in this process, contrary to the recommendations of the Groundswell Review. If there was any doubt about CVT’s intentions there now can be none.”** This was completely ignored. This referred to a letter from CVT to families on the 13<sup>th</sup> May<sup>20</sup> claiming that **“As a result of the legal opinion, the trustees have reluctantly concluded that the legal and financial risks of failing to act now are such that there is no realistic option but to initiate discussions with co-workers and HMRC about them becoming employed”** and that **“On the basis of professional advice no employees are currently permitted to live in accommodation provided by the charity because of the legal and other complexities and risks involved.”** They stated that, due to changes in tax law, they had obtained ‘privileged status’ legal opinion, which they refused to share. The Treasury confirmed that there had been no change to the BIM22040 Tax Treatment of Co-workers<sup>21-22</sup>. The change could only have arisen from CVT’s actions.
- 11.2 CVT claimed to have convinced the Charity Commission of a new co-worker financial basis and that legal counsel had advised that from a tax point of view this was not sustainable. They also claimed, in their fact sheet and subsequent correspondence, that the Commission had directed them that employment was necessary. It begs the question - why did CVT develop a management regime that would lead to an opinion from the HMRC that co-workers would be considered to be employees? CVT had leading accountants and tax advisors who should be expected to anticipate this situation. A reasonable conclusion is that

either the advisors failed in their duty or CVT intended that this should be the outcome. The Charity Commission's position, however, is clear. They confirmed on 4<sup>th</sup> February 2015 that ***"The question of whether the status of an individual is that of an employee or a co-worker is not a matter of charity law, and as such is not something that we can comment on."***<sup>23</sup>

11.3 **CVT's claims that they were responding to direction from the HMRC, resulting from a change in the tax law, and from the Charity Commission have both been proved to be untrue.**

11.4 The co-workers were now under intense pressure from CVT with the threat of eviction by April 2015. They showed their dignity and care for all they represented but to no avail. CVT offered an informal mediation process but broke the terms of their own conditions whilst this was underway.

11.5 In September 2014 212 signatories wrote to the chair of CVT <sup>24</sup>. Her reply was typically full of CVT's spin and misleading information. A simple example, in the final paragraph, ***"Excessive co-worker benefit led to whistleblowing."*** <sup>25</sup> No mention that this was referred to the Charity Commission. On 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2012 the Commission wrote ***"I am pleased to note that the independent investigation has not highlighted any evidence that charity funds were misused."*** <sup>26</sup>

## 12 **Current Developments**

12.1 Discussions are in hand with an alternative Care Provider approved by NYCC, with a view to transferring control of a number of houses to their Shared Lives scheme. Under this scheme of shared living the co-workers would be self-employed; a status that CVT stated was legally unacceptable. Apart from this and for the time being I cannot comment here upon events since the Notices to Quit were served in March 2015.

## 13 **CVT's Disregard for Camphill**

13.1 In December 2011 Huw John wrote - ***"It is not about replacing co-workers with employees" – "It is not about getting rid of the ethos" – "It is not about saying shared living is wrong" – "It is not about getting rid of farm work, gardening, jobs, roles and routines"***. However CVT's actions have proved this to be exactly what was planned. CVT say they have no intention of changing the Memorandum and in the 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2015 CVT confirm ***"that the present financial position of CVT is not such that CVT need to contemplate the sale of assets and/or land at Botton, Delrow or the Grange. There are currently no such plans"***. In the light of all that has happened what comfort can families gain from these statements?

13.2 Until 2011 and the advent of senior management, co-workers developed and ran vibrant communities, with the support and guidance of CVT, funded generously by donors inspired by the Camphill philosophies, living together in families with villagers and working to provide for their welfare and protection. Since 2011 the top down business model has created

multiple levels of management and supervision with villagers cared for by shift working carers on or near minimum wage. Work is secondary and communities are stagnating as Camphill traditions disappear. Where is the continuity and recognition of the complex needs of individual villagers and the choice they have made of shared living in a Camphill Intentional community?

- 13.3 There is no disagreement about the need for regulatory and financial compliance and but there has never been a discussion about how this is achieved whilst maintaining the intentions of the Memorandum, because it has never been in the interests of those who now control CVT to allow this to happen. The financial pressure this operational model imposes is proving to be unsustainable to Botton and potentially to the Charity as a whole.
- 13.4 The future that CVT now offer is far removed from Camphill and Botton traditions. The fear is that villagers will no longer be able to move freely around their village safe and secure in the knowledge that they are known to all and that their welfare is protected. The advent of more and more levels of management, contractors, shift working and bank carers means that they will be strangers and they will be dealing with strangers who are unaware of them and their needs.
- 13.5 The CVT Code of Conduct defines relatives of learning disabled residents as 'carers'. An example that typifies the treatment of families is that one of the six principal standards that CVT staff must achieve in the Code of Conduct, approved by the CVT Board in January 2011, was to ***"Strive to establish and maintain the trust and confidence of service users and carers"***. A revised Code of Conduct was approved in September 2014 and made no mention of the need to 'establish and maintain trust'. By this stage, however, all trust in the Trustees and Senior Management team to abide by the Charity's Memorandum of Association had been lost.
- 13.6 How is it right that something so special, so inspirational, so wonderful in its concept and practice can be destroyed by those who have now found their way to control CVT? How can all the external bodies, there to protect 'beneficiaries', allow self seeking commercialism to change something so special into something that, by the careful wording of the Charity's Memorandum, it was intended that it should **never** become.

## 14 **Conclusion**

- 14.1 I am in no doubt that by 2011 and the advent of senior managers, CVT had a plan to deliberately dismantle vocational volunteer co-working and shared living. They have ruthlessly pursued this against the interests of the Charity, catastrophically damaging the Intentional Communities and the Camphill intentions which underpinned them. This has also caused serious financial and reputational damage. Reinstatement of governance in accordance with the Memorandum requires the replacement of the trustees and senior management with a team that understands Camphill and can deliver it in compliance with regulatory requirements. Without this Botton will continue to decline unless it is given the

independence that the Aspire & Transform review suggested and was granted to the Scottish communities.

## 15 **Bringing CVT's Actions to Public Awareness**

- 15.1 CVT's actions have been the subject of House of Commons Early Day Motion 249, tabled on the 6<sup>th</sup> July 2015 with 49 signatories to date. This ***“urges CVT to work with the authorities to revert to a volunteer co-worker model at Botton Village; and calls on the Department of Health to work with the Care Quality Commission, HM Revenue and Customs and the Charity Commission to support those running intentional communities to ensure that the unique and successful volunteer co-worker model can continue.”*** Baroness Hollins raised similar concerns in the House of Lords.
- 15.2 On the 15<sup>th</sup> September 2015 there were a series of presentations in Westminster to MP's, **'Choice for Intentional Community and Shared Living'**, which highlighted the benefits of Intentional Communities<sup>27</sup>. Of particular note is the paper presented by Dr Marcus Van Dam 'A Healthy Way of Life'<sup>28</sup>, a study of the welfare of Botton learning disabled residents and the effect of CVT's changes.

## 16 Reinstating Communities

- 6.1 Further support for Intentional Communities is at hand with the publishing of the Centre for Welfare Reform report 'Unintentional Destruction of Intentional Communities', the Centre for Social Justice report 'Need for Community' and Rosa Monkton's 5<sup>th</sup> June article in the Sunday Times 'It's Chilling and They Call It Care In The Community'.
- 16.2 Although Intentional Communities were accepted in the 'Valuing People' White Paper, the welfare and financial benefits have not been recognised by English Commissioners such as NYCC and regulators seem incapable of protecting beneficiaries. Compare this with the recognition of Camphill and the support and high praise by MSP's in the Scottish Parliament.
- 16.3 The tide is turning to show that the standard model of social care has inherent failures that Intentional Communities can overcome and properly recognise the individuality of learning disabled adults and their care needs. However, will the recognition of this be soon enough to save Botton?

Max White  
Retired Chartered Surveyor

*August 2016*

## APPENDICES

- 1 – [29.08.05 Charity Commission letter to CVT](#)
- 2 – [Companies House – Learn to Lead](#)
- 3 – [CVT Memorandum of Association](#)
- 4 – [April 2013 Chris Cook undated letter to Max White](#)
- 5 – [15.06.2011 Huw John letter to Paul Abel](#)
- 6 – [22.06.11 CVT/NYCC Briefing to CVT Communities](#)
- 7 – [17.04.2012 R Goodwill letter to Kay Wilson](#)
- 8 – [24.07.2012 Max White letter to Chris Cook](#)
- 9 – [31.07.2012 Chris Cook letter to Duncan Cameron](#)
- 10 – [09.10.2012 Huw John letter to Families](#)
- 11 – [31.05.2015 Brian Knight/Max White letter to CVT](#)

- 12 – [02.11.2012 Charity Commission letter to CVT](#)
- 13 – [25.10.2013 Charity Commission letter to CVT](#)
- 14 – [22.06.2015 Felicity Chadwick-Histed reply to Brian Knight/Max White](#)
- 15 – [15.03.2015 Mark Barnish Membership letter](#)
- 16 – [17.10.2011 Paul Abel resignation letter](#)
- 17 – [01.02.2015 Ian Bailey resignation letter](#)
- 18 – [18.09.2013 Families' First Complaint to Charity Commission](#)
- 19 – [24.07.2014 Charity Commission reply to Families](#)
- 20 – [13.05.2014 CVT Ultimatum letter](#)
- 21 – [04.02.2015 Charity Commission email to Max White](#)
- 22 – [09.10.14 Treasury Minister letter to G Cox QC MP re co-worker tax agreement](#)
- 23 – [03.11.14 G Cox QC MP letter re co-worker tax agreement](#)
- 24 – [29.08.2014 212 Signatories' letter to CVT Chair](#)
- 25 – [26.09.2014 Felicity Chadwick-Histed letter to Signatories](#)
- 26 – [23.07.2012 Charity Commission letter to Huw John](#)
- 27 – <http://www.camphillresearch.com/choice-for-intentional-community>
- 28 – <http://www.camphillresearch.com/content-stuff/uploads/2015/09/Marcus-Van-Dam.pdf>