

Q3.b Do you have any comments on the key principles?

- "Incentivise people to work" in a political and policy context is being used to justify increasing the burden on people who are low paid or young people like myself.
- 20,000 OAPs die of coldevery winter in this country. Do not increase that number by giving them less support.
- 3a asks crude questions Impact should be prevented on same "vulnerable"households as at present.Incentivisation to work is not the job of council tax. Having the same scheme across E Sussex is beyond the remit of Lewes District Council so why do you ask this ?
- A scheme to incentivise people to work is valueless if jobs are not available. Without available jobs reducing benefits is likely to make prospect of employment less likely, not more, as there will be less money to stimulate growth.
- although I agree with the last principle,I am not sure how this could be achieved as there are not enough jobs available.Could incentives be offered for training and /or work in practical trades such as electricians,plumbers, builders and carers.Within these trades practical qualifications could be achieved, so they would become self supporting and less reliant on benefits in the future.It requires a long term view to really help people back into work or start.Training is vital.
- Although I can see the benefit of having a pan East Sussex scheme I think it may be difficult to find a concensus and to take regional variations into account.
- any family or the elderly (1 child or more) should still recieve their current council tax payments and not recieve any cuts. leave the current system as it is.
- aNY PROPOSAL MUST PROTECT THOSE WHO LIKE MYSLEF ARE UNEMPLOYED. ANY ATTEMPT TO FORCE THOSE ON VERY LITTLE INCOMES WILL BE FUTILE AS WE WONT PAY, BECAUSE WE CANT PAY!
- Anyone, including myself on benefits are already trying to get a job as hard as they can. Making them poorer does not help.
- As A LONE PARENT WHO HAS JUST RESETTLED AFTER COMING OUT OF A WOMEN'S REFUGE I FEEL CONCERNED ABOUT FINDING EXTRA MONEY TO PAY COUNCIL TAX WHEN WE ARE ON SUCH A TIGHT BUDGET ALREADY.I WOULD BE USING MONEY THAT IS USUALLY FOR FOOD FOR ME AND MY SON TO PAY THE EXTRA COUNCIL TAX.
- At what point do you draw the line to incentivise people to work? Using myself as an example, I believe it would be unfair to put undue pressure on on someone who already feels pressured to work although long term disabilty prevents me. People like myself who live at the very bottom of the socio-economic ladder already find daily life a financial struggle, any more pressure could be interpreted as class prejudice.
- before imposing such a scheme have look to the work market most of people looking for jobs according to their skills,experience & qualification and the country already in it's financial crises on the top of that food and feul will beyond reach of the majority the counrty heading to the edge of the public explosion, governement had already been given by saudi's royal £5B to keep quite, blind and support the gulf countries and be a tail of the american's poletics towards the rest of the world.
- Collecting higher Council Tax from SECOND HOME OWNERS is better than collecting a disproportionate amount of money from the most vulnerable households. People on

low fixed incomes could be penalised, it literally won't be worth their while paying overtime to make ends meet. The way Council tax is worked out needs to be reconsidered in terms at least of house value bandings. During a period of reassessment the council should hold back from disrupting the Council tax benefit system until a more sustainable and fair system of council tax payments is worked out.

- Cutting the benefit of people already on the breadline does not give them an incentive to go back to work. It demoralises them further, it impacts with dire consequences on their families and on the local community. The council should not hide behind phrases like 'incentivise people to work' when what is really being said is 'cutting public spending to pay for the mess the governments have made of the economy'.
- disabled are having their benefits cut so wont be able to find extra money for increased council tax
- Disagree to the last as its probable that incentive usually means forced upon and that tends to clump all into one even if they are unable to work..
- Do not see how the proposed schemes 1 and 2 are in keeping with the second principle stated above - as the impact will be great on vulnerable households.
- Do you have any comments on these principles? (Limit: 500...
- DO YOU INCENTIFIES PEOPLE TO WORK BY PUTTING THEM BELOW THE POVERTY LINE.OR ARE YOU MERELY STATING THAT UNEMPLOYED/SICK/DISABLED PEOPLE ARE "GETTING AWAY" WITH SOMETHING IF THEY HAVE ENOUGH TO LIVE ON. DO YOU WANT TO INCENTIVISE PEOPLE TO STEAL FOOD TO FEED THEMSELVES OR THEIR CHILDREN (YES IT DOES HAPPEN IN THIS COUNTRY)
- Don't understand principle three
- elderly and people who are disabled should be exempt.
- everyone should be assessed in the same way but there should be a more in depth in person assessment process rather than just filling out forms. it is very hard to make a fair decision on just the working age as there may be other factors as to why they are not able to work. there are people who can not get work and may rely on the council tax benifit so they have the free income to pay for their heating or electricity.
- Everyone should pay their own way - people should not get a discount on their council tax at all. I have to pay the full amount - so why should I subsidise the lazy who can't be bothered to find a job?
- Existing benefit levels should be retained for ALL households with low incomes. Those paying full CTB will have to pay an increased amount to help those with low incomes.
- For all pensioners and the physically disable they should receive the benifits the others have to pass a questionnaire to see if they could benifit
- Given the other money pressure being put on people at the lower end of income scales by Government policies, LDC must do all it can the mitigate effects on vulnerable locals. It is reasonable that those able should pay extra tiny prop'n of income rather than most vulnerable pay significant prop'n of already meagre income. No objection to encouraging people to work by reducing high marginal tax rates and loss of benefits.This imposes a penalty on unemployed rather than providing an incentive.

- Given the present employment market where although it looks as if people are in work they may only be on very low incomes/part time work, for example my wife has 2 part times jobs on minimum wage (or below on average), I work part time and on a zero hours (as & when) contract sometimes for the last 3 years we have been struggling to pay our rent & council tax (we get about 50% benefit). Any changes at all will totally disincentive the will to work
- Hitting the benefit over any one of these people on Council Tax Benefit is once again affecting those least likely to be able to make a contribution, so however the Council decides it will cause further hardship.
- How about people that are disabled??
- How can people be incentivised to work when there are not enough jobs, especially full time ones.
- how do we know that the people who are Vulnerable are not hit the worst. the government that's in power now want to up the tax on people like my sister who cant work cause she is unable to work cause she is mentally disabled and can only walk so far without collapsing in pain.
- how will it help people who are scared of goin outside
- I agree that it could be helpful to have a common scheme across E Sussex, but not if it is the wrong scheme. People in low paid work already face a cliff edge where their benefit entitlements are drastically reduced. Attempting to use reductions in council tax benefit to encourage people to work would be more likely to have - perversely - the opposite effect
- I agree that the scheme should 'incentivise people to work' as long as it isn't penalizing those who are out of work through no fault of their own i.e disabled or unable to find appropriate work.
- I agree whole heartedly in providing incentives for people to work, however I do NOT agree in this being a devise to push those who are not well enough to work in to a stressful situation that they cannot manage.
- I agree with the above, but you say making the scheme incentives for people who work. I'm a single parent and work part time. What ever overtime I get or wage increase I get, you take straight back of me, I can understand this as that is the whole idea, but when the wage increase is £5 a week, you take it all straight back of again. There should be a wage increase limit to when to let you know, You try and help yourself by working and then a little bit gets taken away again. You get more if you are on full income support, sitting down doing nothing. If you decided to take more council tax benefit money away from single, working age parents on a low income, who are struggling, domestic bills have gone up yet again and there hasn't been an increase in child benefit for the last 5 years to help feed and clothe their children, there are going to be more children on the poverty line, as where are single working age parents on a low income meant to get the extra money to pay the council tax increase from?
- I agree with the comment that 'pensioners should be protected'.
- I agree with the principles but totally fail to see how these limit the impact on the most vulnerable households. It is the poorest and most vulnerable (apart from the protected pensioners) especially larger families who live in larger houses. In a Band D

rented property a family would have to find at least £500 per year even from Income Support or JSA (income based) or ESA (income related).

- I am a carer for a lady who is in receipt of high care high mobility DLA. She is not choosing to stay at home she simply COULDNT work due to the complexity and severity of her illnesses. Is she too going to have to find extra money to help pay council tax? If this is the case, even speaking to her regarding this issue scares her, let alone having to find extra money for another bill, with no increases to her money to help pay this. It is hard enough for her to make ends meet as it is, this is simply going to be another worry which in turn exacerbates part of her illness! There are more vulnerable people other than simply pensioners!!
- I am a carer. My wife is very poorly. I work hard to look after her. She works hard to survive. I do not get paid for saving the system this workload and expense. I cannot work any harder to pay the additional cost of having a roof over our heads but may have to choose between that and treating my wife's illness? No scheme.
- I am a single mother of one. I could not afford any additional bills and if I were to pay more council tax, it would mean going without other important things.
- I am against disabled and people with learning difficulties having these benefits taken from them they cannot help the way they are and are being penalised more and more with all these cuts.
- I am concerned about the comment "making sure the scheme incentivises people to work". This seems to be pandering to the false ideas being promoted by the Government that people who aren't able to work are doing so out of some sort of choice. Many such as myself are genuinely unable to work because of illness and disability through no fault of our own. Making me and others like me pay more will not incentivise me to work but merely financially penalise me further still in these days of already harsh cuts. Please don't try to use this pathetic excuse to justify making cuts as part of a Government policy against the ill and disabled.
- I am disabled and was made redundant on the 29th January 2010 after 30 years work. I was placed on ESA working group which I felt was the right decision. Since I have had my ESA taken away and placed on JSA contributational, which will come to an end at the end of this month, leaving me without any money due to my wife increasing her hours to help the household budget. I have been on 3 work programmes and offered my services free on work trials but have had no success. I believe my family is in need of a council tax benefit to survive the hard times we have and are still going through.
- I am the father of a son who is of working age but who is autistic and has o.c.d. and extreme sound sensitivity. There is no way that he can ever work so the burden of paying his council tax would fall on me. I only work part time in order to help with his care so to abolish the relief we get for him now would be intolerable for us.
- I believe that vulnerable people should be receiving the maximum benefits as long as they are legitimate claims. I also believe there are people who work hard, as I do, having two jobs (and I have 2 children) but on a low wage that need help with council tax benefit whereas I know people receiving it that should not be entitled to it due to being too lazy to work or being too fussy about what type of job they want. I had no choice in my low paid job but I do to work. Those out of work for more than 1 year should not be entitled to it. I got myself a second job within hours of looking so there is no reason why people sitting about for over a year should receive it, these are the

people that should be targeted.

- I believe it is especially important that people are not discouraged from - or penalised for - working. As a single parent, it is incredibly disheartening to be no better off working than I was previously when in receipt of full benefits.
- I believe the local MP should declare his advice as he is part of the government which has brought about this change.
- I believe there should be incentives to work but I feel families with children could be put in a difficult position if both work part time to juggle childcare or one works full time and the other a stay at home parent. Childcare is expensive and families will be put in a difficult position if their tight budgets are stretched even further than they are at present. I think those that are able to work and choose not to should be working.
- I can't imagine how it will incentivise people to work because if people were really that poor they would be either in a very low paid job, incapable either mentally or physically, of working any more. The recession has made even low paid jobs highly sought after so if the jobs aren't there then people can't magic work out of thin air just because a bill has risen.
- I claim CTB as I am on Income Related Employment & Support Allowance due to severe Mental Illness which affects my capacity to work. I therefore feel that making it a scheme to encourage people back to work should be treated very carefully eg people who can rather than those who legitimately can not.
- I consider that changes to Council Tax Benefit should not add extra costs to households on very limited incomes. I do not think that those who are unable to work e.g. because of child care requirements, disability or because they are looking for work, should be disadvantaged by losing Council Tax Benefit payments.
- I could not agree to 'incentivising' recipients without knowing what is proposed. Already long-term sick people are being punished for not applying for unsuitable or non-existent vacancies, and little account is taken of the cost of childcare.
- I disagree with incentivising people to seek work, as some people may feel pressured into doing this when they are clearly not fit either physically or mentally and if they take that first step towards seeking work they could lose Council Tax Benefit whilst doing so.
- I do not believe that placing further burden on vulnerable households is an incentive to work. Creating reasonably paid jobs is the greatest incentive to work. We do not appear to all be in this together with the proposed scheme
- I do not wish my council tax to increase because other people can't be bothered to work and pay the full council tax
- I do think people should be encouraged to work but my personal circumstances leave me unable to work as I am a single mother and my son only goes to nursery part time until the end of next year. I think people should be means tested in order to make this potential change fair.
- I don't feel that it should be part of the scheme to incentivise people to work. Isn't that what the DWP is for?
- I don't know how "most vulnerable households" will be decided. There are some families who only just manage to pay all their bills and don't appear to be "most

vulnerable", however if they no longer got any benefit it may mean they were no longer able to meet their financial requirements.

- I don't think that people who are unable to work because of health problems should be penalised.
- i feel that the government are missing the point as to who the most vulnerable households are I am a single mother of 2 children who has always worked 16 or more when i could . The people who dont work but should/could get all the help possible and the rich people dont need the help ...what about the people who are stuck working as much as they can and loosing benefits ..to me that doesnt seem fair.
- I have been unemployed for over a year and still unable to attain employment. having applied for over 250 jobs and attended several interview.
- I have concerns about the incentivising people to work: as I can see that this govt is committed to short contract/ un-unionised, lower-paid, worse conditions as terms of employment and therefore using CTB as another tool to bully them into this position is unfair.
- I HAVE MENTAL ILLNESS, and rarely able to leave my home. I feel that us who are generally unwell should be considered as well as the elderly. Its not a choice for us with disabilities
- I HAVE SAID I DISAGREE WITH LIMITING THE IMPACT ON THE MOST VULNERABLE BECAUSE ALTHOUGH YOU SHOULD BE LIMITED THE IMPACT ON THE VULNERABLE THIS SCHEME DOES THE COMPLETE OPPOSITE. As someone who receive's disability benefits and who has kids who are on job seekers it would be extremely difficult for me to have to pay extra council tax as it is extremely difficult to live in this day and age anyway and so it would cripple my household in a big way and so all this new scheme will do is take more money from the people who cant afford to live as it is without having to pay more. the whole point of a job seeker getting benefits is so they can buy food and live whilst looking for a job and fo me as my children only get £53 a week i find it ridiculas that these people who are desperate for work would have to pay extra money out of there food budget whilst the people who are rich are getting richer and schemes like this are making people like us even poorer. job seekers get there money because while they are looking for jobs and doing all these work schemes to get these jobs which is extremely difficult to get as there is not enough jobs out there they can buy there food to live and so i strongly and know many many people whom strongly appose this ridiculas scheme that will cripple the most vulnerable contrarily to you apparent believe that it will help them, so please appose this scheme and help the vulnerable unlike this government and in particular david cameron from continuing in harming the poor and most vulnerable like our job seekers who are doing everything to get work and disabled from having to pay more and more. finally by having this scheme it will not encourage job seekers to get work it will just take away more from there benefits as there is no jobs out there, for example for every job available there is an average of 100 people applying for this one job and so how can every job seeker get work when the government who are say ing they are making jobs are then taking double the amount of jobs away. so finally I APPOSE THIS NEW COUNCIL TAX SCHEME.
- I only agree with the scheme incentivising people to work if they are not in receipt of Disability Living Allowance or not receiving old age pension and not physically/mentally incapable of working.

- i think people in general want to work - at the moment there are not enough jobs and many can't for health/disability reasons. managing on benefits is hard enough. people cannot find more money if they have none. the more well off are not contributing enough to austerity.
- I think that having the same Scheme across all of East Sussex is a good idea because it is fair to all within that region and probably less complicated. I feel it is very important to limit the impact on the most vulnerable people as it is extremely challenging if you are a disabled person who cannot work, lives alone with no other income and depends on Benefits to survive. However, for those that are fit and able to work, those individuals should definitely receive incentive(s) within the Scheme to work.
- I think that it is important that not just the elderly are excluded from this but also the vulnerable i.e people with mental health issues (legitimate) It is already very difficult for people to find work (I understand there are a lot of people that don't try) and lots of people are in debt due to redundancies so would not be able to afford to pay towards council tax.
- I think the criteria should be on a household by household basis so each family asking for assistance should be assessed individually dependant on their financial situation
- I understand the need to review the support scheme but the most vulnerable households should be protected.
- I was made redundant in Apr 2009. In Nov of 2009 I gained full-time employment at the Outlook Foundation, after 3 months I was made part-time. I contacted ACAS during this time and was informed that even though I had grounds for constructive dismissal, my employment of less than 1 year rendered me unprotected by the law. I applied for council tax relief, however I was informed my weekly earnings of £173.09 were above what the law says is required to live on, that being £64.45. I at the time appealed on the basis that £64.45 did not include putting a roof over ones head. My mortgage payments ,£526.47, plus mthly building insurance of £34.23 (compliant with mortgage) = £560.70 (comparative in my eyes not an exorbitant amount to pay for one accommodation, rent, etc) if taken into account, together with factored council tax payment of £107.64, left me £22.51 a week to live on. My appeal was declined and I was informed mortgage payments are not taken into consideration. Resigning from Outlook would be deemed as intentionally making me unemployed prohibiting any unemployment benefit. The £22.51 was used in travel expenses to work and I used my credit cards as financial support until I found better employment, which I successfully did in February 2011. Unfortunately I have never been able to clear the debt run up at that time, and can no longer afford the monthly requested payments. After advice from Debt Counselling Service. I find myself in the position of having to sell my home to clear past debts run up at that time. I cannot forget as a tax paying citizen for over 30 years how let down and sad I felt. There seemed a great wrongness towards someone doing their best to get back to work. I Am about to lose my home and very much hope that no other hard working, tax paying, mortgaged resident suffers the same
- I wish to oppose the cuts to council tax benefits as this is hitting the most vulnerable in society: who don't have enough money to live on already, let alone cutting their tax and other benefits. It is unfair. The Council should use its reserves instead.
- i would like to know how this will affect the disabled who like myself can't work and depend on help with council tax

- iam a single parent and work a few hrs a month which is all i can work else i have to get childcare, which comes out of my wages which then my council tax will i cant aford to lose any m ore money and cant work any more hrs
- If I understand correctly, I think the impact will differ between authorities, i.e. those with higher levels of Benefits claimants will face a greater impact. Not sure therefore if the same scheme acorss all of East Sussex would be fair?
- If it forces people to work who are considered vulnerable just so they can survive i think its wrong.. many wont survive satisfactorily.
- If the idea behind devolving responsibility for Council Tax Support is that local areas can tailor the system to their needs, it seems odd to then expand the scheme to county level. A choice of support systems in East Sussex would give the residents of East Sussex the ability to move around according to what suits their circumstances the best.
- If your focus is on encouraging people to get back into work, this is understandable. But a large percentage of people receiving HB and CTB do so because they are unable to work for various reasons. These people are being punished for your supposed motivation for people to work.
- im a lewes council tenant and im getting benifits this includes council tax im very worried about this new scheme i have 4 young children and im on jobseekers allowance which is not alot of money but buy the time we have done shopping paid our water tv and other bills it does not leave alot of money so im worried that if we have to pay council tax to we might not be able to keep up with the payments and get into debt so we think this is a bad idea.
- In relation to the question of limiting the impact on the most vunerable i feel it should say that there will be no impact on the most vunerable as they are already on a level that is classed as being having to live below the poverty line and that there limited income is being eroded by increase in fuel and food charges faster than they are being increased in benefit so the nett result is they are falling further behind and should be protected from any additional increases in what ever format it takes.
- In this economy, using cuts to benefits or other so called incentives doesn't work. A decent rate of pay and open job centres does.
- Incentive to work is the most important part of this scheme - the percentage claiming benefit is far too high.
- Incentives don't work when there are no jobs. They just demoralize people.
- Incentives to work must include investment in local jobs for local residents as many are finding it very difficult to gain employment currently despite proactive efforts
- It depends what you mean by vulnerable. I agree to helping disabled people but people on low incomes will have to tighten their belts and contribute like everyone else. I have often been just above the benefit line and so have known what it is to struggle and go without.
- It is all well and good trying to incentivise people but a) where are the jobs b)how do people with disability avoid being "used", and c)given wages for most jobs barely reach the average wage in the UK, just how does anyone justify asking a low paid worker (assuming they have a job)to pay Council Tax, given it will be a case of food or

CT.

- It should affect more people who are claiming unemployment. I work hard every week to support my children and currently I am at least £100 worse off than those on full benefit. I don't receive free school meals, I currently pay £40 a week for my children. I don't get free school trips, help when I get in debt via local government debt schemes. I have to get up at 5 every morning to go to work and get home at 9pm every night. People who work and support their families should be allowed to financially be awarded for making an effort. I am a mum of three children, two are disabled. I can't get council housing for cheaper rent even though one of my children has a lot of medical issues because of the lack of housing available. I can't afford to make up to my children the time I don't have with them by taking them out as there is never any free cash available. Why should it become harder for me when people keep sitting around claiming? Income support should be scrapped and all families put on JSA and made to seek childcare and work instead.
- It would be great if all of East Sussex had the same scheme. Though I am aware different local councils all have different rates. I think people should have an incentive to work. Making benefits look more beneficial than working will not help morale or the economy.
- It would seem that again the poorer end of the scale would be most affected as in our case we are on pension credit and we hardly get enough to live and you want us to pay more out of the little money we get. I don't see how that is fair and you see us as the easy option taking from the people that need the help. You have to have jobs available and I don't see how it will be an incentive if all you do is take any little bit of help that people are entitled to and they have to pay more. There must be another way apart from taking benefit off of the vulnerable.
- It's unfair I'm on incapacity benefit and would be unable to pay
- It's absolutely ridiculous how can we cope with the cost of living rising & utility bills on the increase it's getting harder to live as it is !!
- It's unfair that people who choose not to work or make excuses not to work receive full support when they can afford to buy alcohol and cigarettes
- Just because someone is in receipt of benefit that doesn't mean they don't want to work. If central government spent money retraining those of us who want jobs not benefits there would be less of us claiming...also..try getting an interview when you are over 50 & have a history of back problems..our applications go in the bin or we are invited for interview as the token disabled applicant..wasting everyone's time..and try taking that up with equal opportunities!
- Making sure that underpaid workers can still afford to eat, that is my concern as I am struggling at the moment.
- Many people that are claiming council tax benefit are in employment but on a low income, these people should not be put under more financial pressure as they are trying to better themselves. People on low income or unemployed, normally fall within the poverty trap. They have no means to obtain a mortgage and have no other option than renting. Renting comes at a high premium which feeds the rich and does not help the poor. If people suffer with mental health problems or have other personal problems e.g. vulnerable people. It is very hard for them to find work and better their lives. These vulnerable people should not be put under more pressure.

This could have a big impact on family relations and be detrimental to children living within these families. Resulting in childhood economic disadvantage which can lead to crime, health problems and in turn will have a impact on the local area and services.

- my fear would be that people who work full/part time receiving ctb will be in a position where it would work out more economical to give up work than to stay working. i myself work part time and am struggling now, so how will this affect me if i have to pay more than i do already. i also think that people that dont and have never received ctb would be extremely annoyed that their council tax has gone up because of people receiving ctb. if its going up by a few pounds i dont think this would be a problem, but if it is a significant amount the council might find they are chasing more people for council tax that the cant afford to pay.
- my husband does work and i stay at home looking after our 3 children, we have help with our council tax as we our on a low income, i think maybe if there is no reason for yoy not getting a job then i understand but people with young children would find this hard to do
- NEAR POVERTY IS AN INCENTIVE TO WORK IN ITSELF. NO FURTHER INCENTIVE IS NECESSARY.
- No
- no
- Not sure how the scheme can be tailored to get people to work when there is an obvious lack of jobs around. Newhaven is one of the most deprived areas for work opportunities so the word incentive has to be achievable and believable.
- One size cannot possibly fit all across East Sussex. Hastings and Lewes will have such different needs for example.
- Other criteria are possible to imagine! For example preserving household income, "incentivising" saving among the less well-off and limiting unreasonably high rents in the private sector.
- People are already incentivised to work. A decent wage and availability of work are the issues. Any scheme must not cause additional hardship to the poorest and most vulnerable.
- People want to work. Thanks to goverment policies there is no work. If the council are holding any works of art, sell them. They do belong to the people.
- People who are able to work, i.e. not suffering medical issues should be looking at contributing towards CT. Those who are infirm or suffering with a medical condition, i.e. pensioners or the sick and disabled, should have priority for the benefit.
- People who are looking for but can't find work are on very limited incomes and should be helped with council tax. Work at this time is extremely difficult to come by as there is tremendous competition for work. People who are fortunate enough to have a job should help people who are not so fortunate.
- Please see general comments at end of questionnaire
- point 3: if person is incapacitated this is not fair.
- principle 3 rather depends on how many jobs are available

- Providing an incentive assumes ability to respond to it. My fear for the removal of support from people of working age is that those of us who are physically or circumstantially NOT able to raise the funds to pay the tax will be penalised by a scheme which is designed to provide 'incentives'. If spending less money is the Council's objective, one cannot expect it to be a 'carrot' incentive, only a 'stick'. From my own experience, it is not always possible to get a correct diagnosis of medical conditions, or in touch with the right opportunities which are there, to be able to exempt ourselves from the 'working age' group, amongst whom we are lumped and must compete as though it is an even field. If the tax is linked to income thresholds and payment for work bearing in mind reasonable living expenses, problems ought not to arise in the way I fear. A card which would enable all people to budget and pay local tax when able, or even to receive privileges% 2C badges or sensible prizes or discounts on some additional services from the Council according to the percentage of tax paid in relation to income earned might work. It might even encourage some to pay more tax to the local authority than is required, if it can be afforded. It could enable local groups to run fund-raising events to provide Council Services, additional facilities, new jobs and regeneration or donate from the Council to National Government to reduce national debt. Looked at as a very special Charity, the Council and Government are wonderful organisations to raise support for.
- Should not target people on Disabled Payments
- Since it seems the bureaucracy will cost more to collect what will, in some cases be tiny amounts but may be significant to the most vulnerable, I think all Council leaders should make strong depositions to Government, but also they should use their reserves. It disgusts me that ESCC can find hundreds of millions to build a bypass while others will go hungry or cold in order to pay their Council tax. When will we have Councils that stand up to this Coalition government of very well financed people who do little but malign the less-well off.
- So-called incentivising people to work may cause additional hardship if appropriate work is difficult or impossible to come by.
- Some parts of East Sussex seem to be worse off than others (eg Hastings area) - should same rate apply? If the scheme is intended to incentivise people to work, what happens when there is no work available?
- some people who claim housing benefit and council tax benefit would love to go out to work, but like myself might be too sick to be able to do so. if you give incentives to people then it might come across as a form of pressure. but then there are some people unfortunately that could work and won't as they know it will affect their benefit. it's going to be difficult whatever happens to make it seem fair to all.
- Sorry, my English not well.
- Such schemes do not incentivise people to work; this is a very simplistic idea of the reasons and routes to poverty and lack of work
- Suggest that the Council treats each case individually to see how the household is made. The main breadwinner in our family had to downscale as he was made redundant - now works for half that he used to which required the need to request benefits. Has a disabled child so his partner is unable to work more than 16 hours a week due to the support needed to give this child.
- take the money from the council high payer, and give it to us, who need it more,

- The 2nd 'principle' I disagree with, as I believe all those living below the poverty line and all vulnerable people should be helped with CBTax. The 3rd 'principle' I'm strongly opposed to, I believe it is loaded with political bias. It assumes that the poor need to be made poorer as an incentive to work harder. The wealthy should pay more, they can afford it, especially those with 2nd homes. The poor should be supported by the state when out of work, the principle of the Welfare State and paid a 'living wage' when in work.
- The country is in a recession and although many cuts have been made it has affected most vulnerable households and it will affect them even more.
- The existing scheme has helped to balance a minimal available budget. Costs keep rising with an ever diminishing funds. Currently after paying for my priority bills I am left with enough for Food, which given the nature of my post Surgery existence is critical. So the Benefit is helping me to avoid a nightmare. I have had to decline a Paramedic to take me to Hospital because I do not have enough money get back home. No TV. Live with using a toilet 10+ times a day, but only one flush, then wash the same times in cold water. & so on.
- The impact of the 10% reduction in funding could be shared between council tax payers and those receiving benefit by increasing council tax by 5% and reducing benefit by the same amount. Another thought is should pensioners already paying council tax be protected from the extra increase? Bearing in mind that council tax increases yearly.
- The most important of these principles is limiting the impact on the most vulnerable, and the best way to do that is to 'spread the misery' by raising the Council Tax for everyone in order to keep the benefits the same.
- The most vulnerable households, ie. the poorest, those with the most severe disabilities, those on total benefit must be protected. I am not sure how incentivising the scheme could be implemented in a manner in which people wouldn't be impacted in a negative way.
- The most vulnerable should not be penalised because the council is short of funds
- The pensioners (old folks) will be protected I understand, but would that be extended to those people registered disabled who are under pensionable age? I do think that the council should take the c/tax directly from whatever benefit you get as if people are left to pay c/tax themselves and are faced with the choice of eating or keeping worm most will choose to eat and keep worm. BUT you also have people who do abuse the system and they would just not pay the c/tax and spend the money on what they want, so throwing the council into deep problems
- The principle of incentivising people to work is fine if there is work available but for single parents on benefits/low income it will have a detrimental effect on children whose parents have less money to spend on essentials such as food and energy bills which are going up again at a far greater rate than benefits do.
- The principle should be not to burden the most vulnerable with additional costs and that is what the proposed scheme does. I do not agree that this scheme can provide a mechanism for incentivising people to work; a decent rate of pay does that.
- The principle should be not to burden the vulnerable with the additional costs which the proposed scheme does. I do not agree that the scheme can be used to incentivise

people to work - there need to be jobs for that to work.

- The principle should be to not burden the poor with extra costs. No scheme can incentivise work, a decent rate of pay does that.
- the scheme needs to be fare to all as a single person i have applied for over 500 jobs since being made redundant in may 2011. so it's Not that i don't want to work i just can't get a job in sussex as a contract security manager. we also need to think about as a single person we still have to pay gas/ elect/water/bills/ like me i dont turn on my heating to try and save money i wash in cold water and some of us still try and help are ex partners towards the up bringing off are children
- the scheme needs to incentivise people to work but most jobs are low paid so must support people in low paid jobs otherwise you end up paying out more than your earn on rent, council tax and bills with no options.
- The scheme that is proposed will make life much harder for the most vulnerable with added costs. People need to be paid properly - that will get them back to work. I don't think that the proposed scheme is a good mechanism to get people back to work.
- There are families who create expense for council , piles of rubbish bags to be collected , numerous cars parked on the street ;but as they have young kids and students, carry on work from home they get benefits . Seem a lone person out at work all day is going to have to pay more to have one shopping bag of rubbish removed and nowhere for them park. who decides who is vulnerable; just because some one is not claiming benefit does not mean they do not need help or that the family with loads of kids need any benefits.
- There are lots of people claimin unecessary benifits while working if these were clamped down on more then it wouldnt affect low income working families as much. I also think none working families should at least pay something instead of relying on the rest of us to foot the bill.
- THERE ARE NO DECENT LOCAL JOBS THAT ARE PAID FOR CREATIVES IN EAST SUSSEX AND LONDON COMMUTE IS WAY BEYOND FUNDS! Its a rubbish argument saying cutting basic support will give incentives for people to find work...also it's relative ofcourse.
- there is a balance between the jobs available for individuals to fill and the incentive provided by the eligibility criteria governing benefit payments and, i suspect, the universal credit. incetivisation implies that individuals require a prod towards taking up employment/seeking better paid employment. whilst it is laudable to incetivise individuals to seek work/better paid work, there will be those who, in the current economic climate will be unable to secure paid employment and the reduction in their benefit entitlement could be regarded as penalisation in addition to that which they may feel due to their inability to find suitable work. whatever the detail of the scheme implemented and subsequent changes made to it, there must be recognition of the penalising aspect that will be sorely perceived by individuals who, through no fault of their own, suffer financial loss as a result. Unfortunately, i can offer no opinion as to how this may be done .
- There is already tremendous financial pressure on the less well off, look at food and fuel price rises. Many families are going cold and hungry already, how many extra incetives to work do you think are needed? Why can you not look at old age claimants? They are not all poor. I know some pensioners who buy a new car every

few years, yet at the same time you are subsidising them for free bus passes. I also know some working families that cannot afford to turn their heating on. Where are your priorities?

- There is no reason to have the same scheme across the county. All working age people on benefit are vulnerable since they are either low paid or on unwaged benefits. The only way to increase work incentives is to reduce the tapers and this is not affordable
- There should be no further impact or burden on the poorest households and families and this proposal does not protect them from the burden of additional costs.
- They are not of equal importance. Preserving an adequate level of income in vulnerable households is extremely important; if even a 'limited' impact goes beyond this it is not acceptable. A further principle should be overall fairness in sharing the burden caused by central government cuts.
- we think the long term ill should be exempt from council tax even though they are of working age
- We work, full time, very hard, self employed trying to build up business, and as not yet earning beyond our allowances, receive full working tax credit, & hence entitled to CTB. No need to be incentivised as the moment thank you! Full ctb makes it viable to stay self employed, and further develop our emerging & growing business.
- What about someone like myself who is severely disabled and my husband cares for me 24/7, carrying me around out flat and constantly looking after me. We already struggle greatly to pay for food and electricity. Neither of us can work, that is why we are on benefits and my husband carers allowance. Increasing our bills will not lead to encouraging us to work as it is impossible while I am so ill. Being so sick is already a hard enough strain on us. We don't have any luxuries in our life, we don't even have a tv as we can't afford the license or subscription. Where will we find the money from? It sounds very unfair, even many pensioners will be more physically able to raise extra money than someone who is disabled! There is a big difference between those who are physically sick and unable to work than someone who is perfectly fit yet not working. Surely you should support the most vulnerable in our society? I strongly feel that those physically unable to work and carers who are spending all their time looking after someone should continue to be supported.
- What about those who are disabled and unable to work? this is about council tax support, not about jobseeking.
- What are all of the options? As a unemployed graduate professional in receipt of jobseeker's allowance what do you mean by; "Incentivises people to work?" I have been applying for work for years... Where
- What is the criteria for the most vulnerable for example people who have been means tested and had intensive medicals to receive DLA will they be included as the "most vulnerable" I am in this category, in that I am in receipt of DLA.
- Which ever scheme is introduced, will it have an impact on the vulnerable severely disabled people?
- Whilst it is preferable that genuinely vulnerable households (Pensioners / disabled) should not suffer, there seems to be a small amount of non-genuine claimants who

need to be incentivised to work.

- why should someone who lives in a posh part of east sussex get the same amount of council tax as a person who lives in a poor part. people who can't work are gotten punished for not been able to work. go and sort out the people that can work make them go and get a job.
- women men famlies with young childern how can not afford child care or have family to help, as child care is expensive and hard on the family.
- Won't a job and a salary be more of an incentive to people to work?
- Yes I do - council should lobby government a lot more to catch illegal immigrants who seem to be taking all the UK benefits on false houses and false IDs - geniune people like myself who are struggling to live alone in an expensive county/country - i believe 3rd most expensive place in the world!!! should get help - i have certainly paid thousands in tax when employed and therefore should be supported when trying to run a business of my own in a recession! everything goes up and yet councils are trying to take from the poor - its about time the rich were taxed more not the poor or middle classes. There are many savings councils could make - less management tiers to start with and stupid investments on statues in towns - more effective spending should be made and councils should be accountable to their residents not the other way around. The NHS is losing billions on overseas tourist costs - ID cards for healthcare are easy to get online by ANYONE therefore costing NH S billions - the health minister should be working on stopping the NHS being regarded as a Worldwide healthcare charity - charity begins at home IT WAS DESIGNED FOR UK RESIDENTS WHO VE PAID TAX not all and sundry! NHS savings could then be apportioned to councils to continue to fund their poor residents otherwise you will have more homeless on the streets and you dont seem to be doing much about those poor people as it is. If people have sent you their accounts and are clearly not cheating the system you should not save money from those people you should be looking at your own expenses with regards to inappropriate expenditure - small businesses are the future and you should be investing more in those too.
- YES. HOW DO I PAY FOR MY COUNCIL TAX,WHEN I DONT GET ENOUGH BENIFITS,OR IS THE GOVERNMENT GOING TO RAISE MY BENIFIT TO COVER THE DIFFERENCE.
- You can limit the impact by not making cuts. The questions assume the council has to do this and that the best way to incentivise people to work is by threatening them with further poverty. Both questions are politically loaded.
- You cannot "incentivise" people to work when there are not enough jobs for people to do. Also disabled people and those with mental illnesses who find it even harder than everyone else to get jobs due to direct and indirect discrimination will be penalised for not getting work, when it is not their fault that employers won't give them work opportunities.
- Your questions requiring a yes or no answer are biased. I am angry at the government's implication and assumption that benefit reciprients are lazy, instead of looking at the reasons that they are on benefits. They take from the poor rather than the rich. I am ill with allergy, which the medical profession provides no help for. I have spent a fortune trying to help myself. Let those most in a position to, pay, not most of those on benefit who cannot help being. Now I have to get back to trying to get well. Do not reduce benefit and increase the council tax. If you must reduce it, do so by as

little as possible and also increase council tax a bit. A compromise.

- 1] I WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT THAT NOT ALL PENSIONERS ARE IN A VULNERABLE GROUP AND YET THEY ARE PROTECTED AUTOMATICALLY - I DISAGREE WITH THIS PRINCIPLE 2] I AM ALSO CONCERNED THAT "INCENTIVE" TO WORK OFTEN IS TRANSLATED AS PUNISHMENT AND HARDSHIP 3] I FALL INTO AN EXTREMELY VULNERABLE GROUP BECAUSE OF DISABILITY AND CHRONIC INCURABLE ILLNESS BUT DO NOT, BECAUSE OF AGE, RECEIVE ANY HELP WITH HEATING. I HOPE I WON'T BE TARGETED AS MY INCOME IS ALREADY STRETCHED.
- A lot of people are truly unable to work and any payment required by them without increasing other benefits will be detrimental
- COUNCIL TAX [POLL TAX] BY ANOTHER NAME HAS ALWAYS BEEN UNPOPULAR AND UNFAIR AND A BURDEN TO RICH AND POOR. IT HAS NOT BEEN VERY SUCCESSFUL IN RAISING THE REVENUE WE ALL NEED AS THESE CUTS DEMONSTRATE. I THINK IT WOULD BE BETTER TO RETURN TO A SYSTEM OF RATES AND INCOME TAX IN ORDER TO RAISE REVENUE, WITH THOSE WEALTHY PAYING MORE, THE POOR MUCH LESS AND THOSE ON BENEFITS NOT PAYING AT ALL AS THEY DO NOT RECEIVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY CT. I HAVE NOT RECEIVED AN EASY READ GUIDE.
- I AM A PENSIONER BUT AS A FORMER SOCIAL WORKER I AM CONCERNED ABOUT THE IMPACT ON VULNERABLE PEOPLE ESPECIALLY SINGLE PARENTS.
- I AM CONCERNED THAT IN PARTICULAR THAT THE DISABLED [WHOSE INCOME DERIVED MAINLY FROM BENEFITS EG SDA/LDA WHICH AMOUNTS TO LESS THAN £7K P.A.] ARE PROTECTED FROM ANY FURTHER CHARGES. THEIR POSITION IS PRECARIOUS AS THE MAJORITY OF DISABLED HAVE NO ACCESS TO THE LABOUR MARKET. THUS YOUR PRINCIPLE 3 ABOVE SEEMS TO BE QUITE IRRELEVANT.
- I PERSONALLY FIND IT DIFFICULT TO GET WORK.
- I THINK THAT ALL PEOPLE WHO NEED CTAX BENEFIT SHOULD KEEP IT
- JOBSEEKERS AND INCOME SUPPORT ARE A PITTANCE. IT IS CRUEL AND UNNECESSARY TO EXPECT PEOPLE TO PAY COUNCIL TAX FROM THEIR ALREADY MEAGRE INCOMES EVEN THOUGH RELATIVELY SPEAKING IT IS NOT A LOT OF MONEY. CUTTING PEOPLES BENEFITS WILL NOT "INCENTIVISE" THEM TO WORK. IT WOULD HAVE THE OPPOSITE EFFECT BY DEMORALISING THEM. VERY FEW PEOPLE WOULD CHOSE A LIFE ON BENEFITS IF THERE WERE JOBS WITH REASONABLE [IE A LIVING] WAGE.
- NO, EXCEPT THAT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS IMPOSSIBLE TO ANSWER AS TOO LITTLE DETAIL IS GIVEN ON THE CHANGES WHICH IN SOME RESPECTS IS NEITHER LIKELY TO BE ACCURATE NOR HELPFUL IN ASSISTING THE AMOUNT OF COUNCIL TAX TO BE LEVIED . THIS WILL DEPEND ON GOVERNMENT ATTITUDES AND THE POLITICAL PARTY IN POWER! SCHEME 2 - TOTALLY UNREALISTIC CAN ONLY COMMENT THAT TAKEN AS A WHOLE THE EXTRA CHARGED BY THE DISTRICT COUNCIL IS TOO GREAT - THE AREA BORDERING THE COAST IS, IN GENERAL,POORER. THE COASTAL AREA SHOULD BE IN THE BRIGHTON LOCAL TAX AREA
- OTHER BENEFITS ARE BETTER GEARED TOWARDS INCENTIVISING PEOPLE TO WORK
- PROTECTING ELDERLY PEOPLE IS PRIORITY. SECONDARY TO THIS PROTECTING SINGLE PARENTS WHO ARE UNABLE TO WORK OR ON A VERY LOW INCOME.
- PUNISHING THOSE WHO, THROUGH NO FAULT OF THERE OWN, HAVE NO WORK IS

NOT A POLICY I CAN AGREE WITH [PRINCIPLE]

- SCHEME 2 SEEMS UNFAIR IF SERVICES WERE CUT TO ENABLE SOME PEOPLE TO BENEFIT FROM COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT. IT IS ALSO VERY DIFFICULT TO FIND JOBS AS I HAVE EXPERIENCED IN THE PAST ONLY FINDING CASUAL WORK, MAKING FINANCES TO PAY THE BILLS EXTREMELY HARD.
- SOME PEOPLE WILL NOT EVEN LOOK FOR WORK BECAUSE THEY KNOW THEIR SUPPORT WILL BE TAKEN AWAY FROM THEM. IT SHOULD NOT BE DOWN FOR EVERYBODY WHO PAYS COUNCIL TAX TO HAVE THIS INCREASED FOR THE LAZY MINORITY TO BENEFIT FROM
- THE LATER TWO OPTIONS COULD BE IN CONFLICT
- THERE IS NO REASON WHY THE EAST SUSSEX DISTRICTS SHOULD ALL HAVE THE SAME SCHEME. THIS DOES NOT HAPPEN IN OTHER COUNCILS, NOT EVEN IN WEST SUSSEX.
- VERY CRUEL TO PENALISE THOSE ON INCOME SUPPORT, UNEMPLOYED. IT IS NOT AN INCENTIVE BUT A PUNISHMENT FOR THE POOR PEOPLE TODAY WHO FIND THEMSELVES UNEMPLOYED THROUGH NO FAULT OF THEIR OWN. THE GOVERNMENT IS ENTIRELY TO BLAME FOR THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY, AND CONTINUE, THROUGH CUTBACKS, TO MAKE MATTERS EVEN WORSE. MAJORITY OF UNEMPLOYED PEOPLE ARE NOT LAZY LAYABOUTS! I AM A CARER, DO YOU WANT TO PUNISH ME?
- VULNERABLE NEEDS TO BE DEFINED AND TO WORK WITH LOCAL SUPPORT TEAMS I MANAGE A LONG TERM FLOATING SUPPORT SCHEME FOR VULNERABLE CLIENTS OVER 400 CLIENTS ACROSS EAST SUSSEX HOW WILL THE COUNCIL LIAISE WITH SUPPORT AGENCIES
- WHILST I AGREE WITH THE 3RD PRINCIPLE ABOUT FORCING PEOPLE TO GET BACK TO WORK, I DON'T THINK THOSE GENUINELY LOOKING FOR WORK SHOULDN'T BE PENALISED. I MYSELF WAS OUT OF WORK FOR 2 1/2 YEARS BEFORE REJOINING F/T EMPLOYMENT DURING WHICH TIME I MADE EVERY EFFORT TO REGAIN EMPLOYMENT.

- **Q4.c Savings and investments (capital limit)**

If you wish to make any comments on this proposal, please do so below

- £ 6,000 is not a big enough cushion and is not in line with other benefits.
- £16,000 is not a lot of money these days!!
- £16,000 savings is not a large amount especially for pensioners who have worked all their lives. My own savings are far less than this however.
- £6,000 isn't very much in savings and would be rapidly used up by any increase in Council tax. It will make saving for a mortgage impossible, put even more pressure on rental accommodation, and make people's lives more precarious. It will create a poverty trap.
- £6,000 isn't very much in savings and would be rapidly used up by any increase in Council tax. It will make saving for a mortgage impossible, putting even more pressure on rental accommodation, and making people's lives more precarious. It will create a poverty trap.
- £6,000 isn't very much in savings and would be rapidly used up by any increase in Council tax. It will make saving for a mortgage impossible, putting even more pressure on rental accommodation, and making people's lives more precarious. It will create a poverty trap.
- £6000 is a very small safety net, which would be quickly consumed by a CT raise. It creates a poverty trap
- 16000 is already very little. you will discourage savings by penalising those who are trying to save for old age or disaster or mortgage - whatever. the rate of reduction for those over the savings limit is already overly penalising. the limit should definitely not be reduced.
- 6000 is a lot of money to have in savings. Many people have hardly enough to live on each week
- A lot of people are being hit by job losses, their savings protect the well being of their families. They need support.
- A particularly nasty proposal since it discourages people to save for a rainy day, but to spend any savings
- Again any changes should take in to account personal circumstances with a reasonable degree of flexibility
- any savings held would be eaten up by ever-increasing fuel bills, CT, rental increases, car costs...from recent experience, i had 6,000 savings, now i have 2,000 which will be spent on the above even though I work.
- Anybody having savings should get no help until they have no savings left.
- As all prices are increasing the upper limit should stay in place to give council tax payers who may need help in future a chance to get some benefits.
- as someone who doesn't have any savings it is harsh that someone who does have savings of 16.000 should get the help that we should be getting
- Basically people with no savings (or having used them to live on already whilst seeking work) should not pay
- because if they have savings they can afford to pay council tax

- Council Tax, in my opinion should be closely related to ability to pay, whether or not a person is eligible to council tax benefit. I would propose a local tax based on a person's income, like a local income tax. This could result in more money for the local authority to provide excellent and much needed services. It would also be more fair. This I can understand would be very difficult to administer but could be much fairer and could easily cover the amount required by the local authority. Worth a try? What are your thoughts on this?
- Currently you only receive Housing Benefit if you have less than £6,000 in savings. The same should apply to CTB.
- Don't increase hardship.
- For those out of work and claiming assistance I think savings should be taken into account. Those in work and no savings have no discount.
- For those who are in genuine difficult circumstances would not have up to £16,000 in savings
- given other cuts to benefits, £16,000 is not a high level of savings to go through.
- Given savings for many people are non-existent, £6,000 would seem a reasonable figure as a STARTING point for any proposals.
- Having previously had a little savings myself, I know they may be earmarked for retirement to supplement the state pension. A possible compromise might be a staggered system (eg pay 50% over £8,000) instead of all or nothing.
- How are single parents able to provide security for their children and protect them from eventualities such as constantly being moved on from their rented accommodation, with savings of only 6,000?
- how can people with large amounts of savings be classed as low earning
- I agree people who have more than £6,000 in savings should pay council tax.
- I agree with this, although elderly or disabled people with little or no income should not suffer. I assume that this is taken into account already.
- I believe that £16,000 is a reasonable safety-net in today's economy. With jobs so scarce this kind of back-up is necessary. There is no point trying to drive people into jobs that do not exist.
- I disagree with the alternatives because it will cost so much to examine finances so as to know the limit to set. Again I say use the reserves and stop the bypass. Services should not suffer.
- I do not have any. But is what you are saying use savings to pay for taxation, even though a person has little income?
- I don't know of the personal circumstances of the individual's receiving the benefit who have up to 16,000 in savings. There could be a good reason they were awarded the benefit and so I feel it would be unfair of me to judge. However I do feel it would be a better way to make the cuts than taking the benefits off those who are physically unable to work and have no savings and cannot do anything to raise the money. People with savings are in a better situation than someone without.
- I don't wish you to cut anybody's council tax benefit. Take it from the rich instead.
- I feel the prime minister is protecting the rich and hitting the most vulnerable poor.
- I have no savings and my income is not much over the claiming limit for benefit, I am a Pensioner, so why should people like me be asked to pay more council tax for all others that are on various benefits whether working or not?

- I state £2000 as I have a reasonable income and don't have £2000 in savings. Those who work for cash, or are self employed and have good accountants have this kind of money stashed all over the place - many of them claiming benefits as well!
- I think £10k would allow people to still save for deposits for mortgages which would help increase social mobility and reduce dependence on local authority housing and benefits
- i think 10,000 is a more realistic amount.
- I think that, if you get benefits and try to save out of that money upto 6,000 which is as you may agree is unlikely then you should still get help if you own your home and it is too big for you then you should sell and use the money gained to pay your council tax bill
- I think the savings limit should 'match' the current yearly tax free allowance for ISA savings & investments.
- I would hope there would be some exceptions. E.G. If somebody with multiple chronic illnesses got medical retirement early and got a lump sum which took them slightly above the threshold it may be worth considering.
- if a person has £16,000 in a bank account they don't need help with council tax
- If an eligible person has a good reason for retaining their savings, which can be disclosed to and agreed with by the Council, the savings could be deposited in an account with the Council, and interest accrued paid to the Council, whilst the person receives exemption. When the person is paying the tax again, and it is possible to use the funds for the agreed purpose (or an agreed person, if the best use for the money by that time has changed) the funds can be released to that purpose as required. It seems daft, when funds for investment in business and property are not available at affordable rates, to take savings away from people who will later be dependent upon the Council for support as a result. We need to work together for prosperity, not take inconsiderately from each other.
- If people are able to save £6000 then they can pay their council tax
- if people have money like this then they can afford to pay something on their council tax
- If the applicant has been saving, then that person can afford to pay council tax.
- If the capital limit is too low then it penalises those who have been careful with money and may have some put away in case of unexpected repairs to their homes etc. (For example, the replacement of the flat roof on my house cost nearly £2,000!)
- If you are able to save thousands of pounds then you should be able to pay your council tax. Benefit should be there for people who are unable to save any money.
- If you are lucky enough to have savings then you should be able to pay the full Council Tax, whatever your age.
- If you are only able to claim JSA then any savings are used to pay Gas, electricity, water etc. That's not including people who have children who need school uniforms and clothing.
- If you can afford to save this kind of money then you can afford to pay some / all council tax.
- If you can save money, then you are in a lucky place. If it's inheritance then there should be a different limit for this as you could be on a low wage, single parent, pensioner and why should you use inheritance money on living expenses. Depending on how much it is, or it should be put into a child's trust fund, if they have children.
- If you can save over £6,000 on benefits, why would you need help? I would be lucky if I could save

£1,000 :)

- If you do reduce the capital limit it should not be anywhere near £6000
- If you get help with council tax costs you are not allowed more than £6000 in savings, why should it be £16000 for some people.
- if you got saving off 6.000 or more why do you need help
- if you have as much as 16,000 in savings then you dont need help with council tax as you could take it out of your savings and then re save for the following year. but 6,000 seems a bit too low. if it was up to me (not that i would have a clue), i would go a bit higher more like 10,000.
- If you reduce it then hard-working people who are trying to buy a house or help their children through university won't be able to do this.
- If you wish to make any comments on this proposal, please...
- In my opinion £12,000 is a reasonable amount as in reality that is only a savings total of £1,0000 per month or £12,000 for one year.
- In today's world it is extremely hard to save any amount of money. Young people looking to get onto the property ladder must save a great deal more than £16k to be in with a chance of doing so. Penalising those who are hardworking, conciencious, and manage to put away savings is the wrong tactic, and encourages people to be profligate with their money.
- individuals may be maintaining this 'lump sum' to pay for future funeral expenses or suchlike, however the current limit appears generous and could be reduced. however should it be the same for both joint claims and those being made by single householders? could a couple, for example, be reasonably expected to have more 'set aside' than an individual?
- it is a shocking proposal to think that those on benefits will need to pay council tax out of it. this is a terrible attack on the poorest members of society and you should be ashamed of such a proposal
- It is unfair to penalize those who have bothered to save rather than spend. However, there must be a limit.
- It seems fair that those with their own means do not receive help with their council tax payments. Benefits should be reserved for those who really need it.
- It should be left as it is or raised to £20,000
- It will be so hard on poor people.
- It would create a poverty trap as £6000 is very little in savings and would very quickly be used up. It would make saving for a deposit for a mortgage almost impossible.
- just because some one has been careful in the past and have not smoked , drunk, gambled, had holidays abroad or wasted their moony but have as previous governments have wanted saved in ISA's, pension funds, they should not now be penalised.
- Leave people's savings out of the equation
- Lewes is very short of housing, yet lowering the savings limit penalises those who have managed to save for a mortgage deposit or those who face a period of low income at the end of their working life who have saves for their retirement - for example a couple in their late 50s who have managed to pay off the mortgage on a modest one bedroomed flat but know they must save for maintenance charges/costs like replacing the boiler when they retire.

- Like many claiming this benefit, I do not have any savings.
- Limits discourage people from saving for a mortgage deposit or for their retirement, which will reduce pressure on housing benefit and pensions. It disincentivises people from doing things to help themselves, as they are then penalised for it by having their benefits taken away.
- Lowering the limit is a good idea, but the elderly should be exempt from this as they have saved for their retirement and thus should not be included
- make the rich pay more council tax will it help people who all ready pays some towards council tax every month
- Not many working class people who pay council tax have savings of more than £1000 , so that should be the limit
- People are struggling and what you are proposing is to leave unemployed people having to take out money from their meager poverty benefit of £71/week to pay a contribution to council tax!! You should be ashamed to even think about it.... particularly as the pension age is being put back and back, you are going to have effectively people who you consider today as being amongst the most vulnerable, who have more needs growing older in heating..etc and penalise them further if they are over 60 and unemployed.. I am sick of this. People should be out in the street and not give in.
- People need to save money in order to buy property.
- people saving money for their children's education who know when we will pay for the public schools!
- People should be encouraged to save and not penalised for being prudent.
- People should have to use their savings to pay for the council tax.
- People that can afford to save money shouldn't be given help. People like myself, a working single mother who cannot afford to save each month should be given more help than those who have £6-16,0000 in the bank.
- People who find themselves unemployed need all the resources that they have to try to get back to work and to make sure they can protect their family. Savings just disappear when we need to pay rent or a mortgage for weeks before being entitled to benefits. So basically it is about dragging people to the bottom faster, make them poor because the government has decided that it is these people who are going to pay for mistakes made by themselves and by people who have a lot of power ... well too much of it (banking system, the speculators, the fact that all the public finance are now in the 'hands' of private financiers.....on international markets.... NO NO NO.... we need to be able to save, to ensure we can survive... so if someone is made redundant they get money as compensation .. you take it back so they go back down the bottom. Great, thank for your help.
- People who have that much in savings should be paying their own council tax.
- people who have worked to save money for retirement should not be penalised .
- Please consider those who work in the area and may temporary stuggle through poor wage to pay the council tax. Once my house is sold I will be looking towards Lewes District Council to enable me to find a new place to live. A greater cost than if I was provided the right support at the time.
- Reducing the capital limit would discourage people from saving, and would penalize people who might have received a lump sum, perhaps from a legacy, and should be encouraged to save it towards future pension needs.
- Reduction as proposed excessively harsh and de-incentivises saving.

- SAVING matters & should not be even further discouraged (i.e. present low interest & threats to pensions). 4.a & 4.b are at cross purposes. 4.a "NO." Savings limit should not be reduced. 4.b is only if you AGREE but includes the current £16,000, which if chosen means you DISAGREE. The limit should remain at £16,000.
- savings are for emergency's , and with the cost of every thing going up this is a incredulous thing to do .
- Should have no savings before being considered.I am hostile to support for anyone who has savings.
- Sorry,my English not well.
- Surely we want to encourage people to save, not punish them for it.
- The £16,000 capital limit should remain. Reducing it would provide a disincentive for people to save and lead to greater dependency on benefits.
- The low paid as well as Pensioners and disabled would not have more than £16,000 in savings.
- The value differance between £6000 and 16000 bears no relation as the savings would be erroded in a very short time and would then require a fresh application and therefore additional expense to the council making the savings worthless and at the same time preventing people to use the money for they had intended it for. ie emergencys
- This £6000 figure is far too low [a reduction of £10000!]it penalises people who have tried to save a small amount of money and will act as a disincentive for people to save in the future.
- This idea penalises people who have saved, thereby encouraging the culture of unaffordable borrowing which has contributed to the economic crisis which the scheme is a response to. The circularity of this is appalling and shortsighted.
- This is just penalising people for having done the right thing and managed to accumulatesmall savings for a rainy day
- This is news to me, my benefits were reduced until I had less than £6,000
- This is the all to easy option. Just lets take some more of peoples savings. Again and Again.
- This will only create further poverty
- those of disability benefits,oaps should not have there benefit changed and should recieve full council tax benefit
- to be frank i thought that this benifit was for the poorest of the poor. even £6000 is a fortune to me! you could pay a years council tax up front on those savings.
- We have nowhere near this level of savings, but if we did, it could be vital as a buffer (and a psychological buffer) for potential sudden costs (funeral costs, damage to home, sudden vehicle repairs, loss of self employment earnings due to ill heathl/accident, legal costs) and or nest egg for child's future education. A very few things can go wrong in a short time to gobble up this amount.
- what if people have no Savings How will they be affected !! as i have none
- what is the point , as you councillor have made your minds up about this all ready,
- why penalise those who saved for retirement
- Why should anyone with savings receive benefits when others have no savings at all. They should have to live on their savings as I had to when I had a lump sum from a divorce settlement years ago. If they

are to receive the benefit it should be based on their savings and how much they have.

- Would the £6000 include childrens savings accounts where grandparents set up standing orders for their grandchildren?
- You risk trapping people in poverty and discouraging saving if you lower the limit
- PEOPLE WHO HAVE £6,000 OR ABOVE SAVED OR INVESTED DO NOT FALL INTO 'VULNERABLE' CATEGORIES AND HAVE INCOME TO SUPPORT THEM IN A CRISIS.
-
- £16,000 IS NOT A LOT OF MONEY IN THESE DAYS AND MAY BE ALL SOMEONE HAS TO MATCH OLD AGE CARE FROM A LIFE TIME OF SAVINGS.
-
- THE CURRENT £16K LIMITATION HAS BEEN IN PLACE FOR MANY YEARS; THIS HAS LOST REAL VALUE DUE TO COST INFLATION, POOR INTEREST RATES AND THEREFORE SHOULD BE UPGRADED AS SUGGESTED.
-
- CTAX IS TOO MUCH FOR EVERYONE BUT THOSE IN NEED SHOULD NOT BE REDUCED
- MOST PEOPLE IN COUNCIL HOUSING ARE LOW WAGED. LIMITING SAVINGS WILL DISCOURAGE THEM FROM SAVING; PERHAPS FOR A HOME OF THEIR OWN.
-
- HUGE CHANGE FOR CURRENT PASSPORTED IS/MEANS TESTED PASSPORTED CLAIMANTS IF £16,000 [IS] THRESHOLD IS REDUCED - CLAIMANTS WITH SAVINGS OVER ANY NEW THRESHOLD AND IS £16,000 THRESHOLD STAND TO LOSE OVERNIGHT - 100% CTB. [THERE MAY NOT BE MANY IN THIS CATEGORY???] [2] NON PASSPORTED CLAIMANTS WHO HAVE SAVINGS BETWEEN ANY NEW THRESHOLD AND CURRENT £16,000 - THEY WILL FEEL PENALISED FOR HAVING 'BOTHERED' TO SAVE.
- I THINK IT IS UNFAIR ON PEOPLE WHO HAVE NO OR LOW SAVINGS TO BE PUT IN THE SAME CRITERIA AS PEOPLE WHO HAVE HIGH SAVINGS. THIS IS WHY I AGREE THE THRESHOLD SHOULD BE LOWERED.
- £16,000 SAVINGS [IF YOU ARE LUCKY ENOUGH TO HAVE IT] ISN'T A LOT OF MONEY. AND DECREASING IN VALUE EVERY DAY. HIGH EARNERS CAN AFFORD TO PAY MORE. TARGET THESE AND NOT THE POOR.
- SOME PEOPLE YOUNG AND OLDER MAY SAVE TO PAY FOR EG FUNERAL EXPENSES OR UNTOLD EMERGENCIES SO THEY WOULD NOT FEEL PRESSURED FROM TRYING TO SAVE A LITTLE. I PERSONALLY CANNOT AFFORD TO SAVE ON A LOW INCOME.
- IF YOU HAVE OVER £16,000 IN SAVINGS YOU SHOULD BE PAYING YOUR COUNCIL TAX YOURSELF AND NOT EXPECT TO GET HELP FROM THOSE WHO HAVE ABOVE £16,000 SAVINGS. THIS WILL INCREASE COUNCIL TAX.
-
- THIS DISCOURAGES FOLK SAVING FOR A DEPOSITR ON A HOME
- PEOPLE WITH VIRTUALLY NO SAVINGS, IE: UP TO £400.00 SHOULD CONTINUE TO GET 100% COUNCIL TAX BENEFIT, IF IN RECEIPT OF INCOME SUPPORT, JOBSEEKERS ALLOWANCE.
- If people with savings in excess of £8,000 pay or at least contribute to paying council tax the real benefits will go to those without. I don't think it's necessarily fair to support people who have

considerable savings which could cover their council tax. However, those without savings [or with less savings] surely would struggle to find the money to pay if already on miniscule benefits and living on hand to mouth existence.

Q5.b Second adult rebate

If you wish to make any comments on this proposal, please do so below

- 2 people may be working but still earn minimum wage it should stop when each person earns OVER 20,000 pounds
- ABSOLUTELY NOT! The austerity measures have hit the younger generation the hardest. Many who are perfectly employable are out of work which means they often have to move back in with their parents. The above would put a burden on family relationships not to mention increase youth homelessness.
- Again anyone who needs help should have some level of rebate to help them live in a reasonable manner. Prices are increasing and taking away help will contribute to more poverty in the district.
- All households should be judged on income and savings not who lives in the property
- am i dreaming! they dont qualify because they have too much money so they can afford it but because they have a mate living with them who cant they get a discount! no wonder you cant afford to pay the actual poor the benefit.
- As long as the named resident(s) of the property has a high enough income not to qualify for Council Tax Benefit, then it should make no difference concerning who else is living at that same address. The Council Tax assessment should be based on the highest income.
- As mentioned previously this should be dependent on the individual circumstances as it could seriously impact some people that are struggling to get by
- As this cut would raise so little income for the council, what is the purpose of removing a rebate which has for many years past been considered fair to offer to people in this position? Can it not only mean that they are a small and therefore easy target?
- because in my case the second adult can not work due to mental disability
- because it may be their mum or dad living with them who may be retired/ill
- Because of the shortage of housing in the area we should be doing everything possible to encourage people on low income to live in other people's households - this measure would discourage them.
- can the low-earning second adult be charged a small amount of CT? say 20% ? and the high-earning adult pays full CT?
- carers should be exempt from this removal rebate and should keep there entitlement
- Didn't know this rebate existed.
- Difficult one. I didn't know you can get 25% discount on a second adult living with you. Same as the single person's discount. If that adult isn't in full time education and is working earning a good wage then yes I proberbly agree. But if the adult is in higher education and the parent/s haave to support them then no, it should be kept the same as now.
- Don't object to the discount but imagine it is probably costly to administrate

- Giving a 25% discount in this way encourages people to take in lodgers and provide much needed housing.
- I cannot relate to these circumstances.
- I think it would depend on how high the overall household income is to determine whether the 25% discount off their bill would be applicable, therefore this should be decided on an 'individual household' basis. There should be an 'overall household income figure' or threshold.
- I think you need to judge people as individuals not as groups, as everyone's situation is different
- If income is too high to qualify for CTB, then they ought to be able to pay the full CT amount.
- If people are joint tenants then income should be assessed as a household. Those who house share and rent only a room should each be individually responsible for their own council tax
- If people have others living with them, I think not unreasonable that the 25% discount is removed as no doubt the home holder "gains" from the presence of the other person.
- If people share accommodation there should be some reward. As opposed to individuals with large large properties with no one in them.
- If that second person is on a low income and is asked to contribute to CTB, it will put them out of pocket. Council tax should be calculated by the income of the main householder and not set by per band rating. Currently, a live in partner does qualify for a 25% deduction on the house owner.
- If the first only JUST qualifies for benefit, and the 2nd is in the low income bracket, then they together are in danger of being heavily over stretched by removal of this rebate. An incremented means tested reduction rather than automatic complete removal may be a fairer option.
- if the first person can afford the council tax then it is up to them to ask the second person to help towards the bill not expect other people to help. that is what i would do if it was me.
- If the person is disabled and they have a permanent carer whom is a family member then no
- If the second person has a low income, you need to evaluate the circumstances ie means testing. Unable to work long hours due to ill health.
- if they have a second person then that should be added to the first person, the second person is then given a separate bill that asks for the rest of the amount.
- If you wish to make any comments on this proposal, please...
- If you wished to make radical changes so that the Local Tax is payable per person, instead of per property, and each person were assessed on the basis of the value of the property where they live and their own particular income, it would probably work out more fairly.
- In the current situation, many young adults are forced to live at home because they cannot find work/housing. This scheme could potentially put pressure on family

relationships

- It all depends on that persons ability to contribute to the households budget, if it is so low that the cost outways his/her contribution then no so a calculation as exists now needs to be used.
- It depends if the second adult has the ability to increase their income, what if they have been trying to get work but can't like many of the people I know. They can only get limited work and try constantly to get off the breadline or are they disabled and either totally unable to work or only able to work a limited amount of time due to ill health. The proposal is asking the impossible of some people, they won't be able to find the money and then the likelihood is you then need to send enforcement officers to collect money, if they fail then you end up paying more out to enforce the changes. There is no logic here. You can't squeeze money out where there is none. Protect the most vulnerable and genuine people please. Your proposals are assuming that those not working are lazy. There are often very good reasons for personal circumstances.
- it should only be the case for a spouse or partner
- It will increase homelessness.
- It will put pressure on family relationships and increase youth homelessness
- its time the working folk get something back as the none workers get everything paid for an live a better life than working families doesnt make sense
- LDC will only make it harder for the disadvantaged to get jobs and live independently
- living alone and struggling I am not aware of what this benefit is I do know that its about the same to live in cost terms for two as it is for one person.
- Many young adults are finding it financially difficult to get jobs and live independently. This measure may put pressure of family relationships and lead to an increase in youth homelessness.
- Many young adults are finding it financially difficult to get jobs and live independently. This measure may put pressure of family relationships and lead to an increase in youth homelessness.
- Many young adults are finding it financially difficult to get jobs and to live independently. This measure will put pressure of family relationships and lead to an increase in youth homelessness.
- Many young adults are finding it hard to get employment Such a proposal would cause greater family strife and young homelessness
- my mum gets a second adult rebate because I live with her. She is still supporting me. I cannot afford on the minimum wage to rent anywhere. I work 4 days a week,I am under 25. I cannot find the money to train. Without my mother's support I cannot move forward. The more you take away... the more impossible you make our lives, and the help she gives me so I can organise training. So you want young people to be responsible but you take away all the support ..
- No, its hard enough with young people staying at home, unable to find work or claim benefits or afford a mortgage.
- PARENTS AND FRIENDS ARE HOUSING ADULTS WHO WOULD OTHERWISE BE HOMELESS AND DOING THE WORK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD HAVE DONE IE. PROVIDE

AFFORDABLE HOUSING. HOW MUCH DOES IT COST THE COUNCIL TO HOUSE THE HOMELESS PEOPLE WHO ARE ELIGIBLE FOR HELP ?. WHAT HAPPENS TO THE MANY WHO AREN'T -ARE WE GOING TO SEE HORDES OF STREET-HOMELESS AGAIN IN BRIGHTON ETC

- reduce it to 10% discount.there ought to be an incentive for those who assist with the housing problem.
- Removing support for the 46 people living in presumably low income households will have no beneficial impact re increasing council revenue.
- Savings would be almost negligible but loss of flexibility to relieve hardship in particular circumstances could be extremely damaging.
- So many young adults are now unemployed and living with their parents. Again, these families and individuals should not be placed under further financial strain.
- Sorry,my English not well .
- Take it from the rich.
- That would be unfair as lots of single people live in houses where there could be a family of four or more in the same size property paying the same amount.
- the 'benefit' is presumably in lieu of 'rent loss' or 'low contribution towards household rent' that is sustained through the low income second adult not being able to pay any more. whilst the number seems low, and it may be reasonable to offer the potential for withdrawal, this may well result in hardship for the 'higher income' individual who, at the extreme, could be forced through economic necessity to render the other party homeless. the benefit arrangements help to avoid this outcome, and therefore it would appear inappropriate to withdraw the benefit. as once gone it'll always be gone, the key impact is what the effect would be on those affected and given the numbers, perhaps an approach could be made to ascertain the specific circumstances of each case either as a component of the new scheme or in assisting in appraising whether it would be appropriate to discontinue it.
- The householder may be the main person registered but the proposed scapping of second adult rebate would penalise the second adult who has a low income making them in a worse position to meet their part of the council tax bill. what happens when the second adult cannot meet the demanded payments?
- The savings would be minimal but households are disincentivised from taking in people on low incomes, who then have to be housed elsewhere
- The second adult rebate is very important to lone parents who have (very) young people still living with them. These young people stay at home mostly because they cannot afford to live independent lives. These parents are trying to support and guide these young people and meet the cost of doing so
- There is more fraud with this benefit than warrants the rebate
- They are getting the benefits of having their mortgage paid by someone else which is earning them stability and financial security
- This arrangement seems senseless and must go.
- this encourages people to make homes available for young and low income people to live independently. It will reduce pressure on council housing and on the rental market. Its

benefits clearly outweigh its costs.

- this has the potential to lead to more homelessness, which could in the long run be more expensive for the council
- This is too difficult to enforce and should be abolished
- This proposal fails to take account of the potential vulnerability of the second adult eg disabled, elderly etc
- this should be according to why the second adult is on low pay.this person could be elderly pensioner, or some one unable to hold down a well paid job for medical reasons. they may be shop worker or even work for the council at a low level. This should be means tested , a true person in need would not object.
- This would perhaps depend on how too high their income is.
- This would put strain on families and relationships and could mean that young people are forced to move out which could mean higher levels of homelessness in the current housing situation.
- This would remove the incentive for people to house share and make more efficient use of of the limited housing Council and private available in the LDC Area
- We should be supporting our young people through these difficult economic times that they did not create.
- Where will that second adult live if this is their home? they may become homeless and an additional burden on the Council, that doesn't save any money!
- Why give a rebate to someone who earns enough to pay. With another person in the home they actually have two incomes regardless of their relationship.
- why should the second adult rebate apply if the first person has an income that is too high.
- Will this stop people offering accommodation to those in need?
- Would this actually save that much money?
- THE MONEY TO BE SAVED FROM THIS SOURCE IS SURELY OUTWEIGHED BY THE ADMINISTRATION COSTS INVOLVED IN THE SAID CAHRGE. BASED ON THE NUMBER [46] YOU ARE QUOTING IF THIS IS AN ACCURATE REPRESENTATION. MAYBE 25% COULD BE REPLACED BY 10%? SOME SAVING.
- IS THERE A RISK THAT THIS PERSON WOULD BE MADE HOMELESS IF HOUSEHOLDER DECIDED HE/SHE WOULD BE BETTER OFF FINANCIALLY CLAIMING THE 25% DISCOUNT THAN ACCOMMODATING THE PERSON ON A LOW INCOME? WOULD THIS UNFAIRLY TARGET YOUNG ADULTS ON A LOW INCOME?
- THIS SEEMS A WAY OF SAVING MONEY THAT SEEMS FAIR AS LONG AS IT IS INCOME AND NOT SAVINGS THAT ARE CUT
- RARELY SEEN - UNDERSTOOD BY FEW
- I AGREE WITH THIS AMENEDMENT AS THE MAIN HOUSEHOLD PROVIDER COULD HAVE VERY HIGH INCOME/SAVINGS WHICH SHOULD ALLOW THEM TO COMFORTABLY PAY THEIR COUNCIL TAX WITHOUT REQUIRING A DEDUCTION. IT IS UP TO THE MAIN

PROVIDER TO SUPPORT LOW INCOME TENANTS LIVING IN THEIR PROPERTY.

- MY MOTHER LIVES WITH ME. SHE HAS HER PENSIONS WHICH SHE PAYS FOR THE MAJORITY OF OUR BILLS. THE MONEY I EARN ON MY LOW INCOME JUST ABOUT COVERS THE MORTGAGE REPAYMENTS.
- IF 2 OR MORE PEOPLE ARE IN THE HOUSEHOLD THE WHIOLE AMOUNT OF COUNCIL TAX SHOULD BE PAID
- Although this affectes only 46 people, I don't think they should be entitled to a discount when they can afford to pay. If the second person living with them has a low income, they could be contributing to the household, or at least living there without paying any council tax. So surely in that respect they are lucky.
- SECOND PERSON ON LOW INCOME HE/SHE WILL SUFFER.

Q6.d Non-dependant adult contributions

If you disagree with the amounts in questions 6a, 6b or 6c, what do you think the deductions should be?

- 0
- £10.00 per week
- £5 ONLY PER WEEK
- 6. a £10 a week would be more realistic
- 6.a and 6.c should be NIL.
- 6.b & 6.c Find this difficult to follow and therefore impossible to comment on
- 6.c - It should depend on how much money the non-dependant adult has coming in (if any) from other sources if not from earnings, also how much savings they have.
- 6a - Nothing 6c - they should stay the same.
- 6a that should stay the same nil 6b and 6c should go up a bit but not double
- 6C IF SOMEONE IS NOT CLAIMING BENEFITS WHILE EARNING IT IS PROBABLY THAT THE PERSON THEY LIVE WITH CARRIES THE BURDEN ,SAVING THE BENEFIT SYSTEM LARGE SUMS .WHERE IS THE LOGIC IN DISINCENTIVISING THIS ? 6B THIS DEPENDS ON THE TAKE-HOME INCOME OF THE SECOND PERSON . IF IT IS ABOVE ABOUT 14.000 ...THEY CAN AFFORD TO CONTRIBUTE TO HOUSEHOLD COSTS THEY THEMSELVES SHOULD PAY COUNCIL TAX, NOT THE CLAIMANT THEY LIVE WITH
- A percentage of what the claimant's and the other resident adult's disposable income (after necessities have been paid) happens to be.
- According to income
- all depends on the amount of income that is coming into the household
- An increase is unavoidable but to double the amount is not acceptable. I feel it should be a percentage increase taking into account a non dependents monthly income to the household after tax and national insurance has been deducted.
- As it is now I lose a amount according to there income but many be you should only assess as to whatkeep they payrather than earn because u don't charge your kids there council tax share
- As they are at present. People are already living at subsistence levels if not below.
- As they are now
- As they are.
- as they currently are
- Claimants living with non-earning non-dependant adults should not have deductions.
- Current non-dependant deduction should be frozen as they currently are. They have been substantially increased already.

- deductions from current situation should not change until a more measured system of changing council tax is worked out.
- dependant on the household income not what is on a table
- Don't know
- Each claim has to be looked at individually,
- Each person should be treated as an individual regardless of the wealth or income of other members of the household.
- fair amount go in the middle
- give them more money and not less money,
- Given the level of income of claimants, what to most wage earners would seem an insignificant amount would nevertheless be a significant proportion of the weekly income of someone on benefits. In which case, I do not believe there is any justification in increasing deductions.
- I am not too sure I understand this set of questions as I thought all people paid council tax unless they are unemployed
- I disagree because you are taking money away from lower paid people, whether pensioners or non-earners.
- I do not disagree with the proposals but i think that things should be examined in a case to case basis and people that are working but earn a very small amount over the limits are but are not able to meet basic needs are not punished by people that now how to play the systems
- I dont think it should double but increase slightly.
- I don't think there should be any deductions.
- I don't think there should be deductions. Adult children don't live with their parents unless they are unable to afford a home of their own. Financially penalising the parent isn't going to change that situation.
- I don't understand the questions. By the way I used to design questionnaires for the Department for National Savings as it was then - I'm concerned you will get invalid data from people who also don't understand. Have you tested these? Am I just having an off day?
- I feel the current scheme should be maintained to support people with low incomes
- I think discretion and variability in accordance with with particular circumstances should remain.
- i think that all the income that is coming into the household should be taken as bulk/family earnings and the currant scheme used so that if the earnings come to an amount that is more than the applicable amount they dont get any benifit. how the family divide up the the amounts for each child and themselves is their responsibility. or
- I think the amount of deductions does not justify the cost of administering the scheme. Therefore there should be no deductions
- I think the deductions should be dependent upon the non-dependant's income.

- if someone is earning a wage/receiving benefits they should all pay something towards council tax, whether it be £5 a week or £50 a week, it should go on what they receive.
- If someone is not claiming any of the above benefits and are not earning, the deduction should only be taken from the tenant.
- if the amount that the claimant is contributing has been appropriately determined [ie 50% for a household fully shared] then it would seem inappropriate to effectively penalise that individual for having to claim benefit, which is what such a deduction would represent. however, not all joint occupation arrangements are equitably based, so it may well be appropriate to deduct such an amount, the purpose of which, presumably, would be to redress any potential imbalance eg if the proportion paid by [and claimed by] the benefit recipient is inappropriately skewed. However, assuming the benefit claimant could do nothing to redress the balance, they will be inappropriately penalised for circumstances outside of their influence/control
- If the non dependant is not working or claiming how are they supposed to help with costs?
- If they are living with the claimant and not earning or on a benefit surely they must be dependent on the claimant; unless they have a private income and are paying rent. Or maybe they are staying temporarily in which case it shouldn't affect the support given.
- If you disagree with the amounts in questions 6a, 6b or 6...
- I'm afraid I've found the wording to confusing to understand the questions in this section!
- In 6.c I do not believe there should be any changes, at the present time there are too many people that are having benefits squeezed especially for health reasons that are being told they can work even if jobs not available how are they expected to survive
- It should be income based and done on circumstance. You could be 18 a single parent. You pay different amounts for different wage amounts. I think it's a bit much doubling the amount. If you are over 18, not in education and have an income you should pay towards their council tax, but income based. They have to learn to support themselves at some point, but not to be left without money.
- it would depend on how much someone gets paid
- LEAVE ALL PRESENT THRESHOLDS INTACT.
- Left as it is
- Maintain status quo
- maybe £1/£2 per week
- My income based jobseekers set me a limit on what the law says we have to live on, in our case £209 per week, how would I be able to make up the deficit if I have to pay a small portion towards our council tax?
- Nil
- nil
- nil
- Nil
- nil

- nil
- nil
- nil
- Nil
- Nil
- NIL
- Nil
- nil
- No change
- No change
- no change
- no change
- no change
- No change
- No Change
- no change
- No change should be made.
- No deductions
- No deductions.
- NO deductions. the proposals are far too sweeping and do not reflect individual needs.
- Non dependent deductions should be reduced at least by half. There is substantial anecdotal evidence that these deductions increase youth homelessness.
- Non-dependant deductions increase tension within a household and can lead to family breakdown, an increase in demand for housing and even an increase in homelessness.
- None
- none
- None
- none
- none
- None
- none for 6b,6c
- none its that simple
- None of your questions include the benefits of disabled. Could you not add into your proposal a differentiation of those on Job Seekers and Employment Support Allowance to

those on benefits such as Disability Living Allowance and other sickness benefits? I don't feel we should be put into the same category for such decisions.

- None. No change. Hence disagreeing
- not double percentage more 25% poss
- not quite sure what this means.
- Not sure
- not sure
- Not to sure if you mean people with children that go to college will have to pay
- People who work should benefit more not those claiming income support or jsa
- REMAIN AS CURRENT NIL
- Remain as they are.
- Remain on the same basis as at present.
- Remain the same
- Same
- same as now
- Should stay the same
- small increase
- Sorry,my English not well.
- stay as it is
- stay as it is providing it is not made up from fraudulent claims
- stay the same
- Stay the same.
- Still NIL, why should you expect the other person to pay all the Council Tax?
- Taking £5 or doubling the amount will only cause more poverty on the most vulnerable. Those on a higher earnings of over £45,000 per ann should pay a higher amount
- the deduction should be at least as possible, as they cant afford it at the moment which affects there human rights.
- The deductions should increase to 100% of the rebate immediately.
- The proposals just incentivise the other adult to move out and claim additional benefits, such as Housing Benefit. This will probably cost more in the long term.
- The same as before.
- the whole household's income should be taken into consideration - why should single people with no children or people living with them to help them be penalised? of course non dependents who are earning should be paying the council tax

- There is no guarantee that the other adult is making any contribution to the claimant's income if they are waged; if the other adult is not waged, nor in receipt of any other benefit, then they most probably are not making any contribution to the household income, in fact probably the reverse, so why double the deduction. In fact there seems to be an anomaly as things stand currently - why is there a deduction for an 18 year old not in any employment at the same level as one who is working fewer than 16 hours a week?
- THERE SHOULD BE NO CHANGE IN THE DEDUCTIONS
- There should be no change.
- There should not be any deductions in these cases.
- there shouldn't be a deduction
- These deductions should remain the same.
- They should remain unchanged
- This is just hitting at those who have little money to live on...and who are facing difficulties to change their lives. You are making it harder and then you will tell us that we must do better... harassment.
- This is making things way too complex. trying to get non-dependent adults to contribute to the household is fair enough, BUT is can only be done by amicable negotiation within the family, not imposed by outside.
- Why punish someone for helping to house someone in an area where affordable housing is almost non-existent.
- why should the claimant have to suffer, the extra money should come from the non dependant who has an income or earnings
- Would have to know what the disposable income was after essentials. This is too nebulous to respond seriously.
- You know this is going to affect those already struggling most... also women single parents with over 16 years old not in education or work.. who are struggling ... what do you think will happen? There will be increased pressure to turn them out... homelessness...? Certainly going to help these parents taken responsibility and provide more sustained support or hang on to continue to provide guidance for these young people...
- TO SIMPLE 'DOUBLE' DEDUCTIONS ACROSS THE BOARD SEEMS GROSSLY UNFAIR. IF A NON-DEPENDANT IS WORKING THEY MAY ALSO BE ON A LOW INCOME SO A FAMILY OF 1 CLAIMANT, I NON-DEPENDANT COULD BE HIT REALLY HARD
- NOTHING. THESE CASES WILL NOT BE RICH PEOPLE THEY WILL BE PEOPLE WHOSE INCOME IS ONLY JUST OVER THE CT BENEFIT LIMIT
- NIL
- I DON'T THINK THERE SHOULD BE REDUCTIONS
- IMPOSSIBLE TO ANSWER THIS QUESTION
- 6.e.a. WILL YOU HAVE DIFFERENT TREATMENT FOR UNDER 25S ON INCOME RELATED BENEFIT - ALREADY ON A LOW INCOME IF JSA/IS OR ASSESSMENT PHASE ESA 6.e.c. ALIGN WITH 6.a 6.e.b. SEEMS DRACONIAN - CAN THERE BE LESSER THAN 10% DEDUCTION

- UNSURE AS I THINK IT SHOULD BE DONE ON INDIVIDUAL CIRCUMSTANCES IE IS THE NON-DEPENDANT DISABLED OR HAVE MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS
- AGAIN-TAKING MONEY FROM THE WORSE OFF IS NOT A POLICY/PRINCIPLE I CAN AGREE ON.
- NIL
- NIL
- NIL. BECAUSE AS WAS FOUND WITH THE POLL TAX, IT IS VERY DIFFICULT TO GET MONEY FROM A NON EARNING RETURNED CHILD
- NIL
- IT SHOULD BE BASED ON THEIR INCOME BUT A FAIR DEDUCTION SHOULD BE MADE RATHER THAN WEEKLY, FORTNIGHTLY OR MONTHLY, £6, SAY £10 OR £20.
- none
- I don't know, but to double might be a little too much and have a big effect on a household. If someone is not earning or claiming benefits, where would the household be expected to get the rent from? Surely that is slightly unreasonable. I would propose that these cases are considered individually; what are the reasons for not working or claiming?
- I PUT DISAGREE, BUT REALLY DON'T KNOW AS I AM DISABLED
-

Q6.e Non-dependant adult contributions

If you wish to make any comments on this proposal, please do so below.

- £5 is a lot of money for people on benefits. These measures would put pressure on families and relationships and would punish people for housing another person and could lead to people ending up homeless. These plans do not take into account the individuals who may be unable to live independently.
- 6.c should be made to claim if not working.
- 6a should stay at nil, 6b, doubling the deduction from the claimant reduces the income of the household and offends against the principal of making work pay if the non dependant adult is expected to make up the shortfall.
- A better way of saving money would be to incentivise more people living together.
- again this is likely to lead to more homelessness amongst youngpeople
- Again this will cause homelessness. The non dependant adult may be vulnerable in all sorts of ways(mental illness not diagnosed)
- Again, your starting point assumes you need to make cuts. You don't.
- Austerity is making people suffer. I support an increase in council tax rates in order to protect services, the working poor, the disabled, and benefits claimants
- Because of the shortage of housing in the district, claimants should be given an incentive to house family members and friends.
- benefit entitlement ought not be diverting money from the economic need of the claimant towards the better off, whatever the specific agreement existing between any two parties may be. however, the 'cost' in terms of maintaining a lower amount which the benefit claimant would have to pay irrespective of personal circumstances appears hard, and possibly this is why there has not been such a penalty featuring as an element of the benefit regime previously. placing pressure on local councils to make decisions which effectively end a fundamental feature of a broader [national] scheme seems inappropriate.
- Benefits are paid to those in need. They will already be contributing, by negotiation with what is affordable, to the householder(s) and thus to the Council Tax.
- Claimants should not be punished for housing someone else, it is unfair to the claimant and encourages homelessness. The non- dependant adult may have as yet, undiagnosed mental health problems.
- Claimants should not be punished for housing someone else, it is unfair to the claimant and encourages homelessness. The non- dependant adult may have as yet, undiagnosed mental health problems.
- Claimants should not be punished for housing someone else. the non dependent adult could have mental illness
- Claimants should pay more towards council tax

- collect deficit required from council taxes by increasing taxes for SECOND HOME OWNERS.
- Depends on the income. Means testing would ensure that those whose earnings from work only just match or are only just higher than if they received benefits would not suddenly find themselves de-incentivised to work...
- do not know enough about Council Tax Support to comment.
- doubling the amount of council tax a working non dependent pays seems quite harsh if their earnings are low
- Doubling the deduction seems to be totally arbitrary and takes no account of individual circumstances.
- Each claim has to be looked at individually, it may not be a family member, It could be some other circumstances that have persons living with them. Not everyone claims benefits.
- every one needs their bins emptied , and a lot of people on benefits get reductions for other services from other suppliers, not available to those who work and have managed to save by not wasting their money.
- Given income of claimants, a some which to most wage earners would seem insignificant would be significant proportion of the income of someone on benefits. Thus, I it is unfair to increase deductions.
- I am confused as this does not seem to make allowances for non-dependant adults who receive income support or ESA on the basis of ill health.
- I am stuck on my own, & feel unfair to coment. If one of my sons was working & living with me I'd get the flags out.
- I am surprised no mention has been made of those on disability benefits. It feels like we have been totally left out of the consideration!
- i currently claim ESA and because of this i now have to pay almost full CT. this does not follow your: 'claiming ESA does not affect CTB' statement.
- I don't understand these questions!
- I found this difficult to understand, but i feel that benefiy should be related to the income of the claimant, if another adult lives in the house, then they should pay a fair contribution via either housekeeing, rent etc and this should be considered as part of the income of the claimant, if this is already done then i dont think they should be penalised further, however if they choose to support the non dependant & not declare any monies as rent/housekeeping then they should get a reduction in their benefit, as they are keeping their own household income low unnecessarily. (I hope that makes sense)
- I refer back to precious responses. Stop the bypass and save the bureaucracy.
- I think it is appalling that this government's proposal to stop or reduce Council Tax Benefit is even being considered. There are people, such as myself, in a situation where we have no choice but to claim money towards rent and council tax, due to circumstances beyond our control. With rising energy bills etc, we are now in danger of going back to Victorian times where the rich sit pretty while the poorer freeze to death or are left homeless!!!

- I truly believe you have to look at each person individually...you cant look at them as groups of none working/working people as their circumstances may be totally different
- I would like to know how a person is meant to live on jsa 53.00 a week and then the house hold would have to pay an extra 5.00 when they have nothing to start with.
- If people have already been assessed and are on income-based benefits (in poverty) they should be taxed further into poverty to pay for governmental mistakes. If there has to been tax take it from people with disposable income. If people are working but for a short changing, subsidised wages company they are likely to be in poverty and working. So should not be taxed into deeper poverty.
- If there are able bodied young adults claiming benefits and living at home with all the periphery benefits that come with that,they should perform some council related services to help balance the cost of their benefits.
- If they are not dependants (on 6a and 6b)you would expect they are paying the claimant for their 'keep'. Therefore this should be taken into account when assessing support.
- If you wish to make any comments on this proposal, please...
- Increases are made yearly on council tax anyway; So why consider deducting from less fortunate.
- instead the council should recycle that disgusting incinerator and stop charging residents for services they do not want and do not use.
- It is extremely unfair to double the amount of non dependent deduction! I completely oppose that! They might as well live at another address and then more benefits would be needed: so it is counter productiv
- It will be extremely difficult to collect this money from people who are on the minimum amounts of benefit.
- It would appear, from these questions, that there are too many opportunities for fraud.
- LDC will be further encouraging homelessness
- Leave as it is.
- Lewes is not riddled with poverty, so protecting taxpayers at the expense of thosewho do become unfortunately short of income should not be a priority. It is up to other parts of the benefits system to incentivise people to work.
- MAKE SAVINGS ACROSS THE COUNCIL RATHER THAN ATTACK THE MEAGRE ALLOWANCES FOR THE POORER IN SOCIETY
- Moves like this started a civil war which could happen again. I wish not for this to happen but there are talks of this happening.
- non dependant has to start his/her life so they can move out but where the cost of mortgage will beyond our imagination, the only country (isreal as you call it) building houses and flat for their people in the occupied country! but uk saling the public houses and building to traders and fatmen
- People should not be penalised for housing someone claiming benefits - could lead to homelessness

- People trying to live on Job Seekers Allowance, ESA or IS have an extremely hard time of it already. For those people in work earning average earnings, it is almost inconceivable how someone could survive on that income. To penalise these people further is iniquitous.
- Perhaps instead of increasing these amounts more effort should be made to find those who are paying nothing?
- read my comments before - councils need to look at their own costs and wastage as there is a lot. Lobby government to stop allowing the rich to get richer and the poor poorer. Get rid of illegal immigrants - deport them charity begins with the UK citizens not overseas - when we have our own house in order then that is the time we can help others.
- Sorry,my English not well.
- Surly this can result in discrimination and resentment from non claimants living with claimants? May be that is the idea, but surly there are cases where by the claimant is reviving CT benefit for very valid reasons and would be made to feel bad or responsible for something that may be beyond their control (ie circumstances where by they can not pay full council tax because their income is low or they have responsibilities such as providing care and can only take on part time work).
- The circumstances we have had have included our daughter who is not well enough to work but is not entitled to any other benefit and we do not have enough income to support her
- the council could send out seperate bills for each member of the house. a similar scheme to poll tax but would not affect registered students disabled kids vunerable adults.
- The homeowner should receive a discount for being the sole worker and shouldnt be penalised for someone not working. Each person in the house should be eligible for their own tax over 18 yrs
- The income of everyone i the household should be taken into account.
- The non-dependant deduction has already increased substantially. The person liable for council tax is the person who carries the stress of managing the lives that they are trying to support and/or (very often... more than often) guide for the future. What you are proposing is increasing the burden on the person who is liable to pay council tax effectively and this person does not necessarily have a very high income. This can engender pressure and strife and struggle in families. Housing and the cost of housing is very high; living costs are very high. People are struggling as it is.
- the old system was best, this new system is going to be unfere to those people who are at risc,ie,registered disabled and low incom
- The problem with these proposals is that they couls either discourage people from working or in the case of 6.a discourage people from housing, or renting to, people on benefits.
- There is substantial anecdotal evidence that these deductions increase youth homelessness. People currently have great trouble getting non dependents to pay.
- These are already the poorest households and no further money should be asked of them. This policy could also increase homelessness.
- These proposals do not take the claimants circumstances into account. They may well be

sick or disabled. Also the non-dependant adult may be a carer to the claimant

- These proposals seem designed to drive a wedge between parents and children, or partners.
- These proposed deductions even if they appear in cash terms to be low in fact make a huge impact on people's ability to maintain even a modest standard of living and could lead to genuine hardship.
- These questions are not well-worded. The option of "Scheme 2" from the last page is not appearing as a clear option to be chosen.
- think its all a good idea if there not getting everything for free its more of a kick up the rear to get a job
- This is beginning to make me feel uneasy: it is squeezing £5 here and £10 there from people who have to balance a tiny budget, reducing their options and spending by proportionally much more than should be done.
- This is very complex and needs to be simplified
- This proposal seems likely to create tension within households. Since the government is also trailing plans to restrict housing benefit for the under 25's this seems likely to constitute a double blow.
- To confusing
- To double a non- dependants adult share is pushing the non dependent into a situation where they would not be able to meet the demands placed on them and would in some cases make them homeless because the household claimant would not be able to take or meet the non dependants share if they are on a low wage and or on just basic JSA.
- Up to this point I am finding this difficult to comprehend - despite being well educated - is this intentional? It is vital that information is presented in an accessible and easy to understand form - otherwise it makes a mockery of the principle of obtaining feedback.
- WHY IS AN ADULT WHO IS EARNING A WAGE NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR OWN COUNCIL TAX LIABILITY IF THEY LIVE WITH A CLAIMANT ? WHY SHOULD THE LATTER BE EFFECTED ?
- Why not do away with benefit for the non-dependant adult all together
- Why should the claimant suffer because of other people in the house? This is completely unfair,.
- With so many different types and kinds of relationships licensed or permissible today, it could be dangerous to set a hard and fast rule in this way. It would provide disincentive for people to live together, meaning more properties will be needed for everyone to live individually. What if the person with the money doesn't share it or take responsibility for the tax? You need to establish where there is real 'disposable' income, and find a way of taking tax from this after bills and sensible necessities have been paid for in a shared household for all parties concerned. It is wrong that exemptions from tax are given so that claimants have available cash for anti-social behaviours and unnecessary luxuries, whilst hard working people are paying full taxes with nothing extra to spend on a social life and good things that they may wish to increase the health and prosperity of the whole community with.

- IT WOULD SEEM MORE RATIONAL IF YOU INTEND TO MAKE DEDUCTIONS BASED ON NON-DEPENDANT ADULT EARNINGS YOU SHOULD USE A SLIDING SCALE OF EARNINGS FOR THE NON-DEPENDANT ADULT WITH A RELATIVE DEDUCTION. IF NOT YOU ARE PUTTING EXTREME PRESSURE ON THE NON-DEPENDANT ADULT TO SUPPORT THE CLAIMANT AS IF THEY WERE A 'PARTNER'. TOTALLY UNFAIR. THE 'BANDS' OF EARNINGS IN THE APPENDIX NEED TO BE EXTENDED TO SAY 6 BANDS INSTEAD OF THE 4 SHOWN.
- ALL THESE PROPOSALS TAKE MONEY AWAY FROM THOSE ON LOW INCOMES. LEWES AND DISTRICT HAS MANY EXTREMELY WEALTHY PEOPLE. IF THEY WERE TAXED £1 MORE PER MONTH IT WOULD GO A LONG WAY TO SOLVING THIS PROBLEM AND WOULD NOT HARM THEM IN ANY WAY. THIS GOVERNMENT HAS BLAMED AND PUNISHED THE POOR AND VULNERABLE ENOUGH FOR MISTAKES RICH BANKERS AND INVESTORS MADE.
- I DON'T KNOW BUT AM CONCERNED THAT THE STANDARD OF LIVING FOR THE HOUSEHOLD COULD BE SERIOUSLY AFFECTED. COULD IT LEAD TO HOMELESSNESS?
- EVERYONE WHO HAS LIVED WITH TEENAGERS KNOWS HOW HARD IT IS TO GET MONEY OUT OF THEM. THIS COULD RESULT IN CONFLICT FOR SOME FAMILIES STRESSED BY POVERTY AND EVEN LEAD TO HOMELESSNESS OF YOUNG ADULTS.
- I REALLY THINK THAT IF YOU INCREASE THE AMOUNT THE CLAIMANT MAKES WHEN THEY HAVE A DEPENDANT OVER 18 LIVING WITH THEM IT WILL ENCOURAGE THE CLAIMANT TO SUPPORT AND ENCOURAGE THE DEPENDANT TO GAIN EMPLOYMENT AND ACTUALLY BE MORE PROACTIVE IN SEEKING WORK.
- RE LOOK AT BANDING - THE STYLE/SIZE OF BUILDING IS USUALLY A GOOD INDICATION OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE VERY WELL OFF AND THE NOT SO WELL OFF. WE'RE TOLD WE'RE ALL 'IN IT TOGETHER'. SADLY THIS DOESN'T SEEM TO BE THE CASE. STOP TAKING FROM THOSE WHO HAVE THE LEAST TO GIVE.
- IT IS NOT FAIR FOR GENUINE CASES THAT NEED THE HELP COMPARED WITH SOME PEOPLE ABUSING THE SYSTEM.
- I think if you have more people in your household able to work, you should all contribute but these cases need to be looked into with regards to savings and incomes of those already paying or contributing to council tax. Doubling the amount a household is expected to pay without a change in (the people living there) incomes would be met with difficulty surely? Unless they earn enough to pay the amounts expected. Perhaps this should be means tested individually and not made as a universal expectation, as some incomes are obviously far lower than others. Maybe it should more than double for the very wealthy. I think those who earn more should pay more. That seems fair. The vulnerable shouldn't be expected to foot the bill. Where would they find this excess?
- CLAIMANT WILL BE IN PROBLEM, BY HAVING A NON-DEPENDANT THEREFORE I DON'T AGREE TO MAKE ANY CHANGE.

Q7.b Maximum support

- **If yes, what do you think the maximum limit should be?**
- £0
- £10
- £10.00
- £15
- 32.42
- 35
- 35
- £35.00
- 40
- £40
- £40
- £40
- £50
- 50
- £50
- £10-£15
- £10pw
- £32.42 ie a cap at Band D
- £39.63 or whatever top of band E is
- a percentage
- about £10-£25
- at least £40.00
- depending on the council tax band
- Don't know
- equiv to average property value/band for area,£30?
- no limit
- NO MAXIMUM AMOUNT FOR COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT
- Not that simple
- please state what you think the maximum should be?

- The level of Council Tax due.
- the maximum amount should be 50% of the total
- The maximum amount should be reduced to £15.00/week
- There should not be a maximum
- Whatever the Band D maximum is at any time.

Q7.c Maximum Support

- **If you wish to make any comments on this proposal, please do so below.**
- £20 PER WEEK IS TOO LOW.
- £5.22 is a lot of money to find if you are on benefits or a low wage [£20.88 per month, £250.56 per year] again what you are proposing has a disproportionate effect on the incomes of the poorest when compared to the richest people in E. Sussex
- Again someone on an already very low income is not in a position to fork out £5.22 per week towards their council tax bill. They already receive fewer benefits from the council than higher earners - poorer education, poorer local environment, do not use facilities like libraries or music services as wealthier residents for numerous reasons. Why should they pay for it?
- Again the poorest in the community would be effected. There is no social housing so you have to rent where you can this is not a fair way to do things but an easy way for the council to make back money this is not right.
- Again you are hitting the most vulnerable and that is in my view totally wrong
- answered as before on all previous questions....
- Any amount should be increased in line with any and ALL council tax increases. £20 is a silly amount because it would mean a figure of 9p a week would be payable by the bottom band! Why not have a limit capped at a certain band to prevent lots of unneeded paperwork?
- As a full timer carer my income is so low that I cannot afford to live as it is. Less help with Council Tax would be devastating.
- As an example I have worked for 30 years to gain my house and am unemployed for the first time. Because of alterations to my house by previous owner my tax band increased and is higher than my neighbours who enjoy the same size house. I should not be penalised if I continue to need to claim council tax benefit because of previous house owners works.
- As Council Tax brackets have nothing to do with income levels, it makes no sense to link liability for tax to Council Tax bands. Large families, for example, would be unfairly affected. Moreover, £20 is far too low as it would mean that almost everyone in the entire district would have their benefits cut.
- as i understand the council tax banding, and if it is assumed that house values are an indication of economic affluence [potential if not actual] the less well off half of household occupiers may be expected to occupy homes of band d or below. therefore, an upper limit based on the level of council tax payable [ie the band] ought to be payable to the maximum of the band d equivalent. i am sorry to observe that individuals who occupy expensive/large homes ought to be under the same pressures to downsize according to personal economic circumstances as those who are less well off - an 'incentivisation mechanism not less valid than those which apply to those seeking work or sharing accommodation.

- As less than 25% of properties in LDC are in Bands A or B, it would be unreasonable to expect people to move to a Band A/B property to avoid a significant penalty.
- Band D is used as a marker for many things, it should also be used for this.
- Based on the figures above, every household will have to be billed, even for as little as 9p a week, which will be expensive, many people will not be able to pay even a small amount. It is likely that people will get into debt on their rent if they can't afford to pay both.
- Based on the figures above, every household will have to be billed, even for as little as 9p a week, which will be expensive. many people will not be able to pay even a small amount. People may get into debt on their rent if they can't afford to pay both.
- Based on the figures above, every household will have to be billed, even for as little as 9p a week, which will be expensive. many people will not be able to pay even a small amount. People may get into debt on their rent if they can't afford to pay both.
- benefits are already calculated to be the minimum people can live on - this could lead to debt and also to lots of admin/chasing up very small amounts of debt
- Billing for as little as 9p will be ridiculous, expensive and unworkable. Debt problems will increase.
- By capping support in an economic environment where most other costs are increasing, especially rent, you are putting a disproportionate burden on the poorest.
- Council tax charges should be increased for Bands E to H. Those who can afford to purchase and living in more substantial houses are no doubt able to afford more. People in pension credits in these bands should be protected, however, pensioners with expensive and large properties with substantial pensions should be charged... quite simply. We are now in a ridiculous situation in which some people are expected to work until they are 66, 67, while their counterparts only barely 4 years older than them, will be considered pensioners !!!
- council tax is way too high anyway for the services we receive! you should minimise your wastage and get your council tax bills reduced - single people with no or one income need help - it costs the same to keep a house whether one or more people live in it - it should be means tested
- Council tax should be calculated on the resources the individual uses. Given that it is not, it seems unfair to penalise someone for living in a more expensive property if he or she is using the same resources as someone in a cheaper residence. I therefore believe that council tax benefits should be calculated by percentage, and not capped at a set amount.
- even people living in the most modest housing will lose out. Their benefit will not cover all of the council tax. Things will be worse for families, who need larger housing which tends to be in higher bands. Almost everyone who is unable to work will have to meet some of the council tax out of their personal benefits. How the council will manage to collect the amount of council tax not covered by benefit - rage about the community charge (poll tax) meant that councils could not collect the amounts of the charge not covered by benefit.
- Exactly where did you think this money was going to come from, do you not watch the news? And exactly how many people live in band A or B properties? Most are in band D. Again, find those not paying or claiming fraudulantly.
- Have you estimated the cost of collecting the outstanding amounts from people with hardly any income? What default rate are you assuming. Do you remember what it was

like trying to collect 20% of the community charge?

- help people with least money
- I believe that vulnerable people in the community should be supported and should be exempt from paying council tax.
- I don't think that a monetary amount should be applied to houses in Band D or below, the limit should apply at the top of Band D properties.
- I don't think there should be a cap on the support, but if one has to be introduced it should be considerably larger, so that householders in at least the lowest 3 bands are completely unaffected.
- I feel this maybe too low & should be based on what the average property band is for the area, if someone becomes unemployed/single parent, to penalise them for living in an average house seems unfair, however it should be capped so you cant live in a massive house on full benefit, to the detriment of the less well off
- I have CFS & worry cannot focus on all this.,
- i rely am sorry but i donot rely understand most of the questions so may not have sent a true reply,
- i strongly disagree because as someone who is on disability benefits as i have said it is extremely difficult to live anyway without having to pay more, the whole reason for help paying council tax is so we have the money to live and this scheme would cripple our household just like the goverment is doing anyway. half the time we cannot afford to eat anyway and so taking more from us would make our live not worth living anyway as we would have no money for food etc and the government is already taking more and more away from us the most vulnerable as it is
- I strongly feel that the proposed £20 maximum is going to cause hardship to a lot of claimants. This is the equivalent to a Band A property and this will affect larger families adversely.
- I think £25 per week is adequate for most people.
- i think it may work as long as the level for benefit goes up with inflation
- I think you should help people who need it the most, people who work and have more than one income in their household should pay more.
- I would support Scheme 2.
- If council tax rates increase then so should the maximum amount of support
- If husband and wife are both not working, how will they be able to afford the extra out of jobseekers allowance which is suppose to pay for food and heating and looking for work.If two people live in 3 bed house, you do not pay full rent,so extra will have to come out of jobseekers as well
- If I had resceived at least this amount of benefit wehn made part-time. I believe I would now be in a position to stay at my home instead of selling.
- if people are on very low incomes/benefits they cannot find more money. many are already cutting essentials. they cannot find more money. if you have a family and need a bigger house then your council tax will likely be higher.

- If someone can afford an expensive house then why would they need benefits in the first place? If they can't afford a house like that then maybe they should get a cheaper house instead.
- If the Council can provide financial advice to enable a person with a larger home which has high overheads to reduce their running costs and make sums available to pay in tax, that would be acceptable. Having larger homes may be necessary and of value to the whole community, but it may still be hard for the occupant to make ends meet. It would depend upon the amount of disposable income available after reasonable living and home maintenance expenses have been paid.
- If the government increase benefits payment to help with Council Tax benefit that is another question. £71per does not go very far these days
- If you are receiving the benefits of living in a more luxurious home then you should expect to pay a bit more.
- if you have a big family on a low income how can they afford to to only get that kind of help just because they have a bigger house to accomadate they family size
- If you wish to make any comments on this proposal, please...
- In 2012 households often include several children from different marriages, sometimes 5 or 6. Reducing the number of bedrooms available to reach a lower Council Tax Band - or doubling up with another family -may not be an option. Some discretion must remain.
- Increase council tax on the higher bands... because people who can afford houses in band F, G, H in my view can afford to pay council tax...and it is the wealthiest that you should charge. Many people on low income in the lower bands are already proportionately paying more income tax and affected more
- it is a shocking proposal to think that the poorest and most vulnerable members of society have to pay for the cuts imposed by th government and that lewes district council agrees with this.
- it is ludicrous that someone living in a high band property and earning a good wage should be entitled to council tax relief but equally lots of people are being housed at tax payers' expense, pay no tax, get every benefit going and work off the cards.
- It should be £20 for band ABCD which are the most common, benefit should not be given to any household above band D
- It should be done on cicumstance and income.
- its hard enough to make ends meet as it is
- It's impossible to survive on JSA my savings have been decimated since I became unemployed
- Living in a council property we would like to downsize so we don't pay as much council tax but would like more support to facilitate this
- Many people and families are already struggling to pay rent, have experienced a recent cut in housing benefit AND then are going to be asked to pay more council tax - surely this will send the most vulnerable families in our district into deeper poverty and potential debt. Will it also not create a ghetto of poor housing for poor people and better, more central housing (with higher council tax bands) becoming the preserve of the very rich?

- Many residences are banded incorrectly and many are people unsure of how to find out.
- Maximum limit should depend on what band this person lives in
- More people will get into debt if they cant afford to pay both
- Most people do not chose to live in council properties or which one they are allocated, but if you live in a large property you should pay more
- My small 2 bed council house (with a family of 4 living in it) has a council tax of over £30 a week. Maxium level of support has to cover at least to band E as small council houses in village in Sussex can be in band D.
- not every one would be able to pay £5.22 p/week £20.88p/month especially the months you get your household bills do you pay £5.22.tax or do you pay your gas bill and keep worm in winter.
- Once again I will reiterate that people need to be assessed as individuals!
- Once again, I feel that this should be decided on an individual basis. The lowest income families should continue to receive full assistance and those whose financial circumstances are more favourable, should incur a 'maximum level of support'. Again, there should be an 'overall household income' figure/threshold to determine who receives full support and who doesn't.
- Ones CT band is as a result of the retail value of properties in the street/area, isn't it? This and the proposed maximum level of support could result in more of a divide in society based on wealth. Those renting in an area where CT band is high (yet rent is no higher than areas where CT band is lower) could be forced to move. Again I would go for a system where by the amount that a person pays is directly related to, ability to pay, the income of an individual or household - not the band and not a flat rate for all persons in a area.
- only household in bands A to D should get maximum benefit,households in bands E to H should get a maximum of £20 or less per week.
- People are already finding it hard to live. if these proposals go through then we will find more and more people forced on to the streets.
- People cannot afford to have less benefits than they already do: it is an unfair system: tax the rich!
- People in very high value properties should only get maximum payment for a limited time.
- People may not be able to pay their rent. Some pensioners who have owned their homes for years but are in a house with higher taxes might be forced out of their homes. Large families live in large homes, too.
- Please see general comments at end of questionnaire
- Reassess the system. Collect higher taxes from the rich who now need to give back to society in a proportional way. There will be food shortages and hikes in food prices after Xmas and this isn't going to help vulnerable families. It's going to cost Lewes District Council a fortune to collect bad debts and drive people into deeper crisis.
- Some households rent is over the threshold and these families have to use their savings to pay for the shortfall in rent, so this maximum Council Tax Support would hinder the pockets more. I strongly recommend a meeting with the Housing Department as this will

put householders onto the streets!

- some will not be able afford anything towards council tax, however small the amount
- Sorry, English not well.
- Take it from the rich.
- The amount should be dependant on personal financial circumstances of the claimant, and proportionate to the property they live in.
- The bands dont present a true picture of income or status. I lived in a £400,000 lewes house but had to move yo one worth less than half yet my new house in a worse area is a higher tax band
- The difficulty here is that Council Tax bands no longer represent size or value of housing in Lewes and much of East Sussex.
- The level of support should remain as it is and directly related to the Council Tax due. If a maximum is introduced, some people would not be able to afford to remain living in their homes and a form of 'social cleansing' would result. This is not acceptable in my view.
- The limit of £25 would cover those in Band A and B properties who are most likely to be those who will struggle to afford any payments from JSA etc
- The questio FORCES us to give an amount.. so we are forced to answer yes to process the survey for the consultation !!!!! I DISAGREE.. you should not change the full support received by those with accommodation in A to E, change them for those who have large expensive properties F, G, H.
- There are too many factors invloved to have a standard limit. Any benefit should be based on need and income, not a arbitrary limit such as £20
- There has to be a recognition that people have NO ALTERNATIVE to renting accommodation - more often from the private sector - and I already have to pay £12 per week from my benefit to pay the difference between the rent and the Housing Benefit. If the lowest rate was applied here I would end up paying another £8.82 per week. I am disabled and I have a son with a learning difficulty/global development delay disorder. I am already finding my budget being squeezed with higher energy prices, increasing rent shortfall and rising food costs.
- There must be a better way. Not everyone living in larger houses are earning any more than others.
- These plans would mean that the poorest would be faced with having to pay more than they can afford. Even a few pounds a week is a lot for people on a very tight budget - for some people this would be impossible and could mean they would fall behind on their rent or other bills (which are all on the rise). This could lead to people getting in to debt.
- Think there needs to be a review of the banding - in view of changes to properties and of property prices
- This is I assume different to the lone residence rebate , but not clear. I did not know there was other benefits available. in the past i may have been entitled to claim
- This is the same idea as the Poll Tax which just increased poverty and social dissent.
- This is where I have problems. Anyone living in a Band E and above home, is going to be

generally better off than say someone living in a band C, surely it is better to examine this aspect of Council Tax, where the better off, capable of paying such costs, should do so, without help from the Council! It cannot be right for someone with two cars a four bedroom house etc to get the same help as someone living from day to day.

- This seems unfair as sometimes it is not you're choice on which band of property you live in and some people who need larger houses (e.g. with children) should not be penalised into having to pay a lot more than a single person in a flat.
- This will be expensive to administer and people may not be able to pay or may get into debt
- This will be expensive to collect and take money from people who are living on means tested benefits and so by definition are getting by on the minimum income needed. Would penalise families. Council would spend more on trying to collect from people who have nothing. Rent arrears would go up, leading to pressure on limited housing stock.
- This would cover the council tax on the smaller/cheaper properties.
- THIS WOULD EFFECT MOST PEOPLE ON C T BENEFIT. IF YOU ARE GIVEN JOB SEEKERS/DISABILITY AND OTHER ALLOWANCES THAT ARE COSTED TO ALLOW FOR SURVIVAL NEEDS -HOW DO YOU PAY COUNCIL TAX AND STILL EAT /PAY RENT /AVOID DEBT./ HOMELESSNESS. IF YOU THINK THIS IS IN ANY WAY AN EXAGERRATION OF THE SITUATION YOU ARE TOTALLY OUT OF TOUCH WITH THE REAL WORLD
- This would force many people to leave Lewes - it actively discourages a mixed community
- To reduce down to £20 if some people are currently receiving more than triple that is extreme.
- Using this scheme, among the others, to push council tenants out of affluent areas is despicable.
- Why use the example of £25.22, when this falls in Band B? You've already stated the Tax Bands A or B would be less affected! It would have been better to use Band F, G, or H, as most households fall under this category.
- Would the maximum level of support rise in line with council tax rises???
- You are going to penalise heavily larger families who have to live in larger houses - especially in the private rented sector.
- You will be billing for tiny amounts which will cost more than you get. People will get into further debt as there is no room in their budgets
- Your proposal is to take up to HALF of a claimants total weekly income, just for Council Tax. How many houses in Lewes are band A-C? Your proposal will significantly cut the benefit to most claimants. There is no way that these sums can be collected, or are you wanting a repeat of the Poll Tax collection fiasco, when councils eventually just wrote off the sums owing?
- I HAVE TO LIVE IN ACCOMMODATION I CAN AFFORD AND RENT PRIVATELY. I LIVE IN A BAND A PROPERTY AND WOULD THINK IT UNREASONABLE FOR ME TO EXPECT TO CLAIM FOR A BAND H IF I KNEW I COULDN'T AFFORD IT. IF I OWNED A BAND H I WOULD NEED TO CONSIDER DOWNSIZING. IS THIS SO UNREASONABLE?
- My daughter receives council tax support and if she had to pay any money at all, without

an increase in her benefits she would be on the bread line

- I DISAGREE BECAUSE IF ONE IS LIVING ON BENEFITS OR A VERY LOW INCOME EVEN £5 A WEEK IS A LOT OF MONEY. COUPLE THIS WITH THE DRASTIC CUTS IN HOUSING BENEFITS DUE TO THE CRAZY LHA WHICH BEARS NO REALITY TO THE ACTUAL PRICE OF THE RENT OF A FLAT, HOUSE OR ROOM IN LEWES AND YOU LEAVE PEOPLE WITH VIRTUALLY NOTHING TO LIVE ON OR PAY BILLS WITH.
- THIS DOES NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT WHY PEOPLE ARE LIVING IN HIGHER BANDED PROPERTIES, ESPECIALLY IN LEWES. SIZE OF FAMILY SHOULD BE NOTED. UNABLE TO AFFORD - LOW INCOME ETC. WHAT HAPPENS TO DISABLED PEOPLE WHO ARE OF WORKING AGE BUT UNABLE TO WORK?
- THE CONCEPT OF "WORKING AGE" IS IRRELEVANT TO THE UNEMPLOYABLE DISABLED [SEE 3b]
- THOSE WITH HIGH HOUSEHOLD RENTS SHOULD BE MAXIMUM SUPPORT TOWARDS CTAX BENEFIT
- I THINK IT IS FAIR FOR PEOPLE IN THE HIGHER BANDS TO HAVE LESS THAN FULL CONCIL TAX SUPPORT BUT NOT PEOPLE IN LOWER BANDS ON STATE BENEFITS AS £5 REPRESENTS A LOT OF MONEY FOR THEM.
- IMPOSSIBLE TO ANSWER THIS QUESTION
- IN ANY EVENT £20 TOO LOW
- I THINK IT SHOULD BE DONE ON INDIVIDUAL CIRCUMSTANCES BECAUSE YOU CAN HAVE AN INDIVIDUAL WHO IS UNABLE TO CONTRIBUTE TOWARDS COUNCIL TAX WHO WILL BE PENALISED PURELY FOR LIVING IN A HIGH BAND AREA
- NOT SURE ABOUT THIS AS WHETHER YOU LIVE IN A MANSION OR SMALLER ACCOMMODATION LIFE IS HARD WHEN YOU LOSE YOUR JOB OR UNFORSEEN CIRCUMSTANCES CHANGE YOUR LIFESTYLE.
- the rate of council tax should be the same for everyone not judged by there housing band that's unfair and a burden on hard up families who struggle with the current climate of food prices going up, fuel prices sky high and travel cost on public transports its time for a fairer Country to live in and families happier without making ends meet or some turn to crime?
- not enough information provided to give a constructive opinion. Probably a lot more claimants in band D than A so your example of paying £5.22 extra pw is misleading. Most claimants will surely be paying in the region of £12 pw on top of significantly reduced housing benefit.
- I think this is a good idea as presumably, people who live in higher banded properties are better off and therefore should contribute more. I think £25 is better than £20 though as you'd still save a lot in expenses by capping it at £25 and would still be able to help people more in A and B banded properties.

Q8.c Minimum support

If you wish to make any comments on this proposal, please do so below.

- £1- and people on JSA, ESA should be receiving full council tax benefit!!!!!! People do NOT choose to be unemployed.. they do NOT choose to be living in poverty on £71/week
- £10. per month is significant for many of this group, and LESS significant for most of those non-qualifiers for Council Tax support.
- £4.50 is below £5 but may make a world of difference to people.
- £5 is an awful lot of money if you are on benefits or have a low income
- ACCEPTING THAT ADMIN COSTS ARE A FACTOR, THE TRUTH IS THAT PEOPLE ON BENEFITS COUNT THEIR INCOME IN PENNIES AND POUNDS. £5 IS AN HOUR OF HEAT FROM THE ELECTRIC METER OF THE FARE TO SEE FAMILY
- Again income and circumstance, even if you get £2.50 a week or below, it helps. It might make the difference if you can buy milk or bread for the children, with that £2.50. instead of not having it towards council tax, or part of your total income.
- Again this is hitting the lower classes and when you do manage to get a job you would be worse off
- again, people have no money. £5 is a lot of money when you are living on the breadline. it will cost a lot to bill every one for small amounts and your proposed limits mean that everyone who is entitled to benefits will have to pay something.
- all council tax benefit that people are entitled to should be paid
- Are you aware of how significant even £1 a week is to people on low or no income???
- as per my other coments the vornable are going to suffer
- As previous comments
- At subsistence levels, a few pounds make all the difference, yet would not increase the council's revenue sufficiently in any case?
- despite what i've previously written, it is important that people recognise that there is a personal financial commitment towards the cost of their home - and a minimum contribution to the council tax of an area can be regarded as a personal commitment towards paying for the services that we all need either as individuals or as memebers of the broader society or indeed both.
- Entitlement is entitlement regardless of the amount
- Even £20 a month towards council tax can make a big difference to some people.
- even £5 is significant for those on lowest income, esp given other cuts,and vat at 20%.
- everyone should be aloud to get help and with the government attacking the vulnerable from jobseekers to the disabled to pensioners. it is extremely imperitive that people who are poor or vulnerable should get as much help as they can and also i believe that pensioners should get as much help as others do as they are just as if not more vulnerable

especially if they are just living off a state pension and has to pay the council tax aswell as there rent and bills especially during the winter when they need extra money to keep warm with the government proposing the withdrawal of the heating allowance and the bus passes, and so they need as much as they can to live.

- for people on low income 2.50 is alot of money which could go on gas/elec
- For people who are dependant on benefits, every £ counts. It would be a dangerous precedent, in my view, to introduce a minimum level.
- For some people, every pound they receive makes a huge difference to their life. Don't underestimate that event £1 financial support makes a difference to poor households.
- for someone in receipt of means-tested benefits, an effective deduction of £5 from their income would be unfair.
- For someone on a low income even £1 or £2 can make a hugh difference to their lives. There should be no minimum set.
- For the poorest £5 is a significant proportion of income. it will disincentivise work
- For the poorest families #5 is a significant amount.
- For the poorest in our communities even less than £5 is a significant proportion of their income. It could be a disincentive to work.
- For the poorest in our communities even less than £5 is a significant proportion of their income. It may be a disincentive to work.
- For the poorest in our communities even less than £5 is a significant proportion of their income. It may be a disincentive to work.
- For the poorest in our community £5 is a big prooportin of their income
- For the poorest of people in the District, £5 is still a necessity
- I cannot imagine a situation where people would need to claim a particular amount they can either afford to pay something or they cannot
- I do not feel there should be a minimum, eveb £2.50pw, £100pa will be a huge benefit to someone on low income
- I do not see the logic behind this.
- I do not understand enough about the proposals but we need to protect the vulnerable while targeting the scroungers
- i dont understand the question
- I feel it should be based on sliding scale depending on income with no cap.
- I would think anything lower would be outweighed by the cost of admin involved in paying the benefit
- If people need help then they need help there is no use playing god in a half baked way.....
- If people need support they need support.
- If someone is getting full Housing Benefit, how on earth would they be able to afford any more cut backs? This should only be put in place for those who can afford their full rent or

mortgage.

- If someone needs even a few pounds benefit then they should be entitled to it. It could make the difference between keeping your head above water and not.
- If they qualify for support and want it they should get it relevant to bracket their house is in. is a minimum applicable or necessary?
- If you wish to make any comments on this proposal, please...
- In principle I am against this but think the benefit of reduced administrative costs will probably outweigh the costs of providing the benefit
- Introducing a minimum, below which nothing is paid, may make all the difference to a family.
- It doesn't make sense to me to use a benefit payment, which is already the minimum amount a human being needs to live on, to now pay taxes with. And this in a time of forecasted food shortages.
- It is a disincentive to work. The poorest may not be able cope with a loss of £5 a week
- it should come from people who have money to waste. if you take support away from those who need it, there will be nothing left for people to live on
- It's precisely the most vulnerable that would suffer from this proposal, so it is a very bad one.
- less than this may not be worth it for the administrative cost
- need to look at admin costs of administering scheme
- No again.... no.... you are just trying to find a way to justify the cuts.. that's all... it doesn't matter what we are going to say in this consultation it is limited by the fact that no matter what WE SAY YOU WILL CUT AND MAKE THE LOW PAY PAY!!!!!! NO NO NO... it is unfair. Find a solution with properties in the HIGHER BANDS which most of us cannot afford!!!! so E, F, G, H....
- No minimum amount. If you are on a low income or if you can only get a little overtime that £5 will mean a lot to you.
- once again the people who need most help won't be getting it as usual
- People on Job Seekers Allowance have £71 currently to live on. EVERY PENNY COUNTS in this situation. They should remain exempt from council tax alongside people on Employment Support Allowance when they are unwell. Furthermore, those on very low income (e.g. minimum wage) and/or working part-time are struggling. Every penny counts. You cannot set out to protect the most vulnerable and at the same time assume that they are always pensioners (particularly around Lewes!).. this is ridiculous. Low income single people are also struggling, alongside low income families. This will proportionately penalise them most... because £1 is more significant to them!!
- People won't bother getting a job because they'll lose their £5.
- Receiving any amount of money, even less than £5 a week, can make a real difference to someone on a low income. Also, it's unfair to penalise people for living in expensive areas.
- Same reasons as given in previous question.

- Sorry,my English not well.
- Support should only be given to those in receipt of/or entitled to Council Tax Benefit
- The amount should depend on the claimant;s financial circumstances
- THE CURRENT LEVEL OF SUPPORT IS FAIR AND WORKS.
- There ought to be a fund which people entitled to a smaller amount of help can apply for assistance from. Council tax could be paid from this fund where there is insufficient disposable income for the claimant to make the Local Tax payment due, where the deficit falls beneath £260 or whatever limit is decided upon. If someone on this list is able to make the full Local Tax payment, they could be provided with a token Tax Credit (a percentage of sums remaining in the fund after applications have been paid out) in return for not applying for the full sum to which they were potentially entitled, had they not been able to manage their budget so well.
- There should be no minimum as even a a few pounds is too much for some people to pay.
- This will mean more poverty. Take it from the rich.
- This will mostly affect people who work for low wages. £5 may not sound a lot, but if you are struggling on the minimum wage it could make working unviable.
- This would not help the most poorest of people and the crime level will increase.
- Very small amounts of support make a big difference to people with low incomes, trying to live on minimum wage etc.
- We are all having to suffer the reductions in the standard of living I do not think exceptions should be made at this point in time. There are many poor families with children who buy expensive phones, designer shoes etc and smoke.
- What next??? Is housing benefit going to be doing the same thing next week, next month, next year? Not everyone chooses not to work. Not everyone is able to earn a living!
- why should someone get a minimum - surely it costs more than £5 a week to process this discount - remove the administration and cut it totally.
- £1 IF ENTIRELY NECESSARY TO INTRODUCE.
- I feel the means tested system is better
- MY HOUSING BENEFIT WAS RECENTLY CUT BY £52PM. HOW AM I TO MAKE THIS MONEY FROM INCOME SUPPORT/INCAPACITY? I CAN'T PAY CT. I SIMPLY DON'T HAVE ENOUGH. I HAVE TO CHOOSE EVERY WEEK TO EAT ENOUGH, TO HEAT MY COLD HOME ENOUGH. I CAN'T DO BOTH.
-
- THE DISABLED GROUP DESCRIBED SHOULD BE EXEMPT FROM COUNCIL TAX.
- I THINK ALL THOSE ON BENEFITS SHOULD RECEIVE FULL COUNCIL TAX BENEFIT
- COLLECTION PROBLEMS PROBLEM WHERE CTB NOW PASSPORTED TO PAY FUNERAL GRANT - WHAT WILL BE SITUATION WHERE CT NOT PAYABLE THEREFORE ENTITLEMENT UNDER THE THRESHOLD. HOW WILL CLAIMANT EXPLAIN POSITION UNDER SOCIAL FUND RULES

- IT'S AN UNANSWERABLE QUESTION
- IF LDC WAIVE ANY SUPPORT OF < £5 A WEEK THEY SHOULD WAIVE ANY RESIDUAL TAX DUE OF < £5 A WEEK
- the sooner this government changes the better the councils will be under the coalition this country is a shamble an absolute mess its making people sick and in debt too
- Again this should be looked at individually. If a person is living on benefits, how will they be able to find this proposed £5 per week? Also if people receive AA or DLA couldn't this be put towards council tax. Why do they need to get more money for looking after people when prescriptions etc are free anyway. It doesn't cost any extra to feed or clothe someone with say C>F. does it?
- I THINK GOVERNMENT SHOULD COME UP WITH BETTER SOLUTION, THAN HITTING THE POOR PEOPLE, AND MAKE THEM SUFFER.

Q9.b Scheme Selection

Briefly, why do you think your choice is best, and if you have chosen Scheme 3, what other ideas do you have

1

-
- (See comments on previous page)
- 60% OF THE SHORTFALL SHOULD BE MET BY INCREASED TAX TO ALL RESIDENTS, AND THE REST BY CUTS TO SERVICES. THE SHORTFALL SHOULD NOT BE FINANCED DISPROPORTIONATELY BY POORER RESIDENTS.
- A combination of scheme 1 & 2, so that everyone in the county gives a little bit. Higher council tax to the excessively wealthiest. Support for the poorest. Not an easy Job!
- A much more fair way to spread the cost for the working majority.
- Although some of the measures proposed in Scheme One seem fair and workable, others (primarily the £20 limit) would introduce undue hardship to some benefit claimants who are already struggling to survive on the help they already receive. I believe that the existing scheme contains enough flexibility to maintain the current levels of support. Alternatively, a combination of Schemes One and Two might prove viable. Caution should, however, be taken to ensure that those already in financial straits are not further punished, and also that they are not deterred from seeking work.
- any family or the elderly (1 child or more) should still receive their current council tax payments and not receive any cuts. leave the current system as it is. people who are earning above 15,000pa should pay all of their council tax, people below this get help depending on their income. people out of work pay nothing until working, its that simple.
- Any more cuts to services would mainly harm those people who need help to lead a better life
- Any other scheme would result in a loss of services for ALL residents of Lewes District, including those funding the full rate of Council Tax - this would be extremely unfair. As long as assistance is provided to those households genuinely in need of help and not just to council tenants living in rented accommodation the scheme will be fair.
- As a single working mother with 2 children I feel it is important that the scheme is means tested as well as taking into account dependents (children, young adults, family members). It could also take into consideration other help i.e. other benefits some people receive. Indeed it has become evident over the years that some families are better off not working than working because they are getting too much help from the state. Finally there could be an incentive for families or young people to remain in Lewes by having lower council taxes. Indeed with the attraction of bigger cities around where you pay less in rent and council taxes, people are leaving Lewes and we don't want the town to become "god's waiting room".
- As always the onus is on the lower paid and or needy to fill the shortfall. What a shame a more sympathetic approach cannot be found to help those in real need.
- as i said before i am a single parent of 2 and work all i can without childcare cost and all i earn is then taken of, so if i work more hrs i pay more so lose money for food bill and rising fuel bills

- as long as the most vulnerable claimants were protected
- As long as this scheme is implemented properly i cant see any reason that it would not work well.
- as we have very little money to live on now and have to buget for everything we have any changes would be bad for us
- Assess people individually this is the only fair way of dealing with this issue!
- At present there is no incentive for people on council tax benefit to go out to work, if everyone had to make a small contribution this would make a difference, why should I finance other people? I also believe that some services such as free bus passes should be cut.
- At the very least you must not ignore feedback.
- Because as i said i think people who are genuinly unwell should be considered as much as the elderly, we are not all choosing not to work
- Because families who have young children with no support will just suffer and may not make all there other day to day bills etc.. young adults who have no responsiblties will be pushed to work. It would work well for all. Having the limitation on help for your children will put a stop to people having more then 4 children.
- Because I don't think people on low income should be forced to pay for their council tax when they can not afford to. They hardly have any money to live on as it is and that people on disabilities should not be affected
- Because I think, on the whole, those people paying council tax will be least affected by the change. The poor are struggling, mostly through no fault of their own. I did lean a bit towards scheme 3. Compromise and increase council tax and reduce benefit, both a bit. Priority is to protect the poor which David Cameron should not assume is their own fault without having looked at the reasons they claim benefit, backed by evidence.
- Because it incentivises work. It spreads the burden more fairly than just increasing Council Tax as has been the case in the past. The constant demands for increasing Council Tax has to stop until the Nation can afford it. Which is not at Present the case.
- because the councils get lot more money then they are saying as most of it going on wages to the top mangers and boss, so they are the one that should have there wages cut down,
- Because this scheme gives incentive for people on low incomes to work and gives help to the most vunerable in society, with all other government changes who are taking the full impact of the recession the most
- Because we cannot cut services to the most vulnerable groups.
- Because you need to be taking taxes out of disposable income, not basic income which is required for each person to live and maintain their home. In addition to the ideas that I have already written down above, I think that you could provide further ways of adding the required value to the Council's resources. For example, if cash is just not available to pay the sum without inadvisable sacrifice due to a lack of real disposable income, the Council could request voluntary work or other forms of input into the Council's services or the community. Or, the Council could set up a company which is capable of raising money with some input from those exempt from payment (preferably in excess of the sums that

would otherwise be payable, in order to cover overhead and make the exemption scheme more valuable). The company's profits would then all be payable to the Council.

- Before doing anything else ensure Lewes District has made the most of removing the flexibility over second homes and empty homes. Strongly lobby the Government to give Lewes District further flexibility over the other discounts and exemptions.
- Briefly, why do you think your choice is best, and if you...
- by increasing the tax to everyone in the district would be less expensive to implement, Fairer. The draft scheme seems to target the poorer families that are already struggling .
- By this stage I am confused and confounded by schemes which seem to me irresponsible. I have made the comments I feel are applicable: no bypass and no harming the vulnerable. Use reserves.
- Cap the amount provided per week to £25. See notes in Point 10.
- Charge more Council Tax for higher bands, and second home owners. cut Hastings Bypass if you want to cut services. By taxing more vulnerable households you deepen the divide between rich and poor. Work out a fairer system of collecting council tax before you adopt a scheme that is short-termist and isn't going to change the dynamic from now to 2020 with govt forecasted cuts to councils year on year. no changes to current levels of Council Tax support. Use council flexibility to work out a decent council tax system. Start thinking about soup kitchens.
- choice is best because it affects us the people , when you make a decision it's all about money , but when we make a decision it's how it would affect us all in reality .
- council tax benefit should be based on people's income and savings, so it is for the most needy.
- Cut a bit of everyone so everyone still gets some but not a complete loss
- Cuts should not impact on the poorest people most, so that scheme 2 is likely to spread the pain in the fairest way. The way council tax has been assessed for each dwelling is in itself most unfair and richer people in larger houses should be reassessed so the tax is raised more fairly. I suppose the Government is unlikely to do this reassessment, so meanwhile the scheme you select should not worsen this unfairness towards the poorer part of the population
- Cuts to council tax benefits combined with housing benefits cuts WILL CAUSE HOMELESSNESS AND DEPRIVATION .
- Depending on your feedback, a fairer way of doing this would be to assess on each family (individual) basis. Each one has to be judged on its merits. Under your schemes some households may suffer greatly.
- disabled people and the elderly should have priority with help paying their council tax. we do not get enough money to live on without having to try and find more money when our benefits may be cut
- Do not change the current levels of help for the people who are worse off in our community - I'm sure 'flexibilities on Council Tax discounts and exemptions' means just that. Fund the shortfall by increasing the Council Tax for all residents of Lewes district.

- Don't get rid of discounts such as the 25% off for people who live alone as council tax is quite expensive, but could maybe make it means-tested as some people are earning minimum wage and this discount really helps, but others could be earning huge amounts of money such as people who work in the City in London and live in places like Lewes, also some might be millionaires and wouldn't even notice a discount.
- End ALL benefits, including council tax benefits to immigrants having entered this country in the last 10 years. Restrict ALL benefits to any individual or couple who are unemployed and have more than 2 children. Having further children while unemployed and on benefit would end their entitlement to ALL benefits. Charge those who have second homes between 5 & 10 times their annual council tax, with NO discount and payable in advance.
- EVERYONE IS AFFECTED BY THIS RECESSION NOT JUST PEOPLE ON LOW INCOME. IT IS NOT RIGHT THAT THE COUNCIL TAX FOR ALL RESIDENTS SHOULD INCREASE TO HELP PAY FOR THE FEW. THIS IS OUT OF LINE WITH THE GOVERNMENT STATEMENT THAT COUNCIL TAX HAS BEEN FROZEN FOR ALL.
- Find other ways to make up the short-fall by getting it from those more wealthy residents of Lewes. You could start by imposing a weight-related fine on domestic waste as has already been suggested, and dropped.
- For the next financial year, can the Council not use their reserves to maintain current levels of Council Tax Support - and not cut any further services? The poorest have been hit hard in the last year with cuts to many frontline services and a further potential cut to their incomes with the arrival of Universal Credit. We do not want any further job losses or service cuts. The Council should lobby government for more funds and in a year's time, if needed, review and increase Council Tax for all. Let us all carry the burden and not plunge the poorest into further deprivation. Surely we should remember that many of the poorest households have children and it is they who will suffer further if Council Tax support is removed or reduced.
- Given the current very high level of council tax I certainly would not welcome Scheme 2 or indeed any across the board increase for all Lewes residents. As it is current levels of council tax seem hard to justify. Since I can offer no Scheme 3, this option seems academic beyond saying that, in conjunction with Scheme 2, Lewes District Council should be doing its utmost to reduce expenditure in all other areas.
- Government-imposed cuts disproportionately affect those who are less well off. The Council's shortfall should be made good by increasing Council Tax for owners of higher-band properties, who have gained most from rising house prices.
- hopefully this scheme will help those who need it and if someone can pay even a small amount towards their council tax then they should.
- I am a public sector worker. I have not had a pay rise for two years and will continue to not receive pay rises. My pay increases have not kept up with inflation for years. I have had my pension contributions increased and these will continue to increase over the coming years. I have two children and this year lost our child tax credits. It is not fair to burden working class families with further bill increases to cover benefit increases.
- i am a single parent on income support and full time carer to my special need child, i have no saving and i can see what you are thinking but some of us are not just sponging off the state and i was surprised when i saw what levels saving were set at at present. i hope that a fair deal comes out of this, but this is just more stress in very hard times.

- I am not really sure which scheme would be best personally I would not want council tax to rise as this may cause more claimants and is unfair to everyone. There needs to be Limits with combined incomes, Lodgers and people working the systems. But people who are trying their best to find employment or earn even a small amount should not be punished, I know many people who earn as little as £1 to much who cannot get any help but are struggling to feed their children or live even a basic lifestyle, when other people seem to get everything.
- I am on employment support allowance and struggle already to pay bills. I receive full council tax benefit at the moment so do not have to pay council tax. I cannot afford another bill on top of what I already pay so would end up in debt or even worse, prison for not paying council tax
- I am on incapacity benefit and struggle to pay bills as it is. I have no surplus income or savings and any extra outgoing payments would just make my life harder than it already is. Therefore I have chosen scheme 2.
- I am very against an increase in Council Tax for all residents of Lewes District and I do not see why those not in receipt of Benefits should subsidise others in this way
- I believe scheme 1 would work as by what I have read it won't be an unfair scheme as everyone will pay something into council tax without it causing too much of a struggle money wise. I work part time and receive CTB but I could afford a slight increase in what I pay at this present time, as I'm sure most other people could as well.
- I believe that the draft proposal is fairer to all pensioners that have very small incomes and are struggling to pay their way.
- I believe that vulnerable people in the community should be supported. It is a very difficult time to find work, competition for jobs is extreme. With such pressure on the unemployed to survive financially it would be difficult or impossible for some unemployed people to find the money to pay council tax should the benefit be curtailed. I believe it is right for those fortunate enough to be in employment to help support those that cannot find work. Therefore I support scheme 2.
- I believe the changes in the previous questions would be minimal to the households concerned. I don't believe scheme two would help these households as it would potentially increase their council tax anyway and would therefore probably wipe out any extra benefit they may be entitled to. A cut in services would also presumably lead to more job cuts and those people would also need council tax benefit if they were unable to find further work.
- I can only see big problems for the grater needy people but I do understand the council's problem
- I completely understand the need to find ways to help fund the shortfall, but I would like to see some specific action taken for carers. We have no way to supplement our income and could not afford further benefit cuts.
- I do believe that we can all give a little toward the council tax, except the really vulnerable, I think with the economic climate, the way it is at the moment, if we were all help a little this would find that 10% that we need
- I do not like the generalisation of everyone of working age to be included in this judgement. Surely there should be a differentiation of those of working age able to work and those of working age unable to work due to disability or being a full time carer. I feel if

cuts have to be made then could there not be caterogies where if people on benefits need to start paying some council tax that it is those who are actually able to find means to earn money. Make some cuts for those on job seekers but not those on sickness benefit? Although I do feel if we pulled out of our wars then the welfare system would not be so effected. The amount tax payers money gets thrown into wars we don't support is disgusting and while this happens those barely able to feed ourselves are being asked for more money for services that we don't use or fail us. I would rather scheme 2 or 3 to scheme 1.

- I do not think it is fair to hit the rate payers. We must all share the reductions in service together. Had we had the Poll Tax Then everyone woud have been treated equal. As it is the majority of people who do not pay the rates or already receive a reduction will of course want ther benifits to continue.
- I don not think it is fair that the poorest people should have to pay for the shortfall. How about a reassessment of council tax rates given that some houses in lewes are now worth a lot of money and are owned by very rich people. If they are second homes, they should pay a higher rate of coucil tax. It is also not fair that people who have lodgers should be penalised - we need affordable homes in Lewes District. Richer people should pay more, not the very poorest.
- I don't agree with any. It needs to be income and circumstance on how much benefit you get. Why should eveyone make up the sortfull. if you are on a good wage or if you are in a partner ship or marriage and you both have a good income, then you might not need it. If you are a single person on a low income or a single parent on a low income, then you would need help. So circumstance comes into it big time. If the government have protected pensioners, they should be doing the same with children. They promised to get children out of poverty by a certain date, but if they keep taking away help for their parents who are trying to help themselves and their families by working, but are still on a low income, then they will be more children and families in poverty. Wrong direction I feel. You should be helping the families and adults who are tring to help themselves rather than the ones who can not be bothered and are quiet healthy enough to get a job, but would r ather sit around doing nothing.
- I don't know which scheme this is quite baffling to me and I am an expert windows programmer but I am baffled but I would suggest the following, being involved with some type of voluntary work even if it is two days a week could be a good idea, for instance I would be more than willing to work for any benefit because it would put me back in the work place but for me it would have to be computing.
- I don't think it helps people to just give money out, but there are some very vulnerable people who will still get help.
- I don't think others should have their council tax increased, this country has suffered enough increases over the years across the board. I think scheme 1 is fairer as those who are not contributing must make small contributions and those who are making contributions already will have small increases too.
- I fear that the proposed scheme will penalise people who are unable to work or have low incomes through no fault of their own, or penalise their families/ cohabitants. Saving will be punished. I would favour a general rise in Council Tax and a reduction in services if necessary - the communal cleaning of council properties is inefficiently managed in my view as it is done incompetently, for example. I believe other efficiency savings could be made. I think some changes could be made to the Council Tax Support Scheme without

the serious effects on low income families and individuals that seem likely from the draft proposals.

- I feel if scheme 2 was implemented, it would result in no benefit to true claimants, as the tax would increase & therefore the same benefit would be worth less anyway. Scheme 1, allows some cost saving improvements that would free up the money to pay those in need. I do feel that a lot of money is wasted on admin of benefit at present, with excessive paperwork required & produced. more streamlined interaction with other benefit departments would cut costs, eg child tax credits departments supply info & then it has to be resupplied by claimant by statements/wage slips etc. which results in more admin work & more paperwork issued. I also feel there should be more control on the benefit paid, to ensure the 25% discount on single occupancy is claimed genuinely.
- I feel people receiving DLA should not be penalised as they have already been throughly investigated (especially since the recent new upheavals by the present goverment.) They are vulnerable and not usually able to work, due to disabilites and ill health. Therefore some flexibilty is needed with maybe implementing parts of schemes 1 & 2 as suggested, and giving priority to people in receipt of DLA in that they receive their current levels of support.
- I feel that in today's climate we all have to help out. A small increase in Council Tax, spread over all the residents of Lewes, seems like the fairest solution, in my opinion.
- I feel that nothing should change due to the fact i am a lone parent trying to get back into work as there are no jobs there i feel this would be punishing me and others who want to get back into work but unable to as the jobs are not there for us.
- I feel that Scheme 2 is best because those that really need Council Tax Benefit should continue to receive the maximum amount of assistance no matter what, for the reasons that they do so. However, for those individuals who do not need so much assistance, they should receive less benefit or even nothing at all, so that that money can be saved or rather, continue to be given to those in far more desperate circumstances. Also, where there is mention of the increase in Council Tax - this will happen with or without the new Scheme.
- I feel that the scheme should stay the same, based on sliding scale regarding income. Many people that are claiming council tax benefit are in employment but on a low incomes, theses people should not be put under more financial pressure as they are trying to better themselves. People on low income or unemployed, normally full within the poverty trap. They have no means to obtain a mortgage and have no other option than renting. Renting comes at a high premium which feeds the rich and does not help the poor. If people suffer with mental health problems or have other personal problems e.g. vulnerable people. It is very hard for them to find work and better their lives. Theses vulnerable people should not be put under more pressure. This could have a big impact on family relations and be detrimental to children living within these families. Resulting in childhood economic disadvantage which can lead to crime, health problems and in turn will have a impact on t he local area and services.
- i gather that some councils are using reserves and think lewes should do the same. i think all councils should fight the cut from central governement not assist in it. the poorest are already paying too much for the banks and the bankers - they should not be hit even harder. i think the council should be very careful not to make changes that impact most on the poorest and on families or that discourage saving and responsibility.

- I have a child who has down syndrome and I, her mother, am her carer. This means I am unable to work as my daughter has many other problems related to down syndrome. My husband works what he can, but often has to take time off to take or pick up our other children from school while I take my daughter to numerous hospital appointments, some being in London.
- I have an income based Jobseekers allowance and our total income weekly is capped at £209 which is what my partner receives within her own right as a pensioner and what the Government make up as my allowance. Should I have to pay more or contribute towards our council tax where would we be able to make up the shortfall? I am hoping soon to get back to full time work and as and when this happens I am happy to pay a little more on our council tax to assist others who are not so fortunate.
- I have been out of work for almost 3 years due to illness. I am now able to actively seek work but am finding it increasingly difficult to find jobs in my field that me, my partner and my son could live off. My partner is also seeking work hoping to become the main income earner with me being the main caregiver to my 6 month old son. Our outgoings at the moment are so high we very rarely have more than £20.00 a week leftover after food etc which 9 times out of 10 goes on public transport as neither of us drive. Any increase to our outgoings would cripple us and would leave us in a desperate situation at least until one of us finds work and believe me we are trying and I am certain there are other people in a similar position. I think one of the things we should be most proud of in our country is the way we look after those that need it and it would be a travesty to lose that.
- I have opted for scheme three because your information is presented in an unclear fashion and I therefore do not want to be counted as agreeing to either Scheme 1 or Scheme 2.
- I know people who receive CTB and have more income than I do yet I am in a professional full time job. I cannot afford to buy or rent in Lewes yet pay enormous CT to fund those who don't work. Pensioners in genuine need who have contributed all their lives should be helped with discounts but no one else. If we all paid CT then everyone's tax would be lower instead of the ever poorer workers funding those who don't want to work. If there is a fundamental reason for someone not working then they should receive everything but too many have made a career choice not to work and are rewarded with discounts and benefits.
- I notice that the shortfall after 10% cut in government funding is £81000.00 out of £8.1 million, not exactly £1 million, although near enough. Does this not make any difference? Is any increase in the number of households claiming Housing Benefit really expected to rise to the tune of £19000.00 in just one year? I think a Council Tax on second homes and unoccupied homes could also help to fill the gap. How about creating a new higher band or bands for Council Tax on mansions or extremely large properties of the super-rich? Or use some of the reserves on County, District and Town budgets, while pressuring the government nationally to change its approach and restore the missing 10% of funding, or part of, in future years?
- I picked scheme two because the costs are more spread out more evenly. David Cameron said it himself (we are in it together).
- I propose suspending all changes for one year.
- I suggest adding another CT band for the highest value properties. This would increase CT payments from the people with the most valuable land, reducing the need for cuts and sanctions for the vast majority of people.

- I support Scheme 1 because I cannot agree to the concept of Scheme 2. I feel I contribute enough to income tax and national insurance to support benefit payments. I object to providing anymore of my reducing income to support benefit claimants.
- I think everyone should contribute at least a little towards the cost of local services
- I think it is important that the Council protects those who are dependent on benefits who are after all likely to bear the brunt of cuts elsewhere. I am strongly of the opinion that the Council should adopt a scheme that ensures the cost is shared by all residents of the District, and not just the poorest who are already set to suffer most because of other cuts.
- i think it sounds fair
- I think it would be just to means test all people receiving council tax benefit according to the money they have. Long term unemployed will not have the money to fully pay whereas newly unemployed may still have savings to support them for a while. I.e if someone could pay for 5 - 6 months and then claim then this is 5 - 6 months the council will not have had to pay. I think it is important that all people without money can still claim.
- i think it would need to be worked out on each families incomes and people without children help getting back to work not living on benefits
- I think that council tax should be increased rather than services cut
- i think that if the people who work and have families on a low income have to pay then so should those on full benefit even if its a small amount to make people responsible for their bills and not hand out benefits like sweets. we are allowing these people not to work and i hear alot of people quite happy to see me work on a low income and say all their rent and council tax is paid in full and then their at the pub all weekened .
- I think that it is unfair to penalise the poorest in our society. I believe that the burden of cuts should be born by those best able to cope with them, which means increasing the council tax for those with the highest income and/or high-value property.
- i think that just by changing the exceptions you could make up your shortfall. at the moment your dont take disability benefit into your calculations. perhaps that could be looked at if it is an adult is claiming it. or a dependant over 18 if it doesnt affect the care package they recieve. some disabled people have no care package that they have to pay for. this should be taken into the household income because it is just free money to a lot of households as it is never counted in you calculation. it should only be ignored if they are paying for care/ equipment.
- I think that people who are unemployed but able to work should not receive as much benefit as those who are unable to work (i.e. those who are on DLA, those over working age on limited incomes etc. ot those with physical or mental impairments which render them unemployable.
- I think that the we should keep the support scheme that we already have and try to find another way of finding the money. I am a single mother not able to work due to illness my benefit money has been reduced by over £55 pounds a week in the last year, I live in a C band house, with my 16 year old son. If scheme 1 goes ahead I am very concerned that my CT benefit will be greatly reduced, which would cause me even more hardship. Any new scheme needs to be fair and ensure that households who now have full CT benefit do not suddenly have to pay excessive amounts! I also think that we should look into ways of saving council money maybe a scheme where non-working people on low incomes could

earn their CT benefits by volunteering to help the community or council in any way they can. I would be more than happy to.

- I think that the whole of Lewes District Council ought to be contributing to this enormous cost cutting exercise of the government. The introduction of Universal Credit will be very challenging for those going to receive it and the extra amounts you are going to have to take from the poorest and most vulnerable in our society will cost them dearly. Added to this the cost of the collection of Council Tax who have the least amount will be expensive as well as causing a great deal of stress to these most vulnerable people as imprisonment is the final cog in the wheel of recovery (and yes torture does come to mind). Maybe we could introduce a super Council Tax on Band F, G and H properties to help cover the shortfall.
- I think that there should be a system where some of the council services should be performed by able bodied people without dependents to subsidise their council tax thereby saving the council money on paying for tax and services
- I think the cost of administering scheme 1 will make it unviable. It is better to increase council tax across the board
- I think the current levels of council tax support are correct and fair.
- I think the current scheme is fair and I consider that those on low incomes should not have any extra costs to pay.
- I think the draft scheme is a good idea, and will help the current system and will help the people who really need it
- I think the government scheme of foisting this on local councils is iniquitous, especially when they have stipulated some groups are to be protected. The least well off will be hit hardest and goes against the "we are all in this together" philosophy. Clearly we are not. Eventually if we protest sufficiently strongly to central government they will do another u-turn. Councils and citizens will have to do this as the poorest are the least well organised.
- I think the system should be more flexible but the poorest should still be exempt.
- I think there should be a scheme which takes into account Scheme 1 (draft scheme) but which also increases council tax for all residents of Lewes. Government should be lobbied to introduce higher bands for high value housing.
- I think this scheme is best because it helps people with low incomes and the disabled and vulnerable people.
- I would apply a mixture of both Schemes; whilst attempting to reduce discounts and exemptions, Band E and above properties should have an increase as most poorer people live in properties within the lower half of the bands, in particular Bands A - C.
- I would have to say scheme 1 because with the growing population in this country we need to keep up with the support of the police, emergency services repairs and rubbish collection
- I would like to see a scheme that supports low income workers, especially those in today's climate who have had to accept a lower income to stay employed. Council tax should be calculated on income, minus what a reasonable amount is being paid for lodging and then reason qualification of housing benefit.
- If Council tax benefit is dropped as in option 1 then it could make many people homeless.

Benefits must be based on need,, but take the claimants savings and other income into account.

- If there were to be increases in Council Tax for residents need to ensure that services are appropriate.
- If it ain't broke don't fix it
- If people need help with council tax, it means that they are already struggling, to penalise them further is a disgrace. If the council reduces the pay of its top employees and sells some works of art, if any, problem solved.
- If spread right across Lewes residents, rich and poor, the increase in tax payable on average would be very small. This would be much fairer than imposing a substantial increase in outgoings on the most vulnerable families with the least disposable income.
- If the choice is between scheme 1 or 2, then I would opt for scheme 2 as the most equitable. However, I would rather the council addressed empty properties and single person rebate where income is high.
- if the council is to support others in times of need, then that cost should be shared by the general council taxpayer [who I recognise may be an income taxpayer who indirectly contributes towards the bulk of scheme costs through the contribution from central government and who therefore may regard this as effectively resulting in their making two contributions through income and council tax]. but the same is true for all local government services - and providing such support through benefits contributes towards the well being of all [of and beyond the boundaries of individual authorities]. Therefore, the cost of the scheme ought to be shared between the beneficiaries and society of which they are part through weighing up the cost of service provision against the general social cost of the benefits regime in totality. after all, the non-claimant today may be the claimant of tomorrow.
- in most cases people would not be able to pay the £5 a week that you would be asking for after paying all my house bills I am left with £45 a week to live on which would mean I am left with £40 for my food, clothes, and cleaning how do you think people can live as I am a carer for my mother and step father so not able to work as they take up all my time I have not had a day off for two years now I think you need to think again and look at the well to do family's and leave the poor alone thank you
- In principle Scheme 1 does seem ok, however precautions need to be in place to ensure those claimants who are doing so because they cannot, rather than will not work (ie for health reasons) are protected. Also the £20 cap is ridiculous and needs to be rethought because it may not be cost effective with the paperwork required to chase for such small amount, a cap on a band amount would be more sensible and could still be carried over to higher bands.
- Increase the Council Tax bill for those who pay, and I say this as someone who works and pays Council Tax. What is being done to those with the lowest incomes in our community is disgraceful and we should protect the most vulnerable against these attacks whenever we can.
- Increasing council tax for all to maintain council tax benefit for those eligible is than other residents? very harsh on those who pay and basically as tax goes up, so will the benefit so achieves little. I would like to see protection for the vulnerable but a greater contribution by households with several earners. Would also like to see a huge increase in council tax on second/holiday homes in the district. How can it be equitable to charge people who

can afford these less

- It appears to be fair
- It could result in local authority receiving more to pay for and carry out services and would be fairer for everyone. It would be difficult to set up and may require leasing HMCR. However, the extra amount of cost and time setting it up could be outweighed by the increased revenue the local authority would receive.
- It is blatantly unfair to generalise the 'working age' benefit claimants. Some of us are unable to work due to disabilities and (in my case) responsibilities to my child who has a learning difficulty and stunted emotional age (aged 10 but 5 emotionally) meaning that he is vulnerable and requires constant supervision.
- It is fairer to split the cost among all residents, rather than targeting those who are less well off. East Sussex is an expensive place to live, which is not the fault of the poor, and the draft scheme would cause greater inequality and push people into poverty.
- It is not acceptable to make the poorest worse off or to cut services. The council should use its reserves to make no change and lobby the government for more money. It will cost the council more to make the cuts than not
- It is not an option to make the poorest pay more - it is unworkable and unjust
- It is not an option to make the poorest pay more or make cuts elsewhere. The council must retain current levels of support. Other welfare changes will have an impact in 2013 and these must be evaluated. Scheme 1 is unworkable as the money will not be collectable. The council has a duty to protect the poorest from increased poverty. Scheme 1 will affect children in large families particularly.
- It is not an option to make the poorest pay more. It will be unworkable as well as deeply unjust. It is not an option to make cuts to services elsewhere. The council must maintain the current levels of support for a year and lobby the government for more money the following year. Other welfare changes in 2013 will also have an impact on the poorest. The bedroom tax will affect many local residents as will universal credit. The council must protect and support the most vulnerable, not increase poverty.
- It is not an option to make the poorest pay more. It will be unworkable as well as deeply unjust. It is not an option to make cuts to services elsewhere. The council must maintain the current levels of support for a year and lobby the government for more money the following year. Other welfare changes in 2013 will also have an impact on the poorest. The bedroom tax will affect many local residents as will universal credit. The council must protect and support the most vulnerable, not increase poverty.
- It is not an option to make the poorest pay more. It will be unworkable as well as deeply unjust. It is not an option to make cuts to services elsewhere. The council must maintain the current levels of support for a year and lobby the government for more money the following year. Other welfare changes in 2013 will also have an impact on the poorest. The bedroom tax will affect many local residents as will universal credit. The council must protect and support the most vulnerable, not increase poverty.
- It is quite hard to qualify in the first place, and single people living with dependent children/young adults who are not earning or supporting elderly parents need all the help they can get, as many vulnerable people rely on them, and they save the council/government money.

- IT IS TOTALLY UNFAIR TO EXPECT THE POOREST PEOPLE IN LEWES TO MEET THE SHORTFALL. WE ARE SUPPOSED TO LIVE IN A CIVILISED SOCIETY THAT LOOKS AFTER IT'S CITIZENS NOT PENALISES THEM FOR BEING POOR!
- It keeps the burdons of potential increases in council tax demands AWAY from those of us who would take any job to ensure an income - or two if necessary! There are many who could work but who may lose benefits if they did. The lowering or removal of such benefits would encourage them to get out and work and start to contribute. I am all in favour of benefits for genuine cases, but a situation has slowly developed in the uk whereby this is most often not the case.
- It seems the fairest, people with higher income pay more, if you are on a low income there is only so far you can stretch it.
- it seems to be the fairest
- It will be an absolute crime if you start to penalise the sick, ill and disabled to help the better off and fortunate well. The extra financial pain would be minimal for these people compared to the substantial financial penalties on the sick and disabled. Maybe you should try standing up to the Government instead of rushing to support their unfiar and discrimitary policies designed to attack the needy in society, but then I'd expect nothing else from a Tory council.
- it will help everyone
- It's difficult at this stage to determine which scheme is the best. I should think that a little more from the less vulnerable ,spread out, should be acceptable. There is some scope with regards to a persons savings, for instance if a person were to have over £6000 in savings, council tax could be paid but only for a limited amount of time, in some cases, perhaps with the need for a saftey net of some sort.
- it's difficult to suggest a scheme without knowing all of the information involved in the drafting of those schemes. I'm not clear as to how Scheme 1 would impact people and I'm not clear what services would be threatened or how much the increases would be on Council Tax.
- Its difficult to try and be fair on this for all people, as everybody has very different circumstances. Nobody wants anymore cuts to be made, or services stopped or even increases. But increases are made yearly by 5% on council taxes so it would depend on the percentage of increase; consider a choice to people in the various bands on what they could afford to pay upon and agree on what percentage to keep all as it is.
- It's fair and spreads the cost between those who can afford it.
- It's the council's responsibility not to increase poverty in East Sussex. Why not come up with a scheme which won't penalise the poor and vulnerable.
- Just as long as people are not being made to choice to eat or pay that 5 pounds per week toward there council tax. £5.00 a week may sound a little amount for some but for some it is alot of money to them..Also are students who live along be effected by this
- KEEP EVERYTHING THE SAME, SELL LEWES HOUSE TO FUND THE SHORTFALL AND GET THE COUNCIL WORKERS THERE TO WORK SOMEWHERE CHEAPER
- keep it how it is its worked for so many years and people have never complained, and its targeted at people who claim benefits as people who work still get CTB it wont push

people towards getting a job as they'll be out of pocket all the time

- Lewes District Council is said to spend very large sums on 'perks' and to have some of the highest rates of pay in Britain. Economise on those before taking even more from the most vulnerable people.
- Like Scheme " but no cuts to services. Send it up the ranks.
- limit the automatic support to pensioners based on income and housing band.No support for those with highest banded houses.Hope this is clear.
- Make those who have the RICHEST PROPERTIES PAY FOR THE PRIVILEGE OF THEIR EXPENSIVE LUXURIOUS HOMES. not ordinary residents in bands A to D. Take it where wealth has been accumulated!!! Rather than an arbitrary tax on low paid people effectively who NEED a council tax rebate because it is a MASSIVE TAX on the income of those who have average or low pay minimum wage incomes!!!
- Making the poorest pay more will lead to much higher rates of non payment and higher collection costs, and is an unjust way to meet the shortfall.
- Marginally increase the council tax for those in the top band, don't let the Conservative so-called deficit reduction target the poorest in society.
- My current situation leaves me with no other option which is available.
- My income has stayed the same for four years and our directors have no intention of considering a pay rise next year,I work for a small engineering company, I expect any family on any form of benefits has had pay rises every year. I still pay my council tax it is very difficult but we manage and I expect all benefit claimants to do the same.
- No one likes putting up the council tax but this is the only alternative if we are all to take the strain rather than the most vulnerable in our community. We should do this rather than cut services
- Not sure if it is best (definitely don't want my claim to be affected!) but can't think of a better idea...
- Obviously savings need to be made, so whilst I would prefer to go with scheme 2 this is perhaps not feasible. However I am concerned that the draft scheme will not protect those on low incomes that are trying to work but can not get enough hours or income. I think, and I am speaking with experience, that in many instances those administering benefit do so with a distinct lack of compassion, they scare people struggling to make ends meet inferring all the time that benefit will be removed. A more compassionate approach to understanding individual circumstances may see that the benefit actually goes to those that most deserve it
- On a personal point, I am in receipt of DLA High rate for the mobility component, and my partner is in receipt of DLA low rate for the care component. Any increase to our Council Tax without being in receipt of CT support, would put us in financial difficulties, as we are still paying full amounts for our utilities and costs of living, prescriptions etc. So for us Scheme 2 is better for us.
- People claiming Council Tax Benefit should be asked to pay £10 per month in council tax to make up the 10% shortfall and avoid potential cuts in services
- people living totally on benefits should be exempt from paying council tax even if of working age

- People with disabilities who are living on benefits should not have to pay council tax. They are already struggling to meet their financial responsibilities in this world and to take care of themselves adequately. Ill health costs one money.
- Primarily agree with scheme 2. However, I feel this is unfair to those who do pay their council tax, nor do I see any reason why services need to be cut. As stated earlier, finding those who neither pay, or claim fraudulantly should be a priority. Also third party contractual works taken out by the council could I am sure be better sourced or alternate vendors found. This is after all a buyers market at present. Perhaps paying them by job rather than timeframe would help? (For an example look at the Gas / Roadworks in Peacehaven). Finally perhaps a few less jolly's for senior and middle management might find you a few bob.
- Protect services and increase council tax rates rather than make poor people suffer.
- Reasons previously stated on all questions
- Reduce the cost of council tax and maintain the necessary level of support for people needing help
- scheme 1 if level raised from £20 to £35. As scheme 1 currently stands I'd not be able to afford to live in the village I been in since 1976, and our home of 10 year (small 2 bed council semi, in band D). If level 1 isn't raised I'd say scheme 2. But what ever scheme is used if someone has savings of over £6000, they should use that to pay their council tax and should only be paid for sensible housing (not for single people in 3 bed properties weather over 65 or not, or any under occupancy).
- Scheme 1 is not workable, and the cuts in benefit proposed will not be collectable. All it will do is increase the sums written off. This scheme is effectively a cut in government subsidy, and should be treated as such. To try and limit the cuts to only Council Tax benefit can only backfire. Look at some of the areas that you refuse to look at, such as free bus passes for all wealthy pensioners.
- Scheme 1 is simple and, given levels of adjustment, should not have a dramatic effect on claimants. Scheme 2 is additional tax on those not claiming and Council Tax should be for paying for services, not subsidising them for some residents.
- Scheme 1 prioritises richer council tax payers at the expense of the poorest and most vulnerable in Lewes.
- Scheme 1 seems to me to be the fairest provided that the benefit reductions target the higher banded properties thus protecting the lower income group from cuts to their benefit.
- Scheme 1 seems to shift the onus for paying for services down to the lower paid / lower income end of the spectrum of residents, and push the burden of supposedly necessary cuts (forced in large as a result of irresponsible banking practices by the banking sector) onto the less well off. This seems deeply unfair at a time of rising fuel, food and basic living costs.
- Scheme 1, by definition hits the poorest the hardest. That cannot be right. Scheme 2 would at least spread the burden more widely and amongst those who are more able to shoulder it; the vast majority if not all should be sought through savings in the Council's budget, however.
- Scheme 2 ... and consider increasing council tax for properties in the higher council tax

bands. Those who have large properties with high value. Also means-test pensioners who have high incomes. I have come across pensioners with £650/week combined income, a large house paid outright.. come on. So we need to think what 'most vulnerable' means. If people can afford a large property then the charge should increase. (E, F, G, H)... by at least 10%. If the property is large enough, they can get income from it if necessary... or they can downsize. They have MORE choices to maintain a reasonable standard of living that meets their basic human needs.

- Scheme 2 combined with an increase in council tax on the higher bands (higher 3 bands).... And standing up to central government. NO CUTS. Sick of it.
- Scheme 2 seems the fairest: Council Tax payer s ought all to share the burden that would otherwise fall on the poorest. But if Scheme 1 is chosen, it should be in the form I have suggested.
- Scheme 3 would be same as scheme 2, but DELETING "potential cuts to services" - i.e. would require an overall increase in C.Tax for all residents of Lewes District. I believe in redistribution of wealth and this seems the most promising way of effecting it.
- Scheme one appears to cover those who need CTB the most, Those with low or absent incomes. Allowing those who are better able to make a contribution to their council tax bill. It's a shame that things have come to this.
- Scheme two involves a small increase across the board from those people who can afford to pay extra. Cutting benefits from people who are already struggling to pay will mean additional hardship for them. It will also make collection of the money difficult and in fact if this money is not collected the council will not have saved the required amount.
- Scheme two will put the price up for everybody which isn't right.
- See previous comments which seems fairer i.e. to share the impact of the reduction in funding.
- So financially tight for people on benefits and low wages at the moment. This will just hit them harder still.
- So the poorest in society are not penalised, and because those on higher incomes can afford to pay increased council tax
- Some people cannot afford the changes and live a happy life.
- Some people do need help to survive. Some people (a higher percentage) use any means possible to claim, either to improve their lifestyle or avoid working. It is obviously difficult to single these out without close scrutiny, but I think this should be considered. Next to me is a family of seven, four of whom could work. The man claims carer benefit for his wife, which means doing the cooking, washing, housework and helping with her ponies. I assume they also claim every benefit from the council.
- some people find it hard to get full time jobs these days and if they do work but only part time they should still get help towards council tax benefits as its not their fault there are no full time jobs etc and they are showing they are willing to work, if council tax is to high it might not be worth their while working at all.
- some people with savings on poverty incomes who receive no benefits should not support those on benefit
- something needs to change, its not fair to loose the little benefits that genuine hard

working people rely on to liveI'd be totally better off if I didnt work and would have all benefits and a council house ...thats whats wrong ...money wasted on lazy people ,who have better lives than people who work and struggle ...if I wasnt the sort of person I am , I know which would look more appealing !!!

- Sorry,my English not well.
- Stop making cuts. Use the reserves and fight the government for more funding.
- Taking into account all incomes whether from other people or benefits and the amount of savings. Whether they are living in a property suited to their needs, for example, not having a single mother whose children have all left home staying in a property with more than the required number of bedrooms.
- Taking money from the most poorest or vulnerable will only cause higher crime levels, Instead of this if a household has an income of over £45,000 taking \$5,00 a week from these households would less affect Lewes district and will help keep the crime rate down and the most youngest of the family's going without, essential food as these ones will suffer
- the changes you propose will hit the vulnerable and sick the most and infact will yet again make our lives even harder to live and like every proposal from the government will effect the people who need help the most, unless you can come up with a scheme that will make it easier for us to live and make it so we dont have to pay out more and more then there is no point changing the scheme that we already have laid out in scheme 2. the facts are what is the point making us pay more when the people who are earning lots of money are going through there lives not having to worry about money and living, they are the people who should have to pay moreand not the people who don't have much money like the disabled and the job seekers.
- The council is too readily using the "threat" of cuts to services and an increase in Council tax for all residents, to justify what is clearly their desire to have Scheme One as their program of choice. Too much money is wasted within the council and whilst the council will argue this isn't true, it is abundantly clear to anyone living within the area that the situation is only too true. perhaps a root and branch examination of ALL spending should be undertaken with cutting out of the spending that benefits the council being the first to go. Frankly being told the Sword of Damocles hangs over us gets a little wearing when we see money being used for pointless exercises.
- The council must support the most vulnerable in our society through a combined approach of affordable housing provision, which will also create jobs, a fair proportion of council taxation on those living in the largest and most expensive properties and work generation initiatives aimed at local residents.
- The curent scheme gives only limited support to people starting up or running small businesses. This is a particular problem for people running businesses (shops/studios, etc) in Lewes town centre where the properties council tax bands are high and they are also subject to business rate for the commercial part of the property. Businesses like his are vial for the prosperity and lively character of the town, but if the income is low the owners are under great financial pressure especially when starting up.
- The draft scheme unfairly targets poorer families. There are many wealthy residents in Lewes and the council should think more carefully how to manage taxes so that the poor, who are already hard-hit, aren't hit even harder.

- THE MAIN POINT IS NOT TO FURTHER HURT THOSE AT THE BOTTOM AND THE INFORMAL SAFETY NET OF FAMILY AND FRIENDS THAT NOW SUPPORTS THEM -ESPECIALLY BY THREATENING FAMILY STABILITY WHICH IS ACTUALLY ALREADY SAVING US ALL A LOT OF MONEY. IF THE GOVERNMENT CANT PROVIDE THE BASICS- AFFORDABLE HOUSING- AND FAMILY AND FRIENDS STEP UP TO DO SO, THEY SHOULD BE GIVEN ALL THE HELP AVAILABLE. THIS IS A NO BRAINER. IF NOT WHO WILL PAY FOR THE COST OF HOMELESSNESS, MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS ,CRIME AND DRUG ADDICTION THAT RESULT FROM THE LOSS OF THIS (comparitively cheap) INFORMAL SAFETY NET ? SO PLEASE BE AWARE OF THE RESULTS OF THE CHANGES YOU ARE CONTEMPLATING AND THE HUMAN AND FINANCIAL COSTS OF UNDOING THE HUGE CONTRIBUTION OF THE COMMUNITY ITSELF IN ATTEMPTING TO ADDRESS THESE ISSUES
- the most vulnerable people such as those who cannot work and rely solely upon benefits already find daily living costs a problem. with the increases in food prices and heating costs it is very difficult to survive already on benefits. for these people to be forced into paying towards council tax will not only increase poverty in families struggling at the moment, but because of stress our doctors will be overrun with added stress and depression patients therefore resulting in higher costs to the medical services. a slight increase for those working households and those who have savings should help pay extra. it is always those in need that suffer the most.
- The objective is presumably to keep as many people on low incomes, in their own homes, as possible; the cost of providing alternative housing would surely be far higher. Claimants of Council Tax benefit are by definition at a pretty low level of income. The weight of the shortfall should therefore be carried by those better able to bear it, and in such a way that makes the fact of the cutbacks obvious to all, not to those who are least likely to be able to articulate any objection.
- The people on council benefit are on it for a reason they do not have enough money to live and need help so if the council need money then it should use there reserves instead to pay for the short fall it should not be down to the vulnerable to take the hit again they should be protected.
- the poor cant afford to be hit any more!!!! you ll increase homelessness. Scheme 3 stop paying illegal immigrants or people with many children individual benefits - the whole household income should be assessed - food is as expensive for one as 3 people! you should not be wasting so much money - lobby government to address wastage in NHS - wastage on police looking for people who are doing 35 in a 30 limit - instead get them working on catching real criminals - UK is just rip off britain in my opinion and that is why we will have a brain drain as all the intelligent people will not tolerate this for much more - and will emigrate UK will be left with losers and low income earners. Then where is the Council going to get any money from?
- The poor have no escape, and need all the help that can be given.
- The proposals in the previous questions are mostly appropriate and reasonable
- The proposed changes are dangerous and unworkable. It is completely unjust to make the poorest people in society pay more. These changes will increase poverty and will be damaging to families and individuals who are already struggling. Cuts should also not be made to other services. Vulnerable people must be protected, disabled people should be exempt from any changes in the same ways pensioners are.
- The required increase in Council Tax payments for all residents of Lewes District would not be enormous and it would avoid making life even more difficult for those whose financial

circumstances are already difficult in a high-cost area and are unlikely to improve.

- The shortfall should be met by those claiming the benefit and not other householders in the district. Other householders are seeing cuts in their income in other areas and if you increase their council tax so those on benefits can have the same as before I think this would be VERY unfair.
- the thatcher government wanted to bring poll tax which would have been fare to all.
- The thinking behind Council Tax is that people should pay for local services. That means that every household should pay a fair share, and scheme 1 seems to address this best.
- The upper end of benefits should definitely be looked at, however, for people on low/no incomes, even a small change will make a very big impact on our lives, looking into lowering the amount of savings a person can have will undoubtedly help but that should also be on a case by case basis. Blanket changes will always affect some people adversely that shouldn't be affected by these kinds of changes.
- The wealthy should pay a bit more to help those in need living below the poverty line, on low incomes, out of work, or ill or disabled. It does not mean there has to be a cut in services, that is scare tactics. Those with the broadest shoulders should help those in need for a more equal and healthy society. We are judged by how we help the weakest in society. It is wrong to make the poor, poorer
- There is always wasteful spending by councils and more should be looked at to stop this and schemes for self help in the community should be looked at to take place of some of the council jobs
- There seem to be plenty of jobs in the Lewes area every time I have a look therefore the claimants could get a job & pay like the rest of us do.
- There should be no council tax support scheme - as every penny from the discount that these people get effectively results in an increase for everyone else. Why should the majority subsidise the lifestyle choices of the few?
- there should be no cuts to council tax benefit for the poorest. the council should use its reserves to pay for the cut and build a campaign to oppose the draconian cuts imposed by this repressive and cruel government
- There should not be an increase in Council Tax to support any changes, this just punishes those who work and pay their way. Could you dismiss claimants from the top two Council Tax Bands? These are the wealthiest households.
- this is a very complex issue which I find difficult to understand. however, a small increase to the higher-incomes and a very small charge to the poorer incomes could work.
- This just seems to be the best way.
- This seems the fairest scheme but I am concerned that the most vulnerable will be more adversely affected.
- This seems to have the least impact on the least well off and progressively reduces benefit as people become better off. Every beneficiary contributing a little is better than reducing any services or increasing the tax for everyone.
- this whole central government "bedroom tax" et al is as usual being pushed through without proper thought...taxing the poor again..yet to meet a poor politician or westminster "job for life" civil servant...maybe they should walk a few miles in my dodgy

jumble sale shoes?

- this would benefit lots of families to incentivise them to go back to some form of employment without causing hardship
- To implement any new scheme which means hardship to the low income families must be discussed with all involved before anything can be set.
- To introduce a scheme that limits Council Tax and other benefit support would be detrimental to many people who rely on this support JUST to get by. Even with my Council Tax benefit I struggle financially, without it I would have to take money from my heating/food budget which would be a disaster and mean I would get into debt in other areas...mine would not be the only household that would be affected in this way. More families would struggle just to EXIST!
- To make sure that you are helping only those people who can't pay the full amount.
- Unfair to target poorest as this does.
- Unfortunately due to the mood which George Osborne has induced if claimants do not bear some of the cost at the moment it will cause resentment towards them. Norman Baker needs to buffer this. However you need to reduce what you are asking them to bear.
- We are currently struggling to pay our priority debts EG Mortgage and Council Tax and are often trying to pay by ATE this always leaves us in a difficult situation each time the new bill is sent out... If there was a scheme put in place to help mid range earners to pay a percentage of the council tax and to assess people as individuals rather than working from a table that may not be able to help families pay their priority debts then this reduces stress, time for courts and bailiffs
- We have to encourage people to support themselves. Maintaining or increasing these benefits only makes things worse and penalises people who are honest and hard working.
- What is being proposed is totally unjust and changes should not impact the poorest. LDC will be seriously impacting on families lives. Lives that are already on the 'bread line'. If the middle classes are struggling to make ends meet, families on low wages or no wages will be made homeless. Totally shameful.
- Whilst the burden of this Government cost cutting exercise unfairly falls on the Councils to fund, the principle of welfare reform is sound. The draft scheme is a fair one, in that discounts and exemptions are other forms of benefit. If people currently in receipt of the discounts and exemptions genuinely cannot afford to do without them, they can apply for CTB or other benefits such as universal credit. Whilst I firmly believe that we should provide support for those who genuinely need it, I think it would be massively unfair to simply shift this burden to those who currently pay the full CT, without challenging the real need of claimants more robustly first. I feel therefore that your draft scheme is the fairest approach.
- Why not increase council tax on those best able to pay, as opposed to cutting any benefits on those most vulnerable. In short, why not raise the level of council tax? Or does this affect the amount of government grants the council is likely to get?
- why should you affect people that do need help paying for council tax and have a unique reason

- Working families should receive more support. The freebies given to those on benefits should be taken in to account such as the amount of free school meals etc they receive compared to those working. When assessing income for those working transportation to and from work should be considered
- Working tax payers are already struggling with council tax bill and other bills. Pensioners and workers are almost all on fixed incomes and cannot afford to pay more. Those on benefits are perceived to be receiving too much from the Government. I think it would be much better to cap people on benefits
- Would not choose any of the above schemes, because whatever scheme no one benefits from it, except for the Government.
- you get the best for every council tax payer hopefully
- your draft scheme seems fair, given that everyone should contribute to spending cuts
- SCHEME 3 WHICH SHOULD COMPRISE [SCHEME 1] PLUS PENSIONERS. WHY IS IT NECESSARY TO PRESUME THAT ALL PEOPLE OF PENSIONABLE AGE ARE LESS WELL OFF THAN THOSE OF WORKING AGE. SOME PENSIONERS ARE ALSO SUPPORTED BY NON-DEPENDANT ADULTS LIVING IN FAIRLY LUXURIOUS HOMES AND I DON'T THINK IT ACCEPTABLE THAT THEY SHOULD NOT BE ASSESSED AND WILLING TO CONTRIBUTE TO THESE CHANGES.
- I am concerned that people with disabilities that mean they are genuinely unable to work will lose out
- TAX THE WEALTHY AND BIG CORPORATES AND BUSINESSES A LITTLE MORE RAISE REVENUE FROM RATES AND INCOME TAX WITH THE WEALTHY PAYING MORE IN PROPORTION THE POOR HAVE SHOULDERED ALL THE CUTS SO FAR THE RICH HAVE NOT HAD TO ENDURE ANY CUTS WE ARE ALL ONE, WE NEED TO LOOK AFTER ONE ANOTHER WE ALL HAVE SOMETHING TO OFFER BUT IT MAY NOT BE MONEY
- I AM CONCERNED THAT THERE ARE PEOPLE EVEN WITH COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT ARE FINDING IT VERY DIFFICULT TO COPE FINANCIALLY. I AM ESPECIALLY CONCERNED ABOUT SINGLE PARENTS, DISABLED AND THOSE WHO ARE WORKING BUT ON VERY LOW INCOMES. IT IS VERY DIFFICULT TO "SURVIVE" GENERALLY AND AM SOMEONE WHO DOES NOT THINK COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SHOULD BE CUT.
- ANY SCHEME WHICH INCORPORATES THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS [A] NO INCREASE AND PREFERABLY EXEPTION FOR DISABLED AND [B] THE SHORTFALL TO BE BORNE BY OTHER BETTER OFF TENANTS
- I DON'T BELIEVE YOUR SCHEME (1) WON'T RESULT IN HARDSHIP.
- I THINK NEED TO CTAX BENEFIT AND IN SOME CASES INCREASE IT FOR THOSE IN GREATER NEED
- BECAUSE IT IS UNFAIR THAT THE POOREST CITIZENS IN LEWES SHOUL;D MAKE UP THE SHORTFALL IN COUNCIL TAX BENEFIT. THESHORTFALL COULD BE RECLAIMED BY INCREASING COUNCIL TAX FOR THOSE WHO ARE WELL OFF AND/OR CUTTING COUNCIL RED TAPE.
-
- ACCEPT THAT DECISION MAKING IS EXTREMELY DIFFICULT PROBLEM WITH INCREASE IN CT ON LOWER BANDED PROPERTIES MAY DEFEAT THE PURPOSE BY PUSHING MORE

PEOPLE ONTO CTB/CTS - WHICH MIGHT BE OVERCOME BY DISPOROPOTIONATELY INCREASING CTAX ATTRIBUTABLE TO HIGHER BAND PROPERTIES [WHERE PROBABLY LESS BENEFIT DEPENDANT RESIDENTS] SUGGEST MAXIMUM REDUCTION OF DISCOUNT [IF NOT IN PLACE] ON SECOND HOMES AND LONG TERM SUBSTANTIALLY EMPTY 2ND HOMES.

- GENERALLY SPEAKING, PEOPLE ON COUNCIL TAX BENEFIT ARE RECEIVING IT BECAUSE THEY AREN'T FINANCIALLY ABLE TO PAY THIS BILL. I BELIEVE ELDERLY PEOPLE, PEOPLE ON FULL BENEFITS OR ON VERY LOW INCOME ARE THE MOST VULNERABLE AND THE REPERCUSSIONS OF TAKING AWAY OR EXPECTING A CONTRIBUTION COULD SERIOUSLY AFFECT THESE INDIVIDUALS ABILITY TO REALISTICALLY FINANCIALLY COPE. I DO HOWEVER FEEL PEOPLE WITH ANY SAVINGS OVER £6,000 OR HAVE INDIVIDUALS LIVING WITH THEM SHOULD CONTRIBUTE MORE.
- AN EVEN SHARE OF THE COST OF THE CURRENT FINANCIAL DISASTER SPREAD AMONGST ALL - NOT JUST THE POOR
- I HAVE CHOSEN SCHEME 1 [DRAFT SCHEME] AS I DISAGREE WITH SCHEME 2 ABOUT CUTTING SERVICES AND INCREASING RESIDENTS OF LEWES DISTRICT.
- YOU SHOULD MAKE SURE THAT EVERYBODY IN THE LEWES AREA PAY THEIR COUNCIL TAX YOU SHOULD NOT INCREASE COUNCIL TAX FOR THE PEOPLE WHO PAY TO SUBSIDISE OTHERS AS IT MAKES THEM NOT WANT TO WORK AS THEY GET MORE MONEY AND BENEFITS BY NOT WORKING
- ALTHOUGH I LEAN TOWARDS SCHEME 2 WHERE THE VULNERABLE ARE PROTECTED , I HAVE SUGGESTED A FEW CHANGES, EG NO DISCOUNT FOR SECOND HOMES [NOT METIONED IN DRAFT SCHEME]
- FOLLOW HORSHAM, WEST OXEN ETC AND MAKE NO CUTS THIS YEAR. THE COST OF COLLECTING MONEY WHO DO NOT HAVE IT WOULD BE MORE EXPENSIVE THAN THE MONEY COLLECTED [LOOK AT THE FIGURES IN 18 MONTHS TIME. BY CHARGING THE FULL AMOUNT TO 2ND HOMES NEARLY £1/2 MILLION COULD BE MADE UP.
- I DISAGREE ENTIRELY WITH YOUR SCHEME 1 [DRAFT SCHEME] AND ENTIRELY DISAGREE WITH AUSTERITY MEASURES AND CUTBACKS WHICH HURT THE PEOPLE WHO CANNOT AFFORD TO PAY TOWARDS COUNCIL TAX. £5.00 A WEEK IS A LOT OF MONEY TO SOMEONE WHO IS ONLY IN RECEIPT OF BENEFITS.
- BECAUSE I FOR ONE DO NOT WANT TO SEE DEDUCTIONS IN COUNCIL SERVICES THAT IS THE PROPOSAL FOR SCHEME 2- IF SCHEME 1 MEANS THERE'LL STILL BE ALL THE SAME LEVEL OF SERVICES BUT WITH THE SAME SUPPORT NET OF BENEFIT [OR WHATEVER THE GOVERNMENT CHOSE TO CALL IT ABEIT AT THE SLIGHTLY REDUCED RATE THEN SO BE IT.
- I believe the council are spending money in the wrong areas for the wrong reasons its time to spend it wisely so its long term and not a repeative occurance street lighting the costs is high so alternative should be taking that means long term solar panels is a natural source which provides power for free from the sun climate change is an issue stop going on about oh its costly its for the long term and money saving and puts money back into the council budget with money from the national grid Peacehaven council introduced solar panels on there building and gained over £4000 back via national grid its not rocket science and its long term
- I agree with scheme 1 but with a higher maximum support of £30 pw . I think this would be fairer - a better balance between burden and ease. A small increase for those who do not need assistance and not too high a demand on those who do.

- I think people who are surviving on benefits and not earning should not be expected to pay £5 p/w. This excess should be added to the wealthy instead. There should be flexibilities but those living in higher banded properties, who earn more and with greater savings should pay the most in all circumstances. Those in need of help and support should be given it and those who can work should, if the work is available and it allows them to fulfill their potential.

Q10 If you wish to make any other comments on this proposal, please do so below.

- 300 words....The council really doesn't want to know does it!
- Again i repeat and as many poloticians have said the most vulnerable should be protected as they are the most likely unable to fight changes or actions that affect there standard of meagre living, with regard to making people move homes to smaller properties ie as families shrink , it should take into account that many have spent there life in one place anmd to force a move due to money is wrong as many will suffer in more ways than can be described here breifly.
- any family or the elderly (1 child or more) should still recieve their current council tax payments and not recieve any cuts. leave the current system as it is. LEAVE THE CURRENT SYSTEM AS IT IS.
- As a self employed couple with 4 children (2 of which are now 16 & 17, one on an a work-based apprentiship for which we get no help and one in full time education for whom I still get child benefit for) we already struggle with day to day life, taking away help with council tax would be detrimental to us, we already rob Peter to pay Paul and even the smallest things we used to take for-granted like my daughters packed lunch for school, or one of the many educational school trips can have us going without other necessities. This news couldn't come at a worse time... just as the energy companies have announced a huge hike in its prices too. It leaves us unsure what to expect in the way of help next year, Im all for a shake up in the way things are at the moment, as long as this change doesn't effect the people who need help the most.
- As council tax and rents,whether council or private, continue to rise, help should be available to those in greatest need.
- As one who hates computers, this has been far too complicated and assumes a knowledge of incomes and how changes will impact. It also seems to increase bureaucracy and so the cost of collection
- As stated elsewhere on this survey, I have specific concerns as a full time carer. I cannot work to earn more and my income is far too low to be able to afford further benefit cuts.
- Change the present system at your peril. It won't be allowed to happen without a big fight. Think yourselves lucky that you are well enough to work and have a choice because many of us don't.
- Council tax should be raised rather than make cuts in front line services
- Disabled people should be protected. These proposed cuts will end up costing the council more.
- finally why dont the council talk the government and tell them why should the vulnerable have to pay more council when people like him are driving around in the expensive cars not having to worry about living when we are attacked by them. also talk to the government about the millions of asylum seekers and especially illegal immigrints that they are letting in country taking these jobs that they apparently our making for our job seekers and taking the houses for our own people and giving them loads of benefits when he should be helping the vulnerable first and also with this country being in recession i find it disgusting that he is sending billions and billions of money to other countries when

his own people need just as much. so please oppose this scheme and help us the vulnerable people before it gets even worse for us to live as this sort of scheme and all the schemes that this government is implementing is making more and more people dislike there own country let al one this government. so yes we oppose this new scheme and strongly suggest that the council decide not to attack the vulnerable like this scheme is proposing, thank you for giving us the opportunity to let you know our views and oppose this scheme and I hope you agree with what the people not only want but more importantly need to live in a country that has decided to attack the people who actually need the help.

- Help the ones that need it the most
- Hopefully the single persons benefit will not be reduced as I would not be able to afford to pay the extra 25% especially as at this time I am on reduced pay at work.
- I am currently in receipt of DLA, however if my Consultant & GP deemed me fit & able for work,I would not expect the same level of Council Tax benefit to continue whlst actively seeking employment. I feel that those capable of work should not receive the same level of support as those which aren't.
- I am not a shirker (Cameron), or in 'bed when others go to work early '. Messed up from Surgery, would gladly work, but repeatedly told I cannot. Could not have Insurance owing to pre-existing conditions. I'm afraid I have days with what I find with the couldn't careless attitude with the human race I'd rather not be here. There are to many people with far to much money, and one, who cuts Councils funding anounces £50m+ available to spend on reflecting the tragedy of WW1. And these people claim there is no divide.
- i do not support the localisation of benefits, as it will, inevitably, give rise to differences between authorities which will be characterised by claimants on the borders oetween generous/not so generous authorities. as the scheme will still be broadly paid for from the proceeds of national taxation, it ought remain a national scheme. as indeed universal benefit will be - or are we to localise aspects of that too?
- I don't think services should be cut and council tax rises will mean people have to pay the same amount as they would if council tax stays the same and benefits are reduced. The people who will suffer the most with these decisions are those in low income jobs.
- I feel child maintenance payments from an ex spouse should be included in income, eg I receive no maintenance but have 2 children to raise which i do on my low income. However friends who receive about £600 a month for one child as maintenance on top of their wages do not have this counted as it is considered to support the child, and therefore still receive the same benefit. However the maintenance gives them a huge boost to the household income and eases financial pressures others encounter.
- I feel that people that do work and pay tax should not have anything to do with recovering money for the government. We all pay so much already subsidising benefits etc. I do not necessarilily agree with this scheme but I understand why it is being done. I do feel that vulnerable people are not just the elderly and severly disabled and maybe there should be some sort of assessment process to be able to make the decision fair.
- I had £12,000 in savings when I got the sack, Spring last year. I now have about £2,000. I give myself 1 more year then I will be utterly bankrupt,destitute,and probably homeless. Any further reduction in benefit will just speed this up.
- i have a child who has down syndrome and i, her mother, am her carer. this means i am unable to work as my daughter has many other problems related to down syndrome. my

husband works what he can, but often has to take time off to take or pick up our other children from school while i take my daughter to numerous hospital appointments, some being in london. for this reason i believe families who are in my situation should still recieve council tax benefit

- I have said it all through out the survey.
- I personally think the none workers should pay something as well as working famillies its one thing getting free rent but council tax as well thats why they wont work stop making it so easy for them when honest working low income families suffer for them to live the high life
- I sincerely hope the results are not doctored to suit the council
- I strongley object to a reduction in services or an increase in council tax to support anybody claiming benefits.
- I think in the current financial climate forcing yet more strain onto those least well equipped to deal with is at the very least a deplorable act of contrition, at worst legalised robbery. How exactly do you expect people to cope?
- I think only the most vulnerable should get help & not the rest.
- I think that Lewes council do a very good job and I am grateful for the benefit I have received to date. Whilst unemployed with a dependent husband there is already a short fall with benefits received by gov. of £250 per month. I am facing going in to debt by Jan 2013 if I do not gain a job so if I also have to pay council tax from March I would have to consider selling my home. If I still had savings then I would expect to have to contribute. Many thanks
- I think that the removal of the the central Government 10% is a mistake, but that this should not become an additional burden on those already paying income tax and council tax.
- I think the idea of those living in very high price houses and mansions should pay more than the residents of 4 bedroom places why do they not go up in bands the same of everybody else.
- I think the present scheme is o.k. but I think there should be a cap on the amount provided. As long as people living in Band A & B properties get their tax paid I think that is fair as most people in these smaller properties are the poorest. I think people in larger properties probably have the means to contribute at least something towards their Council Tax Bill. Therefore I think a cap of £25 per week would be sufficient.
- I think the whole council tax benefit scheme should be overhauled
- I would be willing to pay my fair share of the council tax if I was in work, but as I am struggling I would appreciate some help until i'm back in employment.
- I would imagine, being an affluent county, that Lewes would be able to shoulder the burden of this scheme without affecting those most vulnerable, but would imagine that any politician worth their salt would be worried that pensioners and any with savings over the amount suggested by this scheme would be less likely to vote for them.
- I would like to highlight the problem caused by a change in the scheme for those people who have taken occupational pensions before the state retirement age, perhaps for reasons of ill health. I believe these people should be regarded as retired and included in

the group who have a protected claim to Council Tax Benefit.

- I would urge you NOT to introduce a scheme that removes benefits available to struggling households. Those with savings above £6,000 or more should not be able to claim (I thought that was the case anywa) which would free up funds for others with little or no savings. Do we really want more families on the street, and children going to school with mo breakfast, and having no hot meal to come home to, just so the Government can save a bit of cash? They are responsible for squandering tax payers money in the first place! Why should the people of this country suffer for their mistakes?!!!
- If Scheme 2 is adopted, then I strongly favour a general increase in Council Tax to cover the shortfall rather than any reduction in services.
- If the changes come into place I feel it will push more people into poverty leading to more social depravation and a larger class divide. This could effect peoples health and also mean that many may need to move, costing more money even pushing people into living in vans ect. There have been many reductions in services but a home is the fundamental right for every person. Thats why the welfare system was first set up, to support the people in need, the disadvantage.
- if the council stopped wasting money on rubish idias and having training day for this that and the other and spent their time doing their jobs that they are been payed for we wouldn't be in the mess that we are in at the moment and also stoped sending money to banks overseas such as iceland their would be money and would't be a mess as their is now. it is about time that the council woke up and started to listen to what the people are saying and what is needed.
- if the government was to cut back on their own luxury spending and over paid mps, then the little people lower down the chain would be better off. why not just build workhouses and put poor people back in them. the country is going backwards. people who genuinely need help seem to be being penalised.
- If this goes ahead a lot of people will be made homeless
- If you target everyone with these new CTB cut backs, you will face a 20% increase on poverty, homelessness and illness. This new scheme will only work for those households bringing in enough money to support this, but the overall CTB bands should be reduced and not increased according to the size of your property.
- If you wish to make any other comments on this proposal, ...
- In general, I suspect that you do not have the time or facilities to make thorough checks on claimants.If this could be done, I think a 10% reduction could be achieved without recourse to changes that will affect genuine claimants.
- It is about time council tax was reviewed so that residents whose properties are valued at £600000 to £1million + pay more to the Council for services
- It is ludicrous that every council in the country is spending time and money coming up with their own way of coping with the 10% central government funding cut. Couldn't all of this energy have been put to better use? And equally ludicrous it the concept of a Universal Credit that does not also cover Council Tax Benefit. People are going to have to fill in their details twice if they claim Universal Credit and need to claim Council Tax Benefit. How could this oversight have happened? I suppose it is just diverting some of the flack for the cuts from government to the local authority - a diversionary tactic!

- It looks like a recipe for disaster.
- It should never be part of District Council policy to penalise the poor.
- It would be good if the Council could work towards 'intelligent' taxation and tax banding, which takes into account the cost of actual services received by recipients, the social or anti-social nature of the services (public goods/services, merits or de-merit goods), in addition to the expendable income after living and household maintenance costs have been paid. People might then be rewarded for improving and keeping their properties and neighbourhoods in good condition, whatever the size of the individual estates therein.
- its just the gov trying to get more money .and to take away from the poor
- Limiting or reducing claims for the lower banded properties will cause problems for buy to let Landlords who already sometimes struggle to get the rent from their tenants, if you make these people pay Council Tax they will find it harder to pay their rent.
- Look up the ranks more than down for your solution.
<http://www.internationaltaxreview.com/Article/3094490/Michael-Meacher-speaks-for-the-voiceless-on-tax-justice.html> The General Anti Tax-Avoidance Principle Bill 2012-13 is about to have another second reading before it goes to committee... The amount of tax that has been avoided is at least five times the amount the revenue of the Benefit cuts. Make them and the MP's accountable for this. Do your job.
<http://services.parliament.uk/bills/2012-13/generalantitaxavoidanceprinciple.html>
- Looks like you've already made your minds up regardless of consultations!!
- More and more people are struggling and NOT milking the system so do please be generous/supportive. We all contribute in our own way whether paid or unpaid work and that should be appreciated and taken on trust. We are not greedy or even imagine owning our home in this country!!
- My latest understanding according to the radio is that the council tax is to be frozen again. I hope that the council will abide by this and not try to make exceptions.
- No.
- obviously some changes have to be made as there is a shortfall of money to give out for everyone who needs it i do think in all firmness that even those unemployed or unable to work should pay a token amount of council tax show them this is not a free ride so people like me who work could actually feel a bit better about the increase as im sure they will be. i dont want to pay for these people to reciev full benifit when i am struggling on working very few hours a week and look after a family
- On Council Tax in general I would increase the single person discount to 50% and then apply 25% incremental increases for each adult in a property over and above two in residence.
- Organise a scheme that increases the tax on expensive large properties.. the highest bands. Protect those who are on low pay, disabled people who are on low income, those who are ill on low income... Just take it from anyone who have a high income and large properties.... Because if they can afford to continue living in these homes, and pay for the cost of running them and upkeep.. then, they are the people who realistically can afford to contribute more to the community.. And proportionately, low paid people pay a lot more tax than those with high income already so....!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! what are you trying to do, create more poverty?

- Pensioners are not the only people who are vulnerable in society and I know that increasing the Council Tax will affect pensioners too. However, many pensioners are well able to pay - they are the ones currently receiving works pensions that future generations won't have. (I am a pensioner by the way.) This drastic cut must be shared among everyone.
- pensioners MUST be safeguarded whatever or their ACTUAL income taken into account. Many foolishly saved towards their retirement.
- People are increasingly not able to afford to pay council tax. The new proposal making more people liable to pay, will mean that there will be more people unable to pay. I foresee huge costs being incurred by the council in trying to recover this unpaid council tax. In lieu of a major rethink to a fairer system, for example Land Value Tax, I propose that an extra banding be added above band H, for properties with the highest market value.
- People cannot afford any more burden..... inflation, food prices, housing.. forget it. I am marching in London on Saturday 20th and we are going to have to do the same locally... and may be we need to take the bull by the horn and have a campaign like during the Poll tax...
- People should be prepared to pay more council tax in order to keep the services we have and prevent cuts in services to the most vulnerable in our county.
- people who pay some council tax will be even poorer
- perhaps you shouldn't automatically put a claim in for council tax benefit with housing benefit if they have not ticked the box on the claim form. some housing benefit claimants may actually be able to afford the council tax and only want to claim for rent.
- Please do not cut council tax benefits; do not make people on low incomes destitute.
- PLEASE LOOK AT WHAT THE COUNCIL IS SPENDING AND WHERE AND LOOK TO REDUCE SPENDING IN OTHER AREAS TO MAKE UP FOR THE SHORTFALL, FOR EXAMPLE THE STREAM OF FREE AND GRANTS FOR ENERGY SAVINGS COULD BE DIVERTED TO HOUSING UNTIL WE COME OUT OF THE RECESSION. START LOOKING AT THE BUSINESS RATES IMPOSED IN LEWES. IF YOU REDUCED THOSE YOU WOULD ENCOURAGE MORE EMPLOYERS TO BE BASED IN THE TOWN AND THUS CREATE MORE JOBS. INSTEAD YOUR EXCESSIVE BUSINESS RATES ARE TURNING LEWES HIGH STREET INTO A GHOST TOWN OF CHARITY SHOPS
- Please reconsider cutting already vulnerable people's benefits. many of whom may also be affected by other cuts to welfare - ie Housing Benefit etc...
- Remember our benefits are worked out on the minimum the government says we need to survive so is this being scrapped? Yet food prices rise? Because of my illness I feel the cold more so if I don't keep heating on all my joints seize up and generally my health deteriorates. The heating is then so expensive because energy prices have risen so much. My electricity bill is very large. If your changes are enforced the disabled will then get more sick because they won't be able to afford enough food or heating which will then cost the NHS more money! Think about it! Protect the most vulnerable and you in turn cut the NHS expenses. I passionately feel that your draft proposal will put the most vulnerable sick people into a terrible situation. We already suffer enough. In such circumstances you are not actually saving money, you are just transferring the expense to another department eg NHS. I hope you reconsider.

- scheme 1 discriminates against families who tend to live in larger properties
- Scheme 1 discriminates against families, who tend to live in larger properties. I think that it will cost the District Council more to make the cut in Council Tax Benefit, than not.
- Scheme 1 discriminates against families, who tend to live in larger properties. It will cost the District Council more to make the cut in Council Tax Benefit, than not.
- Scheme 1 discriminates against families, who tend to live in larger properties. It will cost the District Council more to make the cut in Council Tax Benefit, than not.
- Scheme 1 discriminates against large families. It will cost the council more to implement scheme 1 than not. The lords have ensured an independent review by government to assess these schemes because they are so worried about the consequences. Precautionary principle should be applied.
- Scheme one should be thrown out Scheme 2 should continue , whilst looking for fairer alternatives in the future
- see (9) re second homes and multiple wage-earners in one household.
- SEE COMMENTS ABOVE
- Shame on Lewes Distric Council for devising yet another way to punish the poor, Lewes and the surrounding villages are full of above average wealth residents; find a way to tax to reduce the short-fall.
- Sorry,my English not well.
- THANK YOU FOR SEEKING THE VIEWS OF THE COMMUNITY IN THIS WAY.
- Thank you for the opportunity to comment, I for one, appreciate it.
- The choice is quite clear - you either force more people into poverty or you tell the government to stick it, use reserves and fight for more funding. The rich can easily afford it but the government is trying to con us all that they can't and we need to make poor people even poorer.
- The council has many millions of pounds held in its reserves and they should be used to oppose the governments unfair reduction in funding.
- THE COUNCIL MUST CONTINUE TO FULLY SUPPORT THOSE IN NEED. THE SMALL AMOUNT OF REDUCTION IN OTHER SERVICES TO THE FINANCIALLY SECURE CAN EASILY BE BOURNE. DO NOT ATTACK THE MOST VULNERABLE IN OUR SOCIETY.
- the current Housing Bands for propertys needs to be reviewed aa the pricees of propertys have fallen
- The idea that restricting council tax benefit will in some way incentivise people to work more is ludicrous. Many people who claim the benefit are hard working, but are struggling with high property and food prices and low incomes. Taking more from them in tax won't change their circumstances for the better, it will simply make them poorer. County council MUST work to reduce their budget accordingly.
- THE INTRODUCTION OF THE DRAFT SCHEME 1 IS TOTALLY UNFAIR AND PENALISES THE POOREST SECTIONS OF OUR SOCIETY FURTHER.
- The key issue here as I see it, is that those on the lowest incomes, who are already finding it difficult to manage, are not plunged further into debt by having their benefits reduced.

In addition, those able to work should not be financially penalised for doing so - there needs to be sufficient financial incentive to finding employment, so that nobody is 'better off on benefits' than they would be in a job.

- The maths doesn't add up. It will cost more trying to collect the money owed to the council, then the money raised. The council should use the reserve funds to pay the short fall from centre government.
- the most vulnerable should be protected
- The poorest and most vulnerable households should not be targeted for further cuts and financial hardship. Every pound and penny makes a huge difference to households living with the most minimal income. Any cut to Council Tax support will create more desperation, homelessness and stress. The Council should be protecting the poorest not targeting them.
- these changes will have a huge impact on low earners, maybe the council should look at themselves and stop paying out so much expenses for councillors who do not need the money as they earn a lot elsewhere
- This is a difficult and unfair imposition on councils by government. However, well done to LDC for communicating this so well and giving all CT payers the opportunity to contribute to the new scheme.
- This needs redrafting in a more concise and easy to understand format
- This questionnaire is impossibly complicated, and will I think therefore lead to some odd results. My own answers are not consistent.
- This survey is a complete waste of time. Survey or not, the Government are going to do as they please. And people who are disabled (like myself) and who are on low incomes, benefits, and the elderly, are going to be affected the most. 0
- This survey was inadequate for lay people who do not understand and do not have the necessary knowledge.
- To consider the effect it could have on families spread throughout ages.
- Unfortunately whatever scheme is implemented it is likely to affect some households who need help.
- What are the changes for a person who is a full time single student especially if they have dependants.
- Whilst there may be budget cuts for the council, the price of everything for people is going up. By adding just another cost on top of things, it is likely that people will simply struggle more. Please consider that not everyone receiving HB and CTB is doing it just because they don't want to get a job.
- Why are the disabled unless independently wealthy not included as automatically covered?
- why is it people that work there as a job to bring money in and can't afford things get discriminated against when people who never had a job or asked to get a job get all the benefits and we true people need it lose it this is wrong as it becoming hard for true people to live as everything is going up apart from the help and wages

- Will people who are in receipt of DLA also be exempt from paying council tax? This is going to open a huge can of worms. What next Housing benefit?
- You've stated that elderly are protected but what basis do you work out for the rest of us? will i have to pay more but my unemployed neighbours won't? i think the overall is a good idea but was hard to answer questions without knowing if i was inadvertently shooting myself in the foot!
- SCHEME 1 IS OBVIOUSLY THE EASIEST TO ADMINISTER BUT SHOULD BE TRANSPARENT AND FAIR IN ITS EXECUTION. THOSE ON BENEFITS ARE ALWAYS THE EASIEST OF TARGETS. BE SURE THAT THOSE PEOPLE YOU ARE TARGETTING CAN MANAGE THE IMPACT ON THEIR LIVES AND WELL BEING. PLEASE THINK CAREFULLY ABOUT TARGETTING THOSE PEOPLE ON LOW INCOMES AND THE SICK AND DISABLED. VULNERABLE PEOPLE ARE ALWAYS EASY TARGETS.
- OUR CONSERVATIVE GOVERNMENT WAS NOT VOTED IN DEMOCRATICALLY BY THE PUBLIC BUT CHOSEN BY THE LIB DEMS. THEY HAVE NO MANDATE FOR ANY OF THEIR POLICIES. THEY AHVE A VENDETTA ON THE VULNERABLE, POOR, YOUTH [STUDENTS BLIGHTED BY HIGH TUITION FEES ETC] OLD AND DISABLED AND SICK. IF YOU ARE IN ANY OF THOSE POSITIONS OUR SOCIETY FEELS VERY SIMILAR TO NAZI GERMANY. THIS TIME THE VICTIMS ARE THE POOR INSTEAD OF THE JEWS. THE BIG SOCIETY IS ANOTHER NAME FOR NATIONAL SOCIALISM. OUR SOCIETY HAS BEEN UNFAIR SINCE THE 1930S. DLA IS BEING REPLACED BSO WHAT HAPPENS NOW? I DON'T THINK PEOPLE REALISE HOW LITTLE MONEY PEOPLE ON THE ABOVE BENEFITS ACTUALLY RECEIVE ONLY A PORTION OF THE RENT IS PAID, FOOD, BILLS ETC. ALL BILLS ARE GOING UP. WE ARE HEADING INTO WINTER. £5 ct IS TOO MUCH! I HAVE JUST HAD MY HOUSING BENEFIT CUT BY £52 PER MONTH, A COLLOSAL AMOUNT OF MONEY FOR ME TO FIND OUT OF INCOME SUPPORT. IF I HAD TO PAY OVER £5 PW CTAX THAT WOULD MEA N IN ALL I WOULD BE SHORT £72PM. I HAVE A DISABILITY AND AM ON VERY LOW INCOME. THIS IS IMMORAL AND UNFAIR AND POINTLESS.
- PLEASE BE AWARE THAT MANY PEOPLE ARE HARD UP!
- -WILL 2X5DP APPLY CONTINUE TO APPLY IN APPRPRIATE CIRCUMSTANCES -P17 OF CONSULTATION-ARREARS DISREGARDS-DOES THIS INCLUDED ARREARS OF HB/CTB ALSO? -P17 OF CONSULTATION-DO YOU INTEND TO LOSE THE 52 WEEK PERSONAL INJURY DISREGARD WHERE MONIES ARE NOT IN TRU
- I FEEL THAT THERE ARE MANY INDIVIDUALS THAT DO OR CAN WORK BUT AREN'T SHOULD CONTRIBUTE. SINGLE OCCUPANTS WITH YOUNG CHILDREN AND ELDERLY OR DISABLED PEOPLES BENEFITS SHOULD NOT BE CHANGED.
- WE NEED TO MOVE ON FROM THE THATCHERITE LOOKING AFTER NO.1. WE ARE ALL IN TROUBLE WE MUST ALL LOOK OUT FOR EACH OTHER. INJUSTICE DIRECTED AT THE LEAST WELL OFF IS WRONG.
- THROUGH OUT THE DRAFT! NO AUSTERITY, NO CUTBACKS!
- HAVING ATTENDED THE MEETING THIS MORNING I DO FEEL SOMEWHAT SORRY BOTH FOR LEWES DISTRICT COUNCIL AND OTHERS AS THESE CHANGES DO SEEM TO HAVE BEEN FOISTED UPON THE COUNCIL WITHOUT WARNING AND ANY CRITICISM IS, I FEEL SOMEWHAT UNFAIR AND UNJUSTIFIED.
- if you make people pay for there council tax to people who are unemployed you will make them further worry about there expenses and may get them in debt and there are people who commit suicide because they cant take no more due to there money spiralling out of

control and cant pay bills and the council tax is a swipe at the vulnerable and hard up and families

- The greatest earners can probably afford to pay more and therefore should. This would surely generate more money for the council for better services and support for the community as a whole. Those who can afford and have savings should pay more. Those who cannot should not be expected to. People living in council properties with large families should be encouraged to work, to support themselves and not sponge off the system. But those in need*, genuine need, should be helped. *This needs to be assessed.