

Appendix A

Responses to question 12

Why has this not been publicised? I have heard nothing on the radio or TV. Has it been hidden in a few small newspaper articles?

If some people get all their council tax paid

For them then you

Shouldn't change that as it could push them

Over the edge.

As usual I expect it will penalise those of us on very low incomes but with modest savings of between 16 and 50k this is really unfair, but simply reflects the inequality of the current government policy.

savings need to be made so that the community as a whole can benefit. There are far too many people abusing the system which others have saved and paid into.

local governments are far too complacent in accepting such changes. a case of accepting the status quo!

I have to pay so I don't want to have to pay any more for the people that don't.

I think more investigation into peoples' outgoings are needed such as signs showing that they haven't adjusted their lifestyle to what they can afford if they have decided they need to claim. Also an additional service for people who admit to having difficulty controlling their money.

As a basic principle, those that can afford to pay should do so - affordability being based on total net worth. So, a person living in a large property that they own, or continue to live in without the need for the space, with a low income should seek first to secure accommodation of a more appropriate scale / value before drawing on Council Tax payers' funds. This should apply to pensioners as well, though I note they are not affected by the proposals.

Definitely means tested even with vulnerable adults as long as they have the income. we are a conservative enclave encouraging rich people to live here forcing up house values etc! Apart from the beautiful countryside! Rutland towns are pathetic and offer nothing. employment opportunities are non-existent! And those we have pay is too low! The bankers and all politicians got us into this mess they should pay!

benefit should be based on taxable income with sliding scale from 0% - 100%

benefit should be based solely on taxable income with 100% for lowest income with a sliding scale up to higher incomes.

this is just a smokescreen ... cuts are coming regardless of this consultation. As usual it is the vulnerable who will suffer.

If you are entitled to CTB it is already for a very good reason. Local income tax would be fairer. The council could re-evaluate housing, there are people living in three bedroom houses given to them when they had family at home, and are now there alone, they do not need three bedrooms and should not get council tax for a three bedroom house. for rents we have a list of rates payable for areas, for example in oakham you will at the present time receive £126.92 towards rent for a three bedroom house, why is a similar scheme not put into place for council tax benefit. If you choose to live in a house bigger than you need, then you can expect to pay more towards your bills

no.

the ability to pay should not be judged or assessed on "vulnerability" but on income and ability to pay. everyone should contribute to our community services to some degree - there is no 'free lunch' in life.

Appendix A

Responses to question 12

p.s. why are we using tax/local authority resources and money to print coloured pictures of Roger Begy? If he must have a photo on the info listing - why can't it be black and white.

i think pensioners should be means tested (as the rest of us are) and payments adjusted accordingly. those with savings and private pensions should get no help. We're all in this together? i suspect that you are asking for our views because you realise that rutland's demographic will provide you with the answers conducive to large cuts. since when was 10 percent of £1.8m, £435.000? £180,000 surely? have councillors and the chief exec offered to cut their high salaries for the benefit of those they serve? looking forward to your findings.

The extra should be funded 100% by council tax payers on Band D and above (like me). We may winge but we are best placed to find the money.

No.

There is too much help given to single mothers with multiple children, many of whom have different fathers. Benefit when paid should only be for a maximum of two children, unless the single parent has become single due to the death of a spouse. It encourages young women to keep having children to claim more benefits
it's going to hit the most vulnerable as usual. Those who cheat the system will continue to cheat the system

Be more helpfull to those who are struggling to pay and take into consideration housing cost ie mortgages as these are essential payments and if not made render peopel liable for repossession which will not help the council with houseing people and will cost the council mor in the long run with housing benefit etc. not to metion loss of what council tax they would have got for the property.

Once again, the Tories at RCC once again show how revolting they can be. Why don't they do their job properly and put up the council tax to cover any shortfall in the council tax benefit budget.

Pensioners on high incomes (£30,000 plus) should not be given the same benefit as those who exist on state pensions alone.

second adult rebate should stat - otherwise Mrs B throws out her adult son who then ends up as William costing the council more + increasing pressure on housing stock. Tapering off benefits too fast is powerful disincentive to working more, so a bad idea. Don't reduce support for larger houses for first five years after the benefit is claimed. Most likely scenario is redundancy from previously well paid jobs - such people already have lots of financial pressures and shouldnt be taxed into having to move house. but five years is long enough to sort things out or make alternative plans.

I think you should be going after the rich who only pay partial council tax on second properties before chasing the poor. Full council tax on all properties.

Perhaps it would be an idea to thoroughly check banding on properties in Rutland

I am strongly against council tax being increased for normal working people to fund this. At the end of the day by doing this we make the gap of funding even wider and hard working people pay even more. I want to support the most vulnerable people in society and I happy to do that through the tax that I pay. However I do not want to support people who cannot be bothered to get up and work for a living.

Route out those making false illegiamate claims for housing benefit route out the greedy and you will have adequate resources for the needy

Why are people on a higher income not required to pay more than people on a lower income - if I live in the same street as someone who is earning three times as me we still have to pay the same amount of Council Tax, this is not fair, only the rich are rewarded in this country.

people who are on really low income and have disabilties and cant work should have help with there council tax . in my view i care for my partner who has had a stroke and has a mental health problem and i cant work as i care for him 35 hours plus a week and the only benefit i get is carers allowance . my partner gets dla and esa we have already gotta pay 25% of our houseing benefit how much more do you wanna squeeze out of us ? it is very distressing wondering what next in essentials have we gotta cut to pay extra council tax ? we are living on the edge already .

Appendix A

Responses to question 12

Reduction in Benefit for people with savings over a set amount (£16000) should be based on bank Interest rates. Currently 0.5% and not a set figure of say 10p per £1. in your information you state it costs £1.87 million in Rutland to pay council tax benefit. You then say government is reducing funding by 10 per cent, you then say this will cost Rutland £435,000. I am no mathematician, but by my reckoning, 10 per cent of 1.87 million is £187,000. where is the rest of the money going??

the changes are clearly unfair and unjust in a wealthy society. It is absolutely disgusting that you are going to make poor people even poorer. You shouldnt have to 'rate' those most deserving of help and fairness. It is your job to protect those most vulnerable in society and if you haven't got the bravery to do it you have failed.

this will make more vulnerable people worst off and a lot more poorer then they already are. the cost of daily living is rising ever year and your money doesnt leave a lot after this already . so how are you meant to find the extra money to pay the extra council tax plus rent payments. i don't think that people who find themselves in a difficult situations through no fault of their own, and who are trying to do something to change that situation. should be penalised by having their financial situation worsened.

When families are struggling to feed, clothe and heat their homes, even making a £1 per week charge from their benefits is a massive deal to them. It's a disgraceful thing to even suggest.

Individual cases need to be considered and assessed and charged accordingly

no

it's time people realised that we all have to pull together on this one - Rutland is only a very small county - if we want to keep on enjoying the benefits of living in this beautiful area then we have to learn that we need to pay for it. I am sick and tired of hearing people say 'I don't want to do any more hours because it'll affect my benefits' - everyone revels in NOT working so that they can get all these free handouts. I have worked all my life, very low income but saved every penny I could - never could afford holiday and now , as a retired OAP, pay full council tax. Dammit I'm not going to support the rest of the scrounge society for the rest of my life!!! Single parents on low incomes who have no support from fathers seems to have been missed off your list! I work hard to support my son who has aspergers (and never asked to be put in this position!) and pay all the bills, as well as clothe, shoe, feed and buy school uniforms etc. and some benefit helps me out for other things such as high gas/electric bills with out the help I am one person along with many others who are likely to start getting into debts that have not occured before!

That those who can pay should but provison should be made to those in temporary hardship especially in this economic climate .

The question re house size-just because someone owns a large house doenst always mean they have large amounts of disposable income. Therefore income needs to be the deciding factor not the value of the house itself. People inherit houses there should be an element of flexibility to cover those cases where disadvantage is temporary or unexpected.

as someone with low income, but not qualifying for benefits, it seems fair to share out the financial responsibilities more equitably.

That there could be an alternative than asking for money. Why not offer the change to "pay in kind" on a pro-rata basis. e.g. cut the grass of an elderly person in council accomodation. or clear litter in your local area or offer some 'care' to an elderly resident or child mind for a friend and they do the same for you, so you can work part-time (if appropriate - as may not be possible) or volunteer at the library. or another similar community activity, which costs the council to run/provide.

there are single parents who struggle on there own some are entitled and others not. with all the changes single families will struggle to live on what they recieve. and could end up homeless. it seems to be housing benefit and single parents being targets. we dont like being single and trying to find jobs i should to.

Appendix A

Responses to question 12

it all depends on income. the present government is right to limit housing benefit to £25,000. in my opinion it should be a lot less than this. there are many people whose income is not £25,000.

a lot of this depends on the circumstances of the household.

a lot of this depends on the circumstances of the household

everybody should pay something so that they appreciate the services they receive. i liked the poll tax!

very difficult to answer 11a) as circumstances can vary according to circumstances (ie other support) children need greatest support

this questionnaire is very hard to complete as for most of these questions the answer for me was not a straightforward 'yes' or 'no' - the answer depended on many other factors.

perhaps more savings need to be made elsewhere. e.g. turning off street lights. cutting staff numbers (senior civil servants)

I feel that central government is hiding its spiralling inflation thorough changes like these. The Government is showing more of its incompetency by imposing these measures. We are now not progressing forward as a society but returning to the dark ages of hitting the poorest in our nation to pay for the wealthiest's excesses.

If all our councils spent less on lining their own pockets on expense claims perhaps these monies could be put towards these charges.
people living in high band rated houses who due to circumstances that causes them to obtain benefit should have a time frame to either pay for council tax on the correct proportion or move to an affordable property. eg. 5 years to sort out their affairs or move.

I have made my comment regarding the vulnerable in the previous question

I would ask the question though:

How are those on benefits due to ill health (mental or physical) supposed to survive? What logic lies behind the thinking that people in this position are going to be able to miraculously 'magic' additional money out of thin air, or gain employment etc. and be able to pay for these increases?

I fear for the future.

They should not be happening at all. As only the most financially vulnerable are entitled and that test is ruthless enough.

so many people know how to fiddle the system and the good honest people have to pay for them which is very unfair

No

As someone who, within the context of the people being considered in this questionnaire, is not suffering financial difficulties at this time. I feel very different about the opinions i have expressed.

Everyone on low incomes (minimum wage) & disabled should be protected from increases in council tax. The area is already becoming to expensive to live in (private rents). Area is in

Appendix A

Responses to question 12

danger of becoming an area of middle and upper income level residents, as someone on disability benefit + other benefits is getting harder to live in the area.

Although I have numbered the 'vulnerable group' it depends how financially vulnerable they are. Do I understand that they receive financial benefit from the state? and where there are child/children state benefit? More money, in fact, than some low paid workers?

It's very hard to choose, someone will lose out & I would not like to have to do it!

Scenario &. If William's only income is JSA of £56.25 pw, which is £243.75 per month. Then £17.12 per month council tax is going to leave him £52.30 pw to live on. There will have other bills to pay, such as water + electric and he will need to eat!

Minor changes should be avoided because of admin costs.

All people need to realise that services cost money; real money not just monopoly money. That we all use services locally (and nationally) and we all have responsibility to contribute. Some use the services (more services more of the time) more than others at certain times in their lives. Some can afford to pay more at times in their lives. We must all be responsible or we will encourage a something for nothing culture. Throwing money at the problem (since the inception of the welfare state) has clearly not worked - how has this "lifted people out of poverty" and into the world of work and self reliance/self respect?

Any need for council tax extra should be spread as thinly as possible across as wide a group as possible. The basis should be that, over a certain level of income, you pay full Council Tax. Below that, you pay a percentageage. But the relevant income should be the income of the whole household. Also, people in larger properties should not be subsidised for their unnecessary extra space (similar to how claimants of HB are targeted).

I feel that some protection should be available to those classed as vulnerable, however they should have to pay more like everyone else but perhaps not as much more if they fall into the vulnerable category.

Please set up a 'discretionary' fund for those that are suffering hardship as a result of these changes.

Your supplementary question on not helping people who qualify for less than £5 per week does not make sense. The supplementary question is reversed to "should get help" where the main question is "not get help" therefore by definition if someone clicks that they answer is "no" they need to have a minimum level at which help is cut off - not the other way round - your questionnaire therefore has a serious error which renders it statistically insignificant. Council Tax is linked with size of property. It would be helpful if CT Support did not encourage those who live in properties that are bigger than their needs to continue this practice.

We are all aware that the country as a whole is experiencing financial difficulty. We can not afford to give away benefit or discount. The wise thing to do will be to remove the promise of "cradle to grave" which was given by the Labour government in 1948. This should be reviewed yearly until we are prosperous as we once were in the mean time it should be the responsibility of each individual to manage.

Working age people who are on Jobseekers or Earnings Related Allowance will be assessed regularly and this should be a good indicator of ability to pay Council Tax. The Local Councillors and officers, if they are doing their job in keeping in touch with their community, will also be aware of genuine cases that need help to pay the council tax.

I think there should be a better assessment system. Benefits should be prioritised - those who want to work but can't should be helped. Those who can work but won't should be given a kick to go out and earn some money to support themselves.

If people are receiving council tax benefit presumably it is because they are on very low incomes and need it. To force these people to pay more would cause disproportional hardship. There are many, many wealthy people in Rutland who could easily pay more rather than

Appendix A

Responses to question 12

penalising the poorest. That is why i strongly oppose these changes.

how does vulnerability affect the ability to pay.?

no comments on changes but feel that councillors are elected to make these decisions and should not waste money on surveys.

'we're all in it together' Rutland has many poor and vulnerable people who should be protected from this awful government's economic incompetence. i see that the chancellors parents have just bought another house for £10million.

i believe it is important that everyone pays something. people with children are not always the most vulnerable and it would be good to have a formula that took into account each persons unique set of circumstances. too many hard and fast rules means many slip between the lines.

how did so many categories become eligible for council tax benefit? it would be helpful to know what percentage actually pay the full council tax.

i am a carer on income support i care for my half sister who needs round the clock care as she has physical and mental health problems if i told her of the current proposals it would cause her mental health suffer quite a bit i don't think governments and councils realise the effect they have on vulnerable people we struggle to exist as it is

if i have to pay towards council tax then i will be worse off and my children will end up losing out as i am a one parent family to 4 children and it is a struggle with what i pay out at the min if i have to pay towards council tax i will end up struggling

I think that these changes could cause a lot of problems.As a lone parent myself with two children one of which is on disability living allowance which will be assessed again next year.I am also in private rent accommodation with very high rent because there are no council property i have to top my rent up already by £130 a month i hardly receive anything from the csa.If i am made to pay towards my council tax this would cause great strain on my already strained budget.I think alot of people are going to be in the same situation.

People on benefits are already living in poverty. Making these people pay council tax when they cannot afford to make ends meet as it is will only send them deeper into poverty and despair.

CTBenefit should be based solely on taxable household income with the lowest earners receiving 100%