



Steven Condra <stevencondra1971@gmail.com>

Clarification Regarding Meeting and Steven's Concerns

1 message

Steven Condra <stevencondra1971@gmail.com>
To: p_murphy20 <p_murphy20@yahoo.co.uk>

10 January 2025 at 14:01

Dear Louise,

Thank you for meeting with us yesterday. Following our discussion, I would like to address an important matter. During the meeting, Jo denied that our second meeting had been scheduled for 2nd January. This information was inaccurate and became a contentious point during the conversation. For your reference, I have attached an email sent to David Tang, Ombudsman, and c.c.'ed to Steven by Jo, confirming that the meeting was indeed arranged for 2nd January.

In addition, it became evident during the meeting that there is a communication breakdown between Steven and Jo, and they appear to be at odds over several issues, such as access to the building. This particular situation has further highlighted the tension between them. These meetings with you have been extremely helpful for Steven, and we sincerely appreciate your time and involvement. Steven feels that he is genuinely being heard when you are present, something he feels is lacking in his interactions with both Jo and the management.

Steven has also expressed concerns about what he perceives as a rigid, "one rule fits all" approach within the service, which he finds highly institutionalized and lacking in autonomy for residents. From his perspective, this regime undermines individuality and personal dignity. However, it was clear during our meeting that you do not wish this for the residents and that you are committed to fostering an environment where they can maintain a sense of dignity and autonomy.

Additionally, Steven has shared that Jo appears to be listening only from management's perspective, resulting in his concerns often being dismissed or ignored. He feels that Jo's approach mirrors the management's stance, leading him to believe that she may be more focused on protecting her position than genuinely advocating for him. This perceived conflict of interest has contributed to a growing lack of trust, and having Jo as his advocate now seems counterproductive to his overall recovery.

Your continued involvement has been vital in providing Steven with a sense of being heard and supported. I hope we can work together to facilitate a more open and constructive relationship between Steven and the Depaul staff moving forward.

Thank you once again for your ongoing support.

Kind regards,
Trish Murphy