

## Braintree LCTS Consultation 2016

Respondents: 257 displayed, 257 total

Status:

Closed

Launched Date: 05/10/15

Closed Date:

16/11/2015

1. Council Tax Support (CTS) is the financial help available from the Council to low income households to help them to pay their Council Tax. Braintree District Council is considering making changes to its Local Council Tax Support Scheme (LCTS) with effect from April 2016 and would like to hear your views on the proposals. You can complete and return this form anytime between 5th October 2015 and 15th November 2015 to give us your views on changes to the scheme which are being proposed for 2016-17. You can find more information about Council Tax Support on our website: [www.braintree.gov.uk/info/200302/benefits](http://www.braintree.gov.uk/info/200302/benefits) The Council is very keen that you have all the information you need to help you to provide informed answers to the consultation. The background to the consultation and information about the Council Tax Support scheme is available on the Council's website at: [www.braintree.gov.uk/info/200302/benefits](http://www.braintree.gov.uk/info/200302/benefits). This explains the scheme and also how the scheme is currently funded. Please confirm whether you have reviewed this information before completing this form.

		Response Total	Response Percent
Yes		82	90%
No		9	10%
Total Respondents			91
(skipped this question)			166

2. The basis of the current Council Tax Support scheme is that it is 'self-funding' – this means that it costs the same as the amount of Government grant the Council receives. Do you agree that the Council should continue with a scheme which is self-funding, and Council Tax Support awards would be reduced, as Government funding to the Council reduces?

		Response Total	Response Percent
Yes		55	69%

No		16	20%
Don't know		9	11%
Total Respondents		80	100%
(skipped this question)			177

3. If the Council does not continue with a self-funding scheme and still provides the current level of support, it will need to find additional funding from other sources. As an example, the current estimated shortfall in funding is £98,800. This would equate to a Council Tax increase of 1.25% or a reduction in services to meet the shortfall. Do you think the Council should adopt any of the following options to help fund the scheme? Please select one answer for each source of funding

	Yes	No	Don't know	Response Total
Increase the level of Council Tax	36.25% (29)	51.25% (41)	12.5% (10)	80
Use the Council's reserves	35% (28)	42.5% (34)	22.5% (18)	80
Total Respondents				80
(skipped this question)				177

4. Comments (See below for individual responses):

Total Respondents	17
(skipped this question)	240

5. All working age residents eligible to receive Council Tax Support are currently required to pay a minimum of 20% of their council tax bill. Do you agree with the principle of every working age person having to make a minimum payment? Please select one answer only

		Response Total	Response Percent
Yes		70	88%
No		6	8%

Don't know		4	5%
Total Respondents		80	100%
(skipped this question)			177

6. If you do agree, what level of minimum payment do you think should be applied?

		Response Total	Response Percent
20% (No change to current scheme)		28	39%
21% to 25%		29	41%
Over 25%		9	13%
Don't know		5	7%
Total Respondents		71	100%
(skipped this question)			186

7. Comments (See below for individual responses):

Total Respondents	22
(skipped this question)	235

8. Setting a Minimum Income Floor for Self Employed Persons in line with other Welfare Reforms In order to align the Council's Council Tax Support scheme with Universal Credit, the Council proposes to use a minimum earned income figure of 35 hours per week at the national living wage. Any income above this amount would be taken into account based on the actual amounts earned. This minimum would not apply for a designated period for new business start-ups. The benefits of doing this are: Council Tax Support will be brought into line with Universal Credit; It will incentivise working age applicants to grow and expand their business The drawbacks of doing this are: Where a working age resident is in self employment and continues to run a business where their income is below the minimum level, they will be assumed to earn at least minimum wage (based on a 35 hour week) after a start-up period. Do you agree with the proposal to set a minimum level of income for self-employed persons?

		Response Total	Response Percent
Yes		59	74%
No		12	15%
Don't know		9	11%
Total Respondents		80	100%
(skipped this question)			177

9. Comments (See below for individual responses):

Total Respondents	22
(skipped this question)	235

10. Removing the Family Premium for all new working age claimants. The removal of Family Premium from 1st April 2016 for new claims will bring the Council Tax Support Scheme in line with the changes in Housing Benefit announced by Central Government. The Family Premium is part of how we assess the 'needs' of any claimant and is included in their Applicable Amount, which is compared with their income. The family premium is normally given where a claimant has at least one dependant child or young person. Removing the family premium will mean that when assessing a claimants "Applicable Amount" the Family Premium, currently £17.45 per week will not be included. This change would not affect those claimants on Universal Credit, Income Support, Income Related Employment and Support Allowance or Income Based Jobseeker's Allowance. The benefits to the Council of doing this are: To bring the Council Tax Support Scheme in line with Housing Benefit changes proposed by Central Government; It is a simple alteration to the scheme. The drawbacks of doing this are: New working age claimants may see a reduction in the amount of support they receive. Do you agree with the proposal to remove the Family premium for new claims?

		Response Total	Response Percent
Yes		48	60%
No		21	26%
Don't know		11	14%
Total Respondents		80	100%

(skipped this question)	177
-------------------------	-----

11. Comments (See below for individual responses):

Total Respondents	15
(skipped this question)	242

12. Reducing Backdating to 4 weeks Currently claims for Council Tax Support for working age claimants can be backdated for up to 3 months where a claimant can prove that there was 'good cause' that they could not claim at an earlier time. From April 2016 Central Government will be reducing the backdating period for Housing Benefit claims to 4 weeks. It is proposed that the Council Tax Support Scheme be aligned with the changes for Housing Benefit. The benefits to the Council of doing this are: To bring the Council Tax Support Scheme in line with Housing Benefit changes proposed by Central Government. It is a simple alteration to the scheme and simplifies the administration. The drawbacks of doing this are: New working age claimants may see a reduction in the amount of support they received if they are unable to claim on time. Do you agree with the proposal to reduce backdating to 4 weeks?

		Response Total	Response Percent
Yes		55	70%
No		21	27%
Don't know		3	4%
Total Respondents		79	100%
(skipped this question)			178

13. Comments (See below for individual responses):

Total Respondents	17
(skipped this question)	240

14. Non dependant Deductions The current scheme includes a £10.00 per week deduction from the Council Tax Support awarded, for each adult over the age of 18, living in the household as a non-dependant. It is proposed to increase the weekly deduction to up to £20.00 per week for each non-dependant living in the household. Do you agree with the proposal to increase the non-dependant deduction, to up to £20.00 per week?

		Response Total	Response Percent
Yes		50	63%
No		21	27%
Don't know		8	10%
Total Respondents		79	100%
(skipped this question)			178

15. Comments (See below for individual responses):

Total Respondents	19
(skipped this question)	238

16. Please use the space below to make any other comments or suggestions you have about our proposed changes or the scheme in general (See below for individual responses):

Total Respondents	17
(skipped this question)	240

17. Please use the space below if you would like the Council to consider any other changes (See below for individual responses):

Total Respondents	10
(skipped this question)	247

18. Are you responding as a resident or on behalf of an organisation?

		Response Total	Response Percent
Resident		77	99%
Organisation, Please		1	1%

specify			
Total Respondents		78	100%
(skipped this question)			179

19. Does your name appear on the Council Tax Bill for your household?

		Response Total	Response Percent
Yes		73	94%
No		4	5%
Don't know		1	1%
Total Respondents		78	100%
(skipped this question)			179

20. Does your household receive Council Tax Support?

		Response Total	Response Percent
Yes		11	14%
No		67	86%
Don't know		0	0%
Total Respondents		78	100%
(skipped this question)			179

21. Does your household receive any other benefits?

		Response Total	Response Percent

Yes		15	20%
No		61	80%
Don't know		0	0%
Total Respondents		76	100%
(skipped this question)			181

22. If you selected 'yes', please state which benefits you receive in the box below

Total Respondents	9
(skipped this question)	248

23. Please select below what best describes your household?

		Response Total	Response Percent
A family with one or two dependant children		6	8%
A family with three or more children		2	3%
A lone parent household		4	5%
A Carer		3	4%
A household with full and/or part time workers		13	18%
A household that includes someone who is disabled		6	8%
A single person household or a couple without		21	28%

children			
None of the above		18	24%
Don't know		1	1%
Total Respondents		74	100%
(skipped this question)			183

24. Are you a service personnel or ex service personnel?

		Response Total	Response Percent
Yes		4	5%
No		70	93%
Don't know		1	1%
Total Respondents		75	100%
(skipped this question)			182

25. Are you a war widow/widower?

		Response Total	Response Percent
Yes		1	1%
No		72	96%
Don't know		2	3%
Total Respondents		75	100%
(skipped this question)			182

26. Age:

		Response Total	Response Percent
30 or under		0	0%
31 - 40		9	12%
41 - 50		6	8%
51 - 60		13	17%
61 - 70		39	51%
71 - 80		7	9%
81 - 90		0	0%
91 or over		0	0%
Prefer not to say		2	3%
Total Respondents		76	100%
(skipped this question)			181

27. Are you:

		Response Total	Response Percent
Male		28	42%
Female		36	55%
Prefer not to say		2	3%
Total Respondents		66	100%
(skipped this question)			191

28. Are you married or in a civil partnership?

	Response Total	Response Percent

		Total	Percent
Yes		35	61%
No		22	39%
Total Respondents		57	100%
(skipped this question)			200

29. Sexual Orientation:

		Response Total	Response Percent
Heterosexual		46	81%
Gay		1	2%
Lesbian		0	0%
Bisexual		0	0%
Prefer not to say		9	16%
Other, please state		1	2%
Total Respondents		57	100%
(skipped this question)			200

30. Religion/Faith:

		Response Total	Response Percent
Christian		33	59%
Muslim		0	0%
Hindu		0	0%
Buddhist		0	0%

Sikh		0	0%
Jewish		0	0%
None		12	21%
Not sure		0	0%
Prefer not to say		9	16%
Other, please state		2	4%
Total Respondents		56	100%
(skipped this question)			201

31. Ethnicity:

		Response Total	Response Percent
White British		48	87%
White Irish		0	0%
White Other		0	0%
Gypsy / Roma		0	0%
Traveller of Irish Heritage		0	0%
Black or Black British African		0	0%
Black or Black British		0	0%

Caribbean			
Mixed White/Black African		0	0%
Mixed White/Black Caribbean		0	0%
Black Other		0	0%
Asian or Asian British Pakistani		0	0%
Asian or Asian British Indian		0	0%
Asian or Asian British Other		0	0%
Mixed White/Asian		0	0%
Asian Other		0	0%
Chinese		0	0%
Mixed Other		0	0%
Not Known		0	0%
Prefer not to say		4	7%
Other, please specify		3	5%

Total Respondents	55	100%
(skipped this question)		202

32. Do you consider yourself to have a physical impairment?

		Response Total	Response Percent
Yes		7	10%
No		60	90%
Total Respondents		67	100%
(skipped this question)			190

33. Do you consider yourself to have a sensory impairment?

		Response Total	Response Percent
Yes		3	5%
No		63	95%
Total Respondents		66	100%
(skipped this question)			191

34. Do you consider yourself to have a learning difficulty or disability?

		Response Total	Response Percent
Yes		0	0%
No		67	100%
Total Respondents		67	100%
(skipped this question)			190

35. Do you consider yourself to have any mental health needs?

		Response Total	Response Percent
Yes		3	4%
No		64	96%
Total Respondents		67	100%
(skipped this question)			190

#### **Question 4. Comments:**

1. this is a test from marketing & Comms Team, braintree District Council
2. I think that the government is 'squeezing' the poor not the rich and am quite happy for my council tax to increase by approx. £24 p.a. to continue this funding.
3. assuming there are sufficient funds available.
4. I would assume that using reserves could only be for a limited time period, so do not think this is a useful alternative. I also accept that council tax will inevitably have to rise eventually but would hope more income could be raised from ensuring council tax is paid by those who default.
5. The Council has acquired a large number of properties, why does it need to keep this land bank all of which are not earning the amount of return that a commercial landlord would be getting so perhaps the idea would be to ensure that any land or property earns it full potential income or sell it.
6. If government funding is not sufficient, the populace must pay for it.
7. I personally have seen many examples where the council wastes money,so am sure there are many ways that the council can make savings.
8. more effort should be made to recover money from those who refuse to pay their Council tax.
9. It will depend on the hardship of those receiving the benefit and the level of reserves and the other services which would have to make savings
10. If this scheme really targets the low income then the rest of us should pay additional sum. 1.25% is not that much for those who can afford it. Loss of help for others could be "the straw which breaks the camels back".
11. It is essential to provide as much support to vulnerable people as possible
12. The main focus of the scheme is dictated by central government and their priorities unfairly protect pensioners. I believe that along with everyone else, pensioners should play their part in enduring the economic pain the country is currently experiencing.
13. Have searched ,but not found info on how much is the council's reserves.
14. The economy has still not picked up and therefore families are really struggling to pay their bills and this would only make matters a whole lot worse.
15. too many people struggling due to other cuts
16. It will penalise low income people. but that seems fine for the government (not the council) Other ways would hit people equally hard

To raise council tax would merely create more people needing help, and more hardship for them, and others if services were cut

17. I think the council has managed very well at this present time. I think that the council tax should rise so that we can provide an excellent service to the public, but also keep the present police in employment and not reduced

#### **Q7. Comments:**

1. I think we discriminate against working age people, I think it should apply to every council tax payer
2. testing

3. Working age people should not get something for nothing. If they can't pay, they should clean the streets etc as payment
4. The living wage has an amount allocated for council tax that should be the amount that should be paid. This amount should be adjusted if the person is earning more than or less than the living wage.
5. 25% seems like a reasonable level for those eligible to reflect the range of services the Council Tax pays for
6. If council tax was raised for everyone then those on a low income should be expected to increase the amount that they have to pay
7. The increase in the recovery work involved in trying to get in over the 20% could outweigh the benefit of the income and increase the % uncollected for the Council.
8. 20% is a very low figure. Most people can afford more.
9. Depends on income. Although not eligible for this we struggle to pay for not a very good or listening council.
10. I think everyone's finances are pushed to the limit, working people have had to make cuts and I think it might be time for people who receive support to make cuts too. For example, I have not been able to take my children swimming for several years now but we have friends who get to pay a lower rate because they receive some sort of benefit. They also have money for holidays, sweets and the cinema. We do not.
11. Depends on circumstances - residents of working age may not be able to work? For example being sick or sole carer for children under 12
12. there is a principle to establish that local services cost money and everyone in the community is expected to contribute.
13. I think working individuals budgets are stretched enough already in finding the money for the council tax bills as they are. Salaries didn't increase whereas the cost of living in general did. If now people need to find additional funds for higher council tax bills it would further weaken their purchasing power leading to a further stagnation in economic growth.
14. People on minimal income from either means tested benefits or very low earnings are already struggling to pay 20%. Any further increase will lead to greater hardship and stress on already vulnerable families.
15. There should be no minimum level the amount of rebate should be according to means and up to 100% IF APPLICABLE
16. nothing to add
17. If some one is employed, but paid only minimum wage, or is on a Zero Hours contract, they should be exempt.
18. People have less money now and therefore will not be able to find the means to pay more than they have to.
19. single working age claimants on £73.10 (or less for under 25 claimants) can not afford more than 20% without causing severe hardship. if the level is more than 20% the costs of collecting the extra will increase.
20. Any min payment is a lot for anyone on the lowest benefits
21. I think all residents over 18 should contribute toward council tax
22. a higher percentage would help secure current services

## Q9. Comments:

1. If they have been trading for over 2 years and still earn nothing, they should not be awarded support based on nil income
2. Some Self Employed claimants are paid for years on NIL income, and nobody can sustain NIL income for years. So i feel very strongly that a minimum amount is used.
3. test
4. More and more people are being forced into self employment as a result of the economic crisis, and many of those people are struggling to make ends meet, even though they try very hard to find work. There should be a real assessment of income, rather than an assumption, so that these people are protected.
5. This seems a disincentive for those currently earning below this figure'
6. It depends how long the start-up period of grace is.
7. I think the council would need to work with the self employed on an individual basis to ascertain a reasonable amount that could be paid thus ensuring the business does not cease to exist
8. One would be tempted to ask why they are still running a business if the declared income is that low and cash earnings cannot be traced.
9. I feel that the council gives away too much money to benefits already
10. This depends on how long the start up period is. Many self employed people are able to keep their income low with clever accounting and so would never reach the minimum amount. However we do need to give new businesses a chance to thrive.
11. If this sets the level at the same level as employed yes
12. 7i
13. If a person does definitely not earn the money after giving evidence it cannot be assumed that he/she does.
14. Being able to apply discretion if earnings fall below the MIF would be essential due to the nature of self employment. Seasonal work, local economic status, sickness, among others factors, are all major contributors to below MIF income. The council should have the ability to not have a blanket policy and should be able to take these factors into account.
15. as STATED BEFORE LEVEL OF PAYMENT SHOULD BE ACCORDING TO MEANS UPTO 100% available if suitable
16. The self employed should not expect welfare considerations to indirectly subsidise their business.
17. This would penalise someone who is trying to gain employment.
18. No matter how incentivised people are to grow their business if people don't have the money to buy into new start up business then they are not going to be able to grow and prosper.
19. In my experience there are self employed claimants who are claiming Working tax credit but are not running a sustainable business. Also they often have less expenses as some of car costs and phone costs covered by business.
20. Dont know enough to judge
21. self employment as i know it, is very unpredictable and I feel that this scheme would penalise too many people especially as for many there is no alternative work
22. what is the start up period ?

### **Q11. Comments:**

1. But only if we applied similar changes to the non working group
2. does this mean that working families are penalised more than unemployed families of the same size?
3. test
4. My Granddaughter lives in a remote location with her farmworker husband, and 3 under 5 daughters. Life is a permanent struggle, with real difficulties in meeting the bills. I strongly believe that the Family Premium should be retained.
5. Although given the number of claimants of other benefits this would not affect, those it would affect are probably the ones who need it most.
6. Not sure I understood the rationale
7. Eventually the levels should balance out and they should be entitled to a fair support level, there will always be winners and losers in any changes made.
8. As I have already stated some people already get to much in benifits
9. WE NEED ONE SYSTEM FOR ALL FAMILY PREMIUM BEING APPLICABLE TO ALL CLAIMANTS
10. Again, this is a further example of penalising everyone except pensioners. Families are in line to have their tax credits cut and ultimately removed. Why is the council even considering even more punitive measures against young people and children?
11. I agree since it doesn't affect those already needing assistance.
12. With less benefits how are claimants expected to pay with what they have not got.
13. yes claiments with children (ie in receipt of child benefit and child tax credit) often have more disposbale income that single claiments.
14. This is the wrong time to make cuts to families who are having other benefit changes made
15. young people have too much burden already

### **Q 13. Comments:**

1. test
2. The inertia of the process has often meant that more than 4 weeks has been needed to process claims, and people would lose out.
3. Although I think there should be some leeway if a client could provide a good reason why they were not able to claim
4. Should make the get round to it tomorrow set to act quicker
5. People we need to act faster.
6. they need to prove a good cause for delaying their claim
7. If there is a family crisis then 4 weeks is a VERY short time to make sure all the right claims are made. I think "If good cause" can be proved then 3 montyhs is a better option
8. If somebody is eligible but unable to claim for benefit it is unfair to cap the benefit and not pay out what is due.
9. The council should be flexible in its approach. circumstances beyond the control of the claimant (hospitalisation for example) should be taken into account.
10. It should be backdated to date need first was proved
11. People who need the money do not really have any valid excuse for failing to apply for assistance after 4 weeks. 3 months is too long.

12. When claimants position has become bad enough to claim, many other things need to be sorted out, and the council tax may not be remembered.
13. I am undecided on this point.
14. This will penalise claimants who are not familiar with the benefits system or who have mental health issues
15. sometimes proceedings take longer to process and the claimants would lose out
16. government is wrong on this proposal
17. that is simply unfair and would be yet another burden on young people trying to make a living

#### **Q15. Comments:**

1. I think the non dependant deduction is grossly unfair for HB - based on the fact we have to use their gross wages - which they do NOT even receive. I agree they should contribute, however £10 is ample for CTS.
2. Apply a higher deduction but I think it should go back to being a % of their net income
3. aren't we then going further back to 'individual charge poll tax' ways but making the charge payer liable for the whole household charge?
4. test
5. It ignores those who are struggling to find work, mainly young people. If we penalise the younger generation we will lose the chance of ever establishing a fairer society in which they wish to participate
6. It should depend on how much that non dependent is earning.
7. Thought you were trying to raise money, keep it the same and reduce the amount of any council tax increase
8. A good step towards being fair to payers and non-dependants
9. If the household has non-dependant occupants they should be able to contribute to the household income.
10. too high a increase in one step. Suggest £15 now and £20 in 2017/8
11. The Gov't seems to be promoting parents to house their adult children for longer, be they students, employed or unemployed, parents should not be penalised because their children cannot leave home and start their own adult lives with the chronic shortage of affordable housing in Essex and elsewhere.
12. This could split families and more young people being on the streets rising the cost of policing, NHS etc etc If there must be a rise then 1.25% making it 11.25p
13. Not all non-dependants are in the same position and £20 for some may be easier than for others.
14. Absolutely not.
15. A household should not be subsidised excessively if someone living in it is working and can afford to pay the CTAX. I believe that if the householder is unable to pay the CTAX liability then that liability should be picked up by any working non depts. The same principle as applied to utilities should apply. Don't pay your gas bill, you get disconnected, no matter who lives in the house!
16. Supports youngsters, may help towards independence .
17. I don't quite understand this point.

18. I think non-dep. deductions should be based on income and not a flat rate. Non-deps that are working should pay more than £10 however if they are on JSA then should be a lower rate. Under 25's on JSA can not afford to pay £10.

19. To double it is too much for people on a low income

**Q16. Please use the space below to make any other comments or suggestions you have about our proposed changes or the scheme in general:**

1. test

2. These changes are contrary to the spirit of fairness and compassion that have been fought for and won, over many years. They will turn the clock back to the 19th century for many people. They are disgraceful proposals, from a disgracefully bloated and immoral Government.

3. Quite fair given financial situation for all

4. I think your objective needs to be a 'happy medium' between increasing the load on those seeking relief and increasing the load on the general Council tax payers. My leaning would be towards increasing the load on tax payers. Of course, you will never get the balance right for everyone so Good Luck!

5. I think that although I have answered the questions I really need more information about the whole council tax system before being able to answer most of them accurately

6. The proposals are good and should help the collection for the Council in order not to have to increase the Council Tax over all. OK look after the minority who are not quite so fortunate but not at the expense of the hard working majority.

7. Anything that encourages people not to depend on credits has got to be a good thing

8. no further comments.

9. None

10. It is always difficult to balance budgets but in these days of CUTS then the local Council has the duty to protect the most vulnerable. This means protecting schemes which offer support to the young, sick and elderly. Those who are working and earning should support others and our community services.

11. I wonder if the savings threshold should be reduced to £15,000 (or possibly even £10,000). Or if a sliding scale should be introduced - ie, the more savings, the less benefit on an incremental scale, rather than a fixed cut-off point.

12. The current scheme, although not ideal, strikes a semblance of balance between fairness and necessity. Any further cuts to the support claimants receive will have a serious detrimental effect on already vulnerable adults.

Most Non Dependents are usually at the bottom of the earnings scale, and at the beginning of a career path. By increasing the contribution severely limits that Non Dep to be able to save for a property of their own. Plus, the £20 that the council is proposing is nearly the equivalent of paying the full council tax for that property.

13. The scheme as it currently stands unfairly protects pensioners. Demographics show that this age group is now the wealthiest part of UK society. It is unethical and unfair to place a heavier burden of taxation on those who are of working age and the young. The Council needs to take a brave step and re-evaluate the scheme and use its reserves and recent NNDR and other incentives, to fund a more equitable system of local taxation.

14. The scheme seems sound.

15. Some clients have really struggled with the previous changes. It is important that they are aware of the exception hardship scheme. Clients with children often have more disposable income. Over 65's still get more help although often these claimants have more disposable income. Same is true for disabled claimants who have more disposable income due to premiums.

16. In general I believe it is the wrong time for these proposals for people who are struggling already. I know that the government cuts to councils means money must come from somewhere but I think council tax should be increased by not too much, to help with these losses

17. It all looks like a further imposition on the young and the poor, and simply makes life harder for people already struggling. How many just give up I wonder ?

**Q17. Please use the space below if you would like the Council to consider any other changes:**

1. test

2. Make sure those who should pay do

3. Look at even more ways of collecting revenue other than relying on the Council Tax income, Business Rate changes should add revenue and making each service justify its expenditure even more that in the past and where possible increase its income.

4. Would like to see the council being made to answer for waisting money

5. None

6. The recent news that funding for infant feeding means the closure of this service amazes me. Surely it is SO IMPORTANT to support young mothers and babies to breastfeed, saving money for the NHS in the future and ensuring babies have to very best start in life.

7. Could non-dependant deduction be done on a tariff, so those with less income are not penalised

8. as above. Moving forward, changes in funding are going to impact more heavily. It is time to consider the long term local impact and respond accordingly.

More effective enforcement action against SPD discount and exemption abuse, including greater use of penalties and criminal prosecutions. Greater use of publicity to highlight enforcement work being undertaken

9. I hope that the four week run on when claimants start working will continue. Hope that Council Tax Support will be limited to band c and below. The council could look at introducing a non-dep deduction if someone in the household gets DLA/PIP especially if more than one non-dep. The DHP schem could be extended to include Council Tax Support.

10. Pensioners are not all on low incomes those below the threshold should be protected with the present benefits. Those above (the tax office has everyones details) do not need these benefits and a lot of money could be saved.