

Appendix B

Local Support for Council Tax Scheme

Detailed responses from consultation exercise

Question 2 - Are you responding on behalf of yourself or an organisation?

- Shinewater Primary School
- Paper copy included by Simon Lever
- Paper Copy - Input by SL
- Eastbourne DIG
- AmicusHorizon
- EBC
- eastbourne borough council

Local Support for Council Tax Scheme

Detailed responses from consultation exercise

Question 3

Key Principles

Please state whether you agree/disagree with the principles underlying the scheme:

	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
a) Be a common scheme across all of East Sussex	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Key Principles Please state whether you agree/disagree with the principles underlying the scheme: a) Be a common scheme across all of East Sussex Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a) Be a common scheme across all of East Sussex Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a) Be a common scheme across all of East Sussex Don't know
b) Limit the impact on the most vulnerable households	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b) Limit the impact on the most vulnerable households Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b) Limit the impact on the most vulnerable households Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b) Limit the impact on the most vulnerable households Don't know
c) Make sure that those who move into work are not penalised	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c) Make sure that those who move into work are not penalised Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c) Make sure that those who move into work are not penalised Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c) Make sure that those who move into work are not penalised Don't know
d) Require all adults in a household to contribute to paying the bill	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d) Require all adults in a household to contribute to paying the bill Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d) Require all adults in a household to contribute to paying the bill Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d) Require all adults in a household to contribute to paying the bill Don't know
e) Not give a discount to those with relatively large savings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> e) Not give a discount to those with relatively large savings Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> e) Not give a discount to those with relatively large savings Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> e) Not give a discount to those with relatively large savings Don't know

Depends on how you plan on doing this if you are talking increasing bills if there is more than one adult in the household no I don't think it is fair as it is hard enough to pay now and there are two people in our household contributing and don't single occupants already get discounts anyway.

Raise tyhe banding. Hit the rich.

I am not sure whether it would be a good idea to have different levels of benefit in different locations. If the principles are the same across the county then the discounts/benefit I would imagine would be similar. We don't want the relatively deprived coastal area to be seen as costing the remaining residents a disproportionate amount of money so if we all share the benefit or support then it would make more sense.

A household on receipt of housing benefit should not be penalised to pay full council tax if another member of the household (i.e. a child) turns 18 or gains employment. Said household should pay tax as a % of who works and who does not.

Do not increase the council tax for working people paying the full amount.

It will depend what relatively large savings means...

D) You could base your calculations on the number of adults in the household but It would be difficult to enforce collection as only the liable parties would be required to pay the bill under Council Tax legislation.

10/29/2012 2:09 PM [View Responses](#)

In certain circumstances adults in a household are not required to contribute to paying Council Tax- students, those with a severe mental impairment- we won't bill for example adult kids living with their owner occupier parents- so this principle is unenforceable

Regarding question d, my understanding is that Council tax is a property tax not people. If this is changing it should be made clear to the electorate. If other adults can contribute I do not disagree but at a time of low pay for many I am not sure it is wise.

I agree that all adults should contribute unless they are not earning

as this puts the pressure on remaining adults. More young people are returning home after university as there is not work for them. The parents then have to continue to pay for them as they cannot contribute themselves. This needs to be recognised.

re D) Agree if over 18, disagree if over 16

I work part time and own my property and so get nothing. Those in my position in Housing Association get cheaper rents to start with then LHA and CTax benefit, repairs etc, and then a right to buy and sell and make a profit. I did without everything to get my house and worked double shift etc as a single parent, I was married when I had my children. A system designed to help those who just put their hands out and collect. I nearly lost my house last year and have had to let it out as I can't afford the mortgage, but I don't qualify as I work!!!!!!!

I think the government does a good job

Where is the help for the disabled people?

People with disabilities to be protected from changes.

How is that determined? Your aim is to achieve income so why not create a new much higher band and leave the poor alone. Picking on the weak and vulnerable. Raise the banding, hit the rich. I think I care for my community; I see the rich getting very fat whilst we are skinny and cold, create more poverty and the sickness levels rise: Catch 22

If I have to take money from my carers allowance, which is my only income, I will not have much to pay for electricity and gas bills!

Carers should be given full assistance due to the £119 billion a year that they save taxpayers. They are the only people on benefits that save more than they claim!

It's not fair if young people who are on low earnings and struggling have to contribute as most jobs for youngsters are not contracted and lots of companies are bringing in zero contracts so they don't have to offer any hours. Both my daughters have moved out, it's just my husband and myself, husband being disabled and I got laid off and now am working on zero contract which is so wrong it

people are relying on a certain amount

Protect the disabled and sick

you say that you will not penalise the pensioners but what about the long term disabled people like myself

my wife and I are in receipt of income support, therefore we do not pay council tax or rent, we are hoping this will remain the same for next year and years to come?

Those severely disabled that get a full exemption should not be made to pay due to the extra financial burden they face due to the disability

e) what do you mean by relatively large savings how much saving do you have to have if any.

I agree with the proposal, in principle. My main concern is that it may create financial difficulties for people. For example, I am currently receiving both Council and Housing Benefit.. due to where I live, my housing benefit only covers 75% of my monthly rent which, combined with my usual outgoings, leaves me with £5 a week to live on...how would I pay some of my Council Tax bill when I don't even have enough money for food? That is my worry, that this may push households further into debt when they have done nothing except be unable to work for whatever reason.

10/8/2012 2:25 PM [View Responses](#)

being on low income ie income support how does that effect them as with every thing else that has gone up it would make difficult for those people to pay yet if you receive tax credit a small amount could be deducted per house more so the ones who are at home

Stil think your proposals are too harsh, some adults living at home wouldnot be able to afford the tax, as councils are never realistic....

The capital limit should remain at £16000. The proposed capital limit of £6000 is ridiculously low.

It would depend on what 'relatively large savings' are.

C) depending on overall position D) many disabled people save bigger amounts to meet the demands of their care needs in the

future

require more information about how this might be structured. i.e. unemployed son/daughter over 18, elderly relative being cared for

as a mother with 8 children i fining for all utility bills and food shopping leaves nothing left not even enough to buy clothes at the end of the week if any of my children need them desperately..making us pay more council tax would put a family like ours into complete poverty how can the government justify this when they get a yearly holiday or more me and my family have never known what it would be like to have a holiday even a trip to the beach we can barely afford with the rising travel costs.

ar pensioners should receive special consideration

i disagree that all adults in a household should contribute it should be up to the household to decide who in their family of grown ups should take liability for the household.

depends on what is regarded as relatively large savings

How large is relatively large?

whart defines "relatively large savings" Again savers are being penalised and those who p**s it up a wall, smoke and do not prioritize their spend get the handouts as usual!!

If someone starts work they should expect to lose some of the help they receive towards their ctax

I diasagree about the savings. Even though I have not saved myself, People who have saved all their lives because they do not want to be a burden on our public finances in later life are being penalised.

With limited income I am pleased that poor are being shielded in some way ,pleased also that across the whole County .Is the saving level going to be the same as the normal benefit level ?.

I do not have any issue with the principles, although I have concerns over how realisticly they will be acheived bearing in mind the current financial climate and potential for fraud.

I will have to pay Council Tax for the first time

Local Support for Council Tax Scheme

Detailed responses from consultation exercise

Question 4

Savings and Investments (Capital limit)

Currently, people who have up to £16,000 in savings might be able to get help with paying their Council Tax. We propose to reduce this limit to £6,000

Should the capital limit be reduced to £6,000 so that anyone who has above this limit gets no help with paying their Council Tax?

Agree

Disagree

Don't know

Would it make more sense to have this measure in line with other social services type means tests? If someone has less than £6k in savings and they are elderly or living alone they are entitled to other help. It might be very difficult for a family to find £6k at any time!

16 000, as it is

10000

if this means a single occupier with £6000 savings will no longer get a discount then i disagree.

£6,000 is far too low

I feel that the Capital limit should remain at £16k as those who have this amount are the people who would normally have saved for the time that they might need to use them, by reducing the amount people would think, why should they save for their future..

£10,000

10,000

This should be a combined assessment based on Earnings aswell. I wouldn't like to see those on a low pay who have struggled to save for a house deposit for example to now have to eat into their savings to make up the shortfall.

£10,000. If you have recently been made redundant and have a family then £6,000 may not last very long at all. I feel such a low amount can penalise families who have saved a small amount to secure their future.

Would that include the 25% discount for single occupancy? I am currently trying to save a deposit for a house and I do not think I should be penalised for that and loose my single occupancy discount.

keep it at £16000

not less than £10K

£10000

10,000

It could be lower than £6,000

this needs linking to individual responsibility - someone in the household may have money and others not

This just penalises those who may have struggled to save - is this not what we want people to do so that they can support themselves in the future?

Savings these days tend to be scraped together through extremely hard work and juggling of family life and committments. I would say the limit needs to remain higher so as not to penalise those who have shown this committment to savings, which will ultimately, likely be put back into the tax system in some manner. However, there are families who could never make any savings and therefore are much less fortunate. I would say around the 12K mark.

Depends on what 'savings' means...if it's accessible cash account then I agree, if it's equity in a property then disagree

Well those with property have to pay for new boilers etc on our properties, are taxed on earning it, saving it and again when we die. Perhaps we should all smoke it and drink it and still get the help from the council when we have no savings!

Disagree because people with greater savings could be trying to save for a mortgage which in turn would save government funding. I think there should be a mortgage exception

it's a bit drastic to remove 10 grand i think you should maybe reduce it to 10 grand and not 6

Leave it at 16.00

£16,000 in savings

Ridiculous as everyone is 3 months off from being homeless! Some mortgages are £1000 per month, rents are £700? £6000 is a pittance to have for savings for redundancy crisis management. It is only 3 months salary for an employed professional.

£8,000

I think it should be more like 8 or 10 thousand . By the way I only have 5 thousand

£10,000

Because people have worked all their life for a decent retirement.

It should remain as it is. why should people be penalised if they have managed to save?

£10,000

i think it should be £8,000 as a maximum savings limit before help is then reduced by half up to £10,000 then over this it should stop after 6 months so that people can then budget in the full amount.

keep the limit the same, you don't know what financial

commitments each individual has or is likely to face, £16,000 is not a lot of money. Raise the amount of money from the higher tax band properties. You will then get more from people who have substantial savings without there being a big impact. If someone owns an expensive property but has no savings they should still qualify for help

£25,000

£8,000, the same limit as pension credit, so that pensioners will still get help.

£10,000

as it is but you would have to make sure that those type of people dont have more than one account or they will get away wiyh it

I think you should set the limit to 10,000, that is far more realistic, people would not mine that...

The capital limit should remain £16000.

This is a big drop, perhaps lowering it to £10,000 would be better.

At Least leave it where it is @ £16,000. I have no wish to penalise those who save for their future; being disabled I save proportionally more for my future care needs. Hence my savings are higher than the limit sopecifically for this purpose

Why was £6000 chosen? Does this relate to any other restrictions on entitlements?

would be nice to have 6,000 in saving but i believe these people that do should pay more if they can afford to save then they can pay there council tax

£15000

£10,000

If someone has under £20,000 in savings they have quite likely worked very hard for this. It is a small amount to live on should other income be reduced.

£5000

£10,000 Inflation would soon make the lower figure unfair.

£16 000

£16,000 as now

£10,000 - £6,000 is too low given the level of savings needed to buy a first home.

£10000 It's a bit unfair that people who have saved should be expected to diminish

their savings before they can get help.

10.000

Would the scheme identify and disregard capital payments for personal care package management i.e. PCT funding and Compensation payments specifically to provide care case management for life in serious personal injury cases e.g. RTA's, Industrial Injuries Medical Clinical negligence cases

Administering the capital limit might be an issue.

Local Support for Council Tax Scheme

Detailed responses from consultation exercise

Question 5

Second Adult Rebate

A small number of people whose income is too high for them to qualify for Council Tax Benefit, can currently get a 25% discount off their bill if they have a second adult living with them (not their partner) and that person has a low income. We propose to remove this rebate.

Do you agree we should we stop paying the Second Adult Rebate?

Agree

Disagree

Don't know

Would it be a good idea to have a household income threshold then? This would then mean that if any number of earners in the household are contributing to the overall household 'pot' then the council tax might be able to be spread accordingly.

Why should a rebate be removed when they are a) providing housing to a low income person (which is hard to find; b) the other person if claiming on their own could be eligible of 100% discount if they were to source their own housing needs.

If the 2nd adult is not dependable upon the first adult then yes. Consideration should be taken to the combined household earnings and each adult liable for a % of the Ctax bill based based on the % of their earnings contribution to the total earnings of the household

Difficult. Does this mean that a person on a low income has to pay more council tax if they lodge with someone on a higher income (suppose it depends on how they decide to split bills)? However it does seem unfair & potentially will produce a split where those who are on lowest incomes will need to share with others in the same situation which will no doubt be the properties in the worst areas in poor condition.

As the government is encouraging young people to stay at home for longer I think this may be rather unfair on single parents.

this particularly supports single parents where a child turns 18 and is on a low income. At this point they lose the single adult reduction and yet their income hasn't altered.

Makes sense, I agree, It be about the individuals

The existing plan is cheaper in the long run. The second person on the low income, could move as not cost effective, thereby leaving the home owner on a low income, then entitled to 100% assistance

Yes if they can afford their bill having a second adult is not relevant and they should get money from them privately

I think the OVERALL household income should decide any discounts.

just reduce the amount of discount to 10 per cent and take in to

account the low income persons income even if their name is not on the deed. depending on age or if in full time study

it is not the second person fault that they have a lower income will this also mean those who are on benefits are disabled

Maybe drop the rate to 15% not to burden the low income person....

if you have a adult child on low income is trying to get there foot on the ladder to have own place it would be ok if earning large amount

Im uncertain on this one but have decided against as MOST people who need someone to 'Live In' will be disabled and to reduce this benefit would be to 'impose a penalty' because they are disabled.

How do you establish who is a Partner/non Partner?

I believe that this will result in more people moving out of the home into their own rented accomodation and that this will increase the Council tax benefit as they may qualify in their own right .

This very much depends on the circumstance. Disabled people should be penalised.

If an adult earns more than enough to not qualify for a discount, the fact that another adult who is living with them, although they may earn less, they are still contributing to the overall household income making it overall even greater, so why should the household get a discount? It's nonsense! All LA should stop paying the Second Adult Rebate.

Will the scheme offer an alternative to the current "Better Buy" comparison

Would not agree if Second Adult disabled

I didn't like the person who lives with me anyway

Local Support for Council Tax Scheme

Detailed responses from consultation exercise

Question 6

6. Non - dependent adult contributions

Some people who receive Council Tax benefit have other 'non dependent' adults living with them (not their partner). We are proposing that the non-dependent adults pay more towards the Council Tax bill i.e.

- o Those who are contributing now will see their current payments double (e.g. from £6.55 per week to £13.10 per week)
- o Those who are paying nothing now will have to contribute £5 per week from April 2013.

	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
<p>a) Do you agree that non-dependent adults should contribute more to paying the household Council Tax Bill?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> *Non - dependent adult contributions Some people who receive Council Tax benefit have other 'non dependent' adults living with them (not their partner). We are proposing that the non-dependent adults pay more towards the Council Tax bill i.e. o Those who are contributing now will see their current payments double (e.g. from £6.55 per week to £13.10 per week) o Those who are paying nothing now will have to contribute £5 per week from April 2013. a) Do you agree that non-dependent adults should contribute more to paying the household Council Tax Bill? Agree</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> a) Do you agree that non-dependent adults should contribute more to paying the household Council Tax Bill? Disagree</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> a) Do you agree that non-dependent adults should contribute more to paying the household Council Tax Bill? Don't know</p>
<p>b) Do you agree that the payments of those</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> b) Do you agree that the payments of those contributing</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> b) Do you agree that the payments of those</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> b) Do you agree that the payments of those contributing</p>

	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
contributing should be doubled?	should be doubled? Agree	contributing should be doubled? Disagree	should be doubled? Don't know

c) Do you agree that those who are not contributing now should have to pay £5 per week (from April 2013)?	<input type="checkbox"/> c) Do you agree that those who are not contributing now should have to pay £5 per week (from April 2013)? Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> c) Do you agree that those who are not contributing now should have to pay £5 per week (from April 2013)? Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> c) Do you agree that those who are not contributing now should have to pay £5 per week (from April 2013)? Don't know
--	--	---	---

If you disagree with b) or c) what do you think the contributions should be? If you wish to make any further

£5 only for students and unwaged and disabled and elderly.

This really depends on the type of relationship. If there is a disability or caring relationship involved then is it fair that the household is penalised. We need to be careful that adding to the expenditure is not going to mean that a low wage income is no longer viable and claiming JSA or other benefit might be more attractive. There is no point in pushing households into the benefits trap if we don't need to.

keep the same-this is unfair to adult children trying to save for their own mortgage and are being penalised

I think that the level of contribution should be based on their income.

Contributions should be assessed on the basis of individual income not as a mandatory requirement. For instance, if two people who are on housing benefit chose to co-habitate, then the contributions should be assessed against their ability to pay and not as a mandatory requirement that 1 pays and the other does not,

Depends on the non-dependants income on the level of contribution

problem is enforcement- it will fall purely and simply to those named on the bill- you can calculate the charge based on the

occupiers etc but at the end of the day it is unenforceable

It would be difficult to enforce non-deps paying towards the bill as they are not legally liable.

b) percentage based on total

Nothing, it should be based per household.

to some extent the income of the non dependant needs taking into account

Should be made in agreement of 18+ non-dependents paying equal share of total existing CT bill

Make every person in the house pay. Why should I pay as much with 1 adult and 1 child in the house as someone with three adults and six children in the house.

Payments should remain as now.

it is not fair to double it

I agree that an employed non dep could pay a flat rate of %5 only. Only if permanent employment. Free for unwages, students, disabled and elderly. Call centre a waste of public funds, Wastes millions on its process of accounting and rebating in my own experience, demanding unreasonable 'weekly' re-evaluation. Not per annum!

If a person currently does not pay then making them pay may be unaffordable for them. £5 a week may not sound much, but when you are on benefits that is a lot of money. For example a carer gets £58.45 a week, £5 is nearly 10% of that money.

Unless they are on a good wage and guaranteed hours, My daughter in particular who no longer lives with us, her hours range from 12 hours a week to 30 hrs as she is on a zero contract, it should be flexible when their earnings are low

Only if they have a fair wage.

I currently receive a 25% reduction. My non dependant adult daughter resides with me for half the year when not at Uni'. An extra 20 per month would be difficult... 5 would be manageable.

People who work and are non dependants should pay more but non dependants who are sick and disabled should pay less.

to stay as they are

I do not agree for example my wife and I who are on income support, have no savings and are severely disabled should be forced to pay anything

To suddenly double the amount someone pays without any check on whether they're able to contribute seems very unfair

For some people £5 maybe more than they can afford in a difficult situation. The idea that all young adults can go and live with their parents does not give room for those who have no support from family or come from an abusive household, who are also more likely to struggle to get the best start in life. It should reflect the persons circumstances.

if a child is in college and not working how can they pay £5 per week towards this bill , it is putting pressure on their parents the number of adults should then half the amount in to equal amount for each then each person should then be evaluate on their income again low income, disabilities, elderly , students should all be taken to to count . if they are just living there and paying rent and working then they should pay at least £5 minimum per week

depending on your meaning on non dependent, if they are working on what their income is or not working

If they are not entitled to council tax benefit themselves, then they should pay a % of the bill. If 3 adults in property and one does not qualify for help they should pay 1/3 of the bill.

Contributions if any should be from the owner of the property or the named tenant of the property

My problem here is, by doubling the amount paid for those already paying, you are penalising them compared to those who don't pay. If you set it at £5 for those who don't currently pay, then that should be the amount for people already paying. It would be unfair otherwise

if it they benefit then it should £2 as then they will realise that you have to pay and a bill sent to them not the tenant

for people who are disabled and cannot work and are on benefit, they have more to pay out and to ask them to find more money when what they have just covers the cost of food heating hot water and general cleaning and support in the home would not be able to afford this.

b] I think it should be increased but not doubled. c] Would need to depend on individual circumstances

A lot of the people are on benefits, with them being cut by the government again the rate is too high, perhaps £2.50 is better....

how can unemployed people be asked to pay. you and the government are squeezing the life out of the poor to point where they are asking what's the point of living.

if already paying should be left as wages not going up

The proposed scheme penalises non-dependants who are on a low income or out of work. A non-dependants deduction should not apply if a non-dependant is in receipt of Income Support/ JSA IB/ ESA IR or GC. The current non-dependant deduction criteria should not be changed. Also just because a claimant has a non-dependant living with them there is no guarantee that a non-dependant will contribute towards the Council Tax bill and even less likely if the non-dependant themselves are on a low income or out of work themselves.

they pay enough already in a totally unfair, unjust system, leave them as they are now.

Cannot answer question as don't know whether these are assessed figures used when calculating rebate

People on low incomes ie ESA will not be able to afford the extra money on top of their non dep payment if the householder is already on Housing benefit as well . Its a recipe for Council tax arrears and rent arrears resulting in increased costs of recovering the arrears and legal action . It will also result in more family

breakdowns and homelessness as non paying members will be asked to leave to avoid the arrears thus further pressures will be placed on other services which may be more expensive to provide ie children taken into care etc if homelessness occurs which would far outweigh the cost of the Council tax rebate. There should be a % set of the total deductions ie HB non dep and CT contributions from the persons income which a person in tis position would know they have to contribute if they continue to live in the household which should leave the non dep with a guaranteed % of their income .

LEAVE THE CURRENT AMOUNTS AS THEY ARE.

this is going back to the old poll tax which will cause more problems with poverty its already been proven that the south east has seen an increase in food packages been given out

Again much more detail and examples needed. This means nothing without some specific examples.

25-50% increase would be sufficient, depending on income

Depends on circumstances

They should increase to meet the shortfall in government funding but by a third.

Contributions as now

I think this should be increased by 1/4 rather than 1/2 and then be increased again the next year.

b - not sure about doubled but the contributions should increase

It would depend on the non-dependants income and any disabilities etc. If they receive DLA and other disability related benefits should they really have to contribute when the owner of the property could also be the carer.

Should be increased to £10 ,doubling in too steep .

Local Support for Council Tax Scheme

Detailed responses from consultation exercise

Question 7

7. Maximum support

There is currently no maximum amount of support a working age person can get to help them pay their Council Tax. We are proposing a maximum level of support of £20.00 per week to help pay Council Tax.

This would affect people differently depending on their property value.

E.g. based on 2012 Council Tax charges, a couple living in a Council Tax Band A property would have to pay at least £0.64 per week; (for a Band B property - £4.08pw week, and Band C - £7.52pw).

Agree

Disagree

Don't know

Again this depends on the overall picture - if it makes a nonsense of earning a low wage then there is no point - each case should be considered on its merits.

£20 per week is too much when your income is very low.

If you are on JSA and or are are stuggling on minimum wage, how are you supposed to pay Council Tax? Also I think that although this may potentially save money for EBC initially, I'm sure a lot of people won't or can't pay, thus costing EBC far more in admin trying to ensure people pay & court costs etc etc

It should not be a dramatic changes as job seekers allowances are already very small and therefore would not help to pay this new council tax bill.

Council Tax for bands A-D should be paid in full

Percentage of total as a maximum.

this give a degree of responsibility to the person - need to be mindful if this comes in at the same time as other benefit loses though

SHoudl go on total household income

Again penalise those who have got of their backsides and done something!

i could not afford this. Band C and living next door to a builders merchant. 100% for a low wage under £6k. It is bad now but this will be devastating. This is a recession

good idea

This should not include the disabled or their full time Carers. Fair enough if the working age person is able to work, but many disabled of working age can not work, and their Carers are not free to look for work in many cases. I personally do 100+ hours of caring a week, I am on call 24/7 and I have had only 14 days off in 8.5 years. I save taxpayers over £3,500 a week and feel it unfair that myself and other Carers who are in similar circumstances should have an extra financial burden put upon us that we have no opportunity to change by looking for work. The £58.45 a week I currently receive is already be hit by rising prices. Any extra burdens are going to put me at crisis point which would lead to the council needing to provide extra resources to look after my severely disabled wife. I am finding it increasingly difficult to cope, I really don't know how much more I can take before I can't cope any more.

Surely it should depend on their income?

£10 and no more, you have to take into consideration their income, hours etc and now the pressure for people to take out pensions

no max

if a couple are severely disbaled and cannot work, they should not be asked to pay anything

Why should anyone have to pay if their only income happens to be other benefits? Benefits hardly (if at all) cover the cost of living. Are you proposing that people end up on the streets if they are unable to pay council tax????

£30

if someone is on benefits how can they pay more when they are living in poverty anyway

those on benefits, which are low anyway won't be able to afford to pay. Currently those on income support get full help.

again depending on how much you have coming in I am on benefits no extra money coming in and my mother is in her 90's and I am her carer, a small amount is fine but what do YOU mean by SUPPORT, why are we who are in real dire straits being penalized? (why is band A only 64p) what about houses that have a extra area built for a disabled person

I do not think that working should be penalised, work should always pay!

10

No limit. If a person of working age is unable to work they are not going to be able to finance further outgoings

£10as there wage and other things that they have to pay will be affected

I still think it is too high, for people on low incomes..

If a claimant is in receipt of a passported benefit they should not have to contribute towards their Council liability.

leave as is now

AMOUNT SHOULD BE BASED ON INDIVIDUAL INCOMES.

Should depend on the individual circumstances, not a blanket limit.

For people on JSA even these small amounts would not be finanically viable.

£50 Inflation would soon make the lower figure unfair.

Either £20 per week or you could make it into a %. E.g assistance of up to a maximum of 50% of the overall Council Tax charge regardless (irrespective) of what Band property you are in. That may be fairer.

£15

However maximum support should be reviewed in line with a relevant index either RPI / CPI / other

There should be no limit. The help provided should be based on income available. Small sums such as £0.64 will not be economically viable to collect so why charge them?

I think a £25 limit would be more helpful to households and families.

£20.00 p/w is equivalent to £1,040.00 pa Band A (for 2+ Adults) is £1,068.51 pa Max (L)CTS Award £20.55 p/w

Local Support for Council Tax Scheme

Detailed responses from consultation exercise

Q8 Minimum Support

There is currently no minimum amount of support that someone can get to help them pay their Council Tax.

We are proposing to introduce a minimum level of support of £5 per week. Therefore, unless someone is entitled to at least £5, they will not get any help at all to pay their Council Tax.

Do you agree that there should be a minimum level of support of £5 per week?

This does not make sense - those who need help really should be able to access it.

No minimum amount

Is anything under £5 worth the administration?

£10 per week to encourage the transition from unemployment to employment.

£4.99 a week is a significant amount if you are working part time on minimum wage or receive JSA. Currently many people are struggling to make ends meet, this would just make things even harder.

There should be no minimum support. People should be entitled to even less than 5 pounds. Every pound counts when you are on low income.

£0.50p

be careful this doesn't increase administrative costs

£0

no £3 per week

If someone is struggling a few pounds can make all the difference, I think the minimum should be £1

Withdraw funding for development schemes; as they do not work for the community only the employees gain. I think if this is going to be how you reclaim £1m then we need a political change. Changing this policy for the worst is not a solution that will help the community.

I think it should be £10.00 a week. people struggling on benefits are already having problems to live

Again, it depends in their income - if they are only earning £60 per week, £5 represents 8.3% of their income; if they earn £100 per week, it is only 5% of income, so surely this should relate to the minimum level of income?

<5

as above

if you can afford to pay some contribution fine but not too much

£2.50 would be better, £5 is a lot to someone on a low income.

I do not agree with a minimum at all, at no level. For those on very low incomes, every penny is important and you would be denying them that money. What about someone who is entitled to £4.90? How would that be fair?

£2 as income support money will not stretch to more with other bills to pay and like myself cannot work due to being a full time carer and health problems of my own

This could have a significantly negative effect on someone on a low wage.

Sorry still too high..

As above, if a claimant is in receipt of a passported benefit they should not have to contribute towards their Council liability and receive maximum support.

leave as current

Any support is helpful to people on a low income although it can cost more than the entitlement to process the claim. I would suggest that where the award is very low the amount is deducted off the yearly bill in one go ie 1 month is reduced by the award thus reducing the month on month costs of administering the claim.

£5 MINIMUM IS TOO LOW. SHOULD BE AT LEAST MINIMUM OF £50/100

For someone on MTB such as JSA every penny counts. It is impossible to live on JSA and pay any additional council tax. Likewise for very low paid workers.

There should be no minimum level of support.

I think it should remain at no minimum support. If a minimum has to be introduced, I think it should be similar to the maximum amount of support available, and thus I think it would be fairer to base a minimum amount of support in percentage terms.

that will make admin simpler

For a person on a low income i.e. below the national average, every penny counts.

£5 can make a huge difference to those on low incomes. £2 might be more meaningful.

£2.00

£2 - £5 is quite a high cut off and for some people could be a third of their bill

For some people a £5 contribution may be vital to balancing their income/ outgoings ,suggest £3