

APPENDIX 1A

Should the council protect the current council tax reduction scheme? (Should it continue to reduce council tax for eligible claimants in the way and to the extent that it does at the moment?)

Category	comment
Agree	I feel that the council tax reduction scheme is vital to help those on low incomes, especially the disabled and those of pension age. Especially to provide adequate help to those residents on their own who are Island born.
Agree / not appropriate	In the county press all the time Bacon your leader says he wants to protect vulnerable people he talks rubbish this will take money from the very people he says the council will protect he is a hypocritical.
Disagree	Neither England nor IW council tax payers can afford to continue the scheme in its existing, amazingly generous, form.
Agree	It's bad enough the income threshold for working tax credit is supposed to be halved in April (though it's currently been rejected by the House of Lords). This would just amount to a further blow. If the conservatives get their way, people like me will be reliant on every penny of additional housing and council tax benefit they will receive to counterbalance the loss of working tax credit.
Unclear	I think all household income should be means calculated. Just because 1 person lives in a house their salary could be more than a couple with dependents. Disability us harder as if they are on high rate and are unemployable it isn't fair their low dia is taken into account, this money is not a true living wage and some have to pay for care or treatment from this - i feel this is a difficult one to judge and these are vulnerable people who have already had to cope with social care cuts
Agree	We have no money to live as it is. You are killing us stop it!
Agree	The Island is fast becoming an area of deprivation. Child poverty is currently at 28.7%. Do we want to plunge further families into poverty?
Agree	People eligible for council tax reduction obviously cannot afford to have their income reduced further. The council has a moral duty to ensure the welfare of our vulnerable and disadvantaged residents. I am also shocked that the council buried this survey making it very hard for people to respond. The Isle of Wight council is consistently incompetent and these proposals are further proof of its inability to meet its moral and statutory responsibilities for Island residents.
Agree	people on the relevant benefits that make them eligible for help with council tax are already on the lowest income ,if you cut their help further they are then pushed into poverty
Agree	The government is cutting peoples benefits and in the coming year they will suffer even more hardship from these proposed changes.
Agree	A society will be judged by the way it looks after the poorest both financially and health wise. Allowing cuts here impacts the vulnerable hardest. We are all potentially only one step away from needing this help.
Unclear	Letter only sent to council. No survey attached.
Agree	Ideally the current council tax reduction scheme should remain as it is at present, but it is obvious that cuts have to be made and the important thing is to protect the most vulnerable.
Unclear	Letter only sent to council. No survey attached.
Unclear	No form returned, only a letter.
Unclear	No form returned, only a letter.
Unclear	This document is really difficult to read and understand.[]
Unclear	This will put people off.
Agree	The Isle of Wight Association of Local Councils have been asked by some member councils to respond to this survey on their behalf. The comments received back from those councils is that they believe that none of the options are acceptable as the savings proposed will target people already on low incomes.
Disagree	No some people can afford to have a reduction in (LCTS) [] People on ESA , PIP & DLA should be paying more tax . [] I am on ESA & would be happy to pay between £150-£200 council tax each year. [] There should be a requirement for people who are able to work to work at least 20 hrs i don't agree with self employed being forced to work minimum of 35 hrs , [] some people will struggle to find that much work & if there penalized too much then it will encourage people to going fully on the dole then council will get nothing !!!!! The scheme should be modified for fairness to everyone . [] people on long term JSA should have to pay more tax , they should have to do a certain amount of voluntary [] of they want council tax reduction
Agree	I'd like to know why we can't go back to the councils of 40 or so years ago, run by volunteers? Why do we need council leaders on six figure incomes, when Mr Smith the train driver, or Mrs Jones the bus conductor, or Mr Brown the dustman, used to do the job in their spare time; yet services were no worse, and in a lot of cases a damned sight better, than they are today. Like other disabled people, this is causing real worry and stress. If it comes down to a choice between eating or council tax...well, there is no choice is there?! If I don't pay the council tax then that makes me a criminal, and I get taken to court, (and charged for the privilege!), so I have to find yet more money I haven't got.
Disagree	There is a need to reduce costs across the board, and to start rolling back the "nanny state"
Agree	Let high salaries within the council and top management salaries plus expenses be reduced after all the working man always bears the brunt.
Disagree	You need to consider what is affordable whilst providing an appropriate level of support
Agree	People on low incomes cannot afford to pay council tax.
Agree	i don't think you should be considering including dia and pip into our incomes, these benefits are for us to be able to get the disabled out and about and keep the house warm and safe for them
Agree	Being a pensioner life is difficult enough without the worry of yet another bill I feel a lot of people claim when they have no need to.
Agree	The Council should do what it can to protect the current scheme
Agree	A lot of benefit claimants find it hard to manage to pay most of their bills, as it is.
Agree	I am currently in receipt of council tax reduction and due to other new demands on my £73.10 weekly income, such as much increased electricity bills, extra bank interest charges, etc, I would find it impossible to pay any more than the current £16 per month I am already paying.
Agree	the reason, is that it helps the people, who are on very low incomes, for a great many people are in this category.
Agree	both my wife and I are 89 years and 76 years of age, we are registered as disabled, and our joint income, is on the bottom level. our savings are very low, and this is impossible for people like us to pay more.
Agree	If council tax goes up not going to be able to afford it we pay over £100 pound now and that with my husband working full time and having 4 kids
Agree	The people who benefit from this are those most in financial need and some are also vulnerable adults. (e.g.; those receiving DLA/PIPS , Unemployed, The Sick)[] Making cuts that target those most unable to fight back is despicable and many cuts have already been made, by Government, that are detrimental for these people. Government has already coldly killed a number of benefit claimants, including people with long term incurable ills and terminal illnesses, so where is the money they saved from this unwarranted obscene holocaust. ?[] You are supposed to be serving the people, not the government.[] We are the people.[]
Agree	Unite with all of u.k's councils and take this back to government, and remind them that they are only elected officials, who must serve the people and release the money they saved by murder and copy that to her Majesty as im certain she is on our side.
Disagree	Some of the eligible claimants have two houses and two or three pension come in
Agree	I am disabled and currently receive council tax benefit for the full amount each month. I am very happy, safe and secure in my home and it has good access for me. If the council tax benefit was to be taken away from disabled people (claiming ESA and/or DLA) I wouldn't be able to afford to pay the council tax each month. Therefore I would struggle to live independently.
Agree	Some people do need help with council tax payments because it is not the only bill that needs to be paid and some bills you cannot get help with, so it is a help to have a council tax reduction.
Agree	My disabled son could be left in terrible financial straits if you take the protection from disabled people away
Agree	I can only speak for myself. I am 80 years of age, and on pension credit, and in order to have a reasonable day-to-day existence, I already have to spend every penny very wisely.
Unclear	Any reduction should be means tested by examining bank and savings accounts, especially looking at where money is going and is it being moved to keep the total amount below the threshold.
Agree	Reducing the amount of tax relief would drive many people already struggling to make ends meet into poverty.
Unclear	I think the benefits scheme should be means tested. Rather than an automatic blanket reduction of 80% there should be a way to calculate what people can afford.
Agree	The proposed increase in council tax support does not take into account the fact that benefit increases (if any) for 2016/2017 will be minimal, and certainly not enough to cover paying an extra £6.64 a month (band A residence (in my particular circumstances). Where are people like myself expected to find this extra money? I am unable to go out to work as I am a full time carer, and yet feel that I am being punished financially for doing something worthwhile, and which would cost the council alot more if my sister had to go into a council assisted care home!
Disagree	With the reduction in government funding continuing it seems only right that all support provided is reviewed and where necessary reduced to reflect the revised funding. Provided appropriate support remains in place to support those of genuine need but encouraged to find ways of improving their circumstances showing. []

Agree yes the elderly need to be protected, many are on low income and cannot afford heating, pensioners should be allowed to keep warm in winter,
Disagree The council is facing increased pressures on already limited resources
Don't do it?!!
When people are living on a limited income of £70/week, once gas, electric, water, council tax and phone bills are taken into consideration they are left ~£15/week for food. To further erode that whilst ESA/JSA is frozen becomes a hardship that is unsustainable, the need to eat will over-ride the need to pay CT bill and will increase the costs placed on the Council due to extended court actions

Agree As a self employed person running a business which currently is not profitable and nor is it likely to be in year 2, but should see profit from year 3, this would have an adverse effect on being able to afford to live and therefore being able to continue a business where we employ up to 10 members of staff- potentially then putting 10 working people into a situation where they are claiming council tax benefit! Which would only cost more money! The council should support those working for nothing, who are employing others and have a long term goal to support themselves. Do not cut support at such a vital time in business start up.
At its meeting on Monday 5th October Ryde Town Council agreed to make the following comment -!!
||
That whatever decision the Isle of Wight Council takes, it also implements an effective, secure and fair process for the protection of those poorest and vulnerable to any proposed changes in the scheme.!!
||

Unclear

As a self-employed single mother of two, from my perspective the council tax reduction scheme allows me enough room in my monthly budget to pay for school trips, clothing and unexpected monthly costs. I do not have Sky, I neither smoke or drink alcohol or have spare money for unnecessary luxuries. Families depend upon additional support to survive on, living on incomes that are already stretched to the limit with increasing costs of living. Over the last year or so, despite increased earnings via invoices & extra working hours the pressure on everyone's finances means that my debtors and bad debts are increasing. I do not see how this could be justified for the authority to apply the living wage for example to my earnings if I have not been paid by my clients and the balance sheet is not taken into consideration, but by applying the matching principle I have to produce accounts that show my debtors.!!
||
With the reduction in Tax Credits for working families this could be, yes an income generator but if people are already stretched, in my experience they will endeavor to feed their children firstly, heat their homes secondly. An outstanding council tax bill may be much lower down their list of priorities and potential revenue may well be lost if the cost implication is not considered for chasing unpaid council tax via the courts from people who do not have the funds to do so?!!
||
The Council should also consider that its residents are subjected to some of the lowest earnings in the Country in comparison with a very high cost of living. As a qualified professional positions advertised are paying at half the mainland salaries. Consider an unskilled worker, working on a zero hours contract which includes no provision for holiday pay or sickness pay and no guaranteed hours of work but the threat of losing that employment if you are considered inflexible within your day. Many people on the Island are employed in this manner or via seasonal work, the pressure on their finances and stresses on their lives due to no fault of their own is unimaginable. ||
||
I don't believe that the Council Tax support should be considered as a benefit. I think that it should reflect a FAIR proportion of "actual" income. I would question why a family in an average three bedroom house with an income of £26,000 and facing cuts would be asked to suffer the same amount of tax as an equal family with an income of £50,000 merely because their properties have been valued within the same band. The ratio of tax to income is unfairly balanced.

Agree It is such a help to someone like me who is on their own with no other income except what I get from work
Agree This reduction scheme is in place for very low income families and OAP's so why should it be discontinued.

Agree To be given a council tax reduction one either has to be on an extremely low income or has a disability that requires extra money. To take money from these people would further increase the pressures faced by these people. This would in turn mean that more people would have to use the foodbank, or increase the number of times someone has to use the foodbank. People would get into more debt, suffer fuel poverty, in families it could mean more children coming under the child poverty bracket, etc etc. Whilst I do appreciate the pressure that the council is under, please remember that a great many people are also under extreme pressure and to increase that pressure the council would be failing in their duty of care by quite frankly not caring about the plight of people already massively suffering under the tory ideological austerity programme. Make the rich pay more because ultimately it's because they are sitting on their fortunes and not allowing money to circulate that we the innocent and poor have to be financially restricted further. The rich want to be richer therefore the poor have to be poorer. Tax second homes, raise the tax in higher band properties, and any other way you can think of to tax the rich but not the poor

Agree In assessing the council tax for claimants I think other benefits should be taken into consideration such as disability benefit and child allowances.
Unclear As a pensioner living only on the state pension the help we receive with the council tax is crucial to our living standards. I have worked all my life in jobs which did not offer an occupational pension therefore the assistance we receive is even more vital.

Agree Working age claimants are already suffering from the reduction of the actual value of their earnings where they have any
Agree Ideally yes, but with such UNDER funding, not realistic, I think option 1a makes the most sense with a 5% increase for most claimants. [option b a revolution!]
Agree This is a valid service, particularly for the elderly who have low income and continued reduced savings, and should be kept for those who really need it.

Those eligible for council tax reduction are likely to be the same families affected by the forthcoming universal credit which will have huge impacts on people's ability to actually pay for food and to house themselves. This would be an added financial burden to those families and one over which the Council has control!!
||
It would have been interesting to see the statistics on how much of the council tax is actually collected each year and what the council is doing to ensure that 100% of owed council tax is being collected. As well, it would be good to understand how much the consideration has been given to the Council sharing services with say Portsmouth or Hampshire?
Agree As someone who benefits from this scheme I would find it difficult to give more money from my benefit (JSA & OTHERS) as I struggle to survive now on my limited money. As it is I find having a proper diet or paying my bills a real struggle also I am patching or patching the patches on old clothes to make them last as I cannot afford to buy new clothes which I really do need.

Agree I am on very low wage, would rather work than be on the dole, but if my council tax goes up I simply won't be able to pay it
Agree I've said it before and I'll say it again. Welfare benefits are set to be the minimum that people need to live. Taking Council Tax from recipients makes no sense. Can't you get your money from people who actually have spare money?
Disagree It's always the hard working people that pay for everything

The Island is suffering already with reduced tourism this year (notably adverse comments about the ferries and the extortionate fares charged have a part to play in this.) Unemployment is high and low income results from seasonal work. How are folk supposed to manage financially in this type of scenario without some assistance ?!!
||
Regrettably, we don't seem to see much for the Council Tax charged. Please don't make it worse !
Agree Any increase would come from my state pension, which would hit me hard.
Agree Without the scheme people suffering poverty through no fault of their own will just suffer more

Rents are increasing due to the large number of holiday homes and holiday lets businesses on the island as mainlanders buy up what was the local rental housing stock. ||
||
These businesses and leisure homes should be subject to council tax surcharges and business rates for the holiday lets businesses.
Agree Yes it should be protected it's there to assist those in need, granted it's not meant to be abused, yet the ever increasing living cost is crippling those on minimum wage. Is it the fault of those struggling that landlords are greedy and employers are greedy. It's not the working benefit claimants that is abusing the system, but the people that house them or pay them.

Agree Those that are already affected by the government's benefit cap will NOT be able to afford any reductions in CT benefits.!!
I returned to work this year & even though I work I still struggle to pay my Share of CT. ||
When I wasn't working I was hit by the benefits cap, I had to pay part of the council tax plus £100 per week towards the rent on a council temporary housing property..... it was a real struggle, & I often found myself at the food bank. (I don't smoke nor do I drink)!!
This will push the poorest islanders into even more poverty, will increase crime & be a strain on charities.!!
Agree Why are once again pensioners exempt? Are we not 'all in this together'

If the council needs to find more money all island residents have to contribute, not just the island residents who go out to work for living. Government cuts are consistently have a bigger impact of the hard working in society whilst certain groups of people still manage to live a better lifestyle than these hard working people. Whatever the decision it must be fair on all island residents and have a real impact on everyone not just those who actually pay at least 75% of their council tax.

Disagree The CTR scheme protects the poorest and most vulnerable in our society and its removal will cause increased financial hardship
Agree As a lone parent with tax credits being cut if you take this help or reduce it I probably will not be able to pay my rent. Please do not take this vital support away. It would mean that paying higher council tax too would be pretty impossible. I am seriously worried about this.

Agree Can't see how the council could do this and maintain services or limit the cuts to services itch out making a change
Disagree the council needs to protect the people who need their council tax reduced,!!
Agree these are the people on benefits & retired who struggle every week to make ends meet
Agree Tax second home owners.
Agree Eligible claimants are already living on less than the law states they need to live, for instance food and keeping warm and such necessities, even without having to pay Council Tax on top of this.
Agree

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE SUGGESTS THAT THE CURRENT FINANCIAL SCHEME IS OFTEN GROSSLY INACCURATELY CALCULATED AND THEREFORE A SOURCE OF BOTH SERIOUS UNDER AND OVER CHARGING/REBATE. GREATER EFFICIENCY IS REQUIRED.¶
 DISABILITY AND SIMILAR BENEFITS SHOULD REMAIN EXEMPT AS THEY HAVE BECOME VERY HARD TO OBTAIN OR RETAIN DUE TO STRICTER CRITERIA. DESPITE THE SERIOUS INCIDENCE OF LOW INCOMES THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE CLAIMING CTR IS SURPRISINGLY LOW.¶
 MANY YOUNGER PEOPLE ARE ALREADY BEING DISCRIMINATED AGAINST ALTHOUGH OF ADULT AGE AND WITH INCREASING DIFFICULTY IN OBTAINING EMPLOYMENT ON IOW.¶

Agree MANY PEOPLE ON LOW INCOMES ARE DISABLED AND OF WORKING AGE.
 once again hitting the poorest. have some morale's and tax those who can afford it a little more.¶

Agree i know house holds where 4 working adults live and they only pay the 1 council tax bill, surly a local income tax would be more effective. everybody pays (and probably less) but the council gets more.

Agree Some the proposed will lead to increased debt amoung those who can least affrd it and also increase the likelyhood of homelessness.

Agree The benefits people are receiving at present, ie: child tax credit, are being reduced by the government so low income families are already having to cope on less money. Reducing council tax help further will make their financial situation intolerable.

Disagree Those benefiting currently should be made to update details of their circumstances annually in case they no longer qualify for it.

The high number of unemployed people on the Island makes living costs very diffcult for them and frequently leads to crippling debt for some.¶
 Trying to live on Job seekers allowance means either food or heat! this is a fact ! with no luxuries.¶
 To increase the amount these people have to pay would mean even less food or heating.¶
 The reduction should be on total income to household with no exemptions which are really based on how many votes and bad press will it cost the council. ¶

Agree

Agree As a severely disabled person i use my dla to help me fund travel costs as the bus service is poor and i find it easier to travel by taxi. If i have to use my dla to pay council tax i would not be able to cope and my condition would get worse and i would have to seriously consider not paying council tax

Unclear I would be ill advised to answer this question without knowing the exact scheme details for all residents different situations, I can only answer on the basis of my circumstance, a struggling mortgaged homeowner trying run a business on a self employed basis due to lack of job opportunities on the island and the spiralling costs of traveling off the island for work opportunities

Agree I believe that myself and other people who have limited money coming in will find it extremely hard to pay anything towards the Council tax, most of my money is tied up by paying off debts as I am under the CAB...¶
 I feel the Council should find other ways of making cuts one being not giving money to the Police they have there own wages without having extra more money coming in from the Council tax..¶
 So I feel everything should be made possible to Protect the Council Tax Reduction Scheme from Cuts....¶
 People like myself that cannot work, we have only Benefits to live on and if you reduce that then we have nothing to live on or for....
 as I am on benefits myself, disabled ,, I only get £100 a week to live on, After Water Electric Gas,¶
 and food. Clothes ,washing powder and cleaning products , Internet Phone line , and TV licence , to pay for, and Paying my current Council tax Fees, It is used up . The government is soon going to make!¶
 Disability payments the same as Job seekers allowance , so I will only get Half of this to live on.¶
 if this happens I will not be able to pay my Council tax, I can only see that I will get a Visit from the!¶
 Bailiffs to take away what meeger posesions I do have, So yes I am in favour of Keeping the reduction scheeme, for people like myself,

Agree Those on benefits have been victimised enough.

Agree I just believe that anyone who receives INCOME RELATED ESA (SUPPORT GROUP COMPONENT) AND DLA/PIP should be protected 100% due to the fact that they are already facing financial burdens for disability and are below the living wage.

Agree

Agree the UK government scheme of helping families & individuals on low income is like no where else in the world & it is to be highly esteemed & appreciated. i certainly do. as a mother of two in a time where job scarcity is the norm, it is difficult to pay the onslaught of constant bills & offer a life worth living to my children. i don't know where we'd be without the help from the UK government. it is adequately monitored so that income is balanced with circumstances so that aid can be fairly given & efforts of employment rewarded even. i sincerely pray that support from the UK government can continue to low income families & individuals & ,due to the higher income families & individuals insatiable appetite & demand for consuming resources, we are not penalised further by our predicament.

Agree It is a sad reflection of our society at large and on the Isle of Wight if we do no aid those in our community who have less ability to contribute to their standing charges. This includes Council Tax. Why must we hit those less able to afford Council Tax with an even greater proportion of their "family/household" income being taken from them in this way. Shall we reduce Councillors payments by a quarter?

Agree People who are claiming benefits can not afford the full amount and struggle to pay the amount now. It's going to cause serious harm to mental health and stress related illnesses that will cost more in the long run. ¶
 ¶

Agree It's a disgrace in fact.

Agree For pensioners and disabled people like me and low wages we are always trying to keep our heads above water, this another tax that would drown us. I have already been told that my carers payments will go up by 400 percent per month which will make me further over drawn at the bank, so I am already thinking that I might have to give it up. If you do charge me and people like me we could be in serious financial crisis, so I hope you look hard and fair at our concerns. Also I cannot see the charging of foot passengers on the floating bridge makes more as there are less crossings as safety has come into more than before and the extra staffs wages, I do not believe that you will make the savings that you thought it would make or prophet, as I use the bridge once a week and have done for years the waiting time is a lot longer, hopefully just for you to consider before you tip the likes me and others over the edge thank you.

Disagree If anyone has savings they should use them before reductions are applied

Agree The benefits paid to claimants has not risen for the last five years. By asking benefit claimants to pay more all the council will do is put these people into further debt. Yes, then the council will employ debt collectors who will further increase the debt to the claimant - simply will not raise any money to the council only rise will be of debt to the claimant.

Agree if now other way can be found then increase the charge on the top three bands in stead of reducing the reduction on the lower bands.

Agree Increase the support for people on low Incomes (Benefits), Protect It.¶
 DO NOT CUT IT.

Agree Yes. A lot of working people haven't had more than 1% pay rises for 6 years now. Any increase will push them into poverty

Agree Savings obviously need to be made but there should be provision for the most vulnerable and financially constrained.

Unclear

Agree The Isle of Wight is one of the poorest areas of the country and further reductions to Council Tax support will have a significant impact on the most disadvantaged people. There are many on the island on a low income, due to our specialatus.

Unclear The Council could use an individualised means assessment to discover individual or family ability to pay nothing, at present, or a graduated amount according to individual/family circumstances.

Agree Wages on the isle of wight are not good with most people on minimum wage also most jobs are seasonal to try to make people pay extra would put most people in to poverty on a grand scale

Agree It seems it is always the poor and needy that have to pay for all the cuts in this country. There are wealthy people on this island who might not miss an increase in council tax. Perhaps a tax on second homes could be an option. I would prefer to see a limit on the number of free bus journeys that pensioners can make. It is very difficult to find decent employment on this island at reasonable rates of pay. This is likely to get worse when the minimum wage rises. ¶

Agree

Agree To not do so, will drastically affect the disposable income of a group of Island residents who have disproportionately had their individual, and household, income attacked through the Conservative government's Austerity programme, and through cuts to the amounts of benefits they receive. This will increase child poverty, and drive a (typically) poorly educated group, not particularly adept at personal finance, into the hands of payday lenders, or loan sharks. This 20% payment (typically about £15 a month) is money this group can ill afford. While the Council is in a parlous state with regard to funding of services, taking funds in by such means to help fund other services, is, in my view, a step too far

Agree I think foreigner coming here free loading should not get any benefits but work. You have them conning you left right and centre. I know of folk that wife works men stay at home with kids at school and con you out of benefits. Alcoholics drug addicts laugh at you because, you pay them to get there fixes and council accommodation. How foolish is that. They should not get benefits at all or accommodation. Because you are making things worse. They laugh at you. Senior councillors should not get expenses or massive salaries either what do they do but push a pen around. That's wronge too.

Not appropriate Thinking about this if you where to reduce council tax even more you could be putting family's at risk of not being able to pay it. Family's are already struggling, some people starve them self so their children can eat. If family's are struggling now do you think they'd be able to take any more strain? You could potential leave family's with no choice but to become homeless and be in loads of debt because they can not afford to pay the council tax. I think a few people with a few hundred in their pocket that can get everything for their family should try living like us for a month and see how they coped maybe it would give them an insite on how to protect our family's rather than trying to crush them even more

Agree get the pensioners to pay for services like everyone else, if the government wants to buy votes from the pensioners, then the government should pay for them to use the services.¶
 we are an island with limited capabilities, with a lot of elderly people and suggest that the council puts our case to the government as a special case.¶
 also feel free to grab some land foc, and start building council houses for local people with the money from asda, this will bring a income year in year out, chances are there is a government grant in there somewhere for building.

Disagree

Agree Not all of us can afford to pay. We have already lost half our benefits.

Agree Most of the people on this reduction scheme are disabled and on either low wage or disability payments . so can not afford the full amount of council tax rates

Agree I am a pensioner, and understand that this survey affects working age claimants, but I think you also wanted general opinion.

Stop wasting council tax money on stupid things & dodgy councillors wasting our hard earned cash on travel & expenses & god only knows what else! []
 The tax payer doesn't pay my partners petrol to get to work or pay for us to take my severely disabled son to go over to Southampton General on a regular bases![]
 []
 The solar street lights must be saving lots of money on the electric bill so wheres that saved cash going...???? []
 []
 Our council have closed public toilets in sandown as well as other towns so there are more savings there.. wheres the saved money from running them gone...????[]
 []
 Sandown didnt have the blue flag this year so where are the savings from that...????[]
 []
 Our wonderful council has also closed lots of schools so where has the money saved from that gone????[]
 []
 Also our post offices have been privitised so wheres the money frm this...??? []
 []

Agree As you can see... lots of money has been saved so why why why is our council tax goin up AGAIN!!!!?????
 Disagree People who have no intention of working and claim every benefit going should be penalised
 Agree / not appropriate Yes sack your financial accountants. YOU are solely to blame for this outrageous position your in, no one else, just you at county hall. Your a total disgrace to this Island and you should all be dismissed. Shame on you all.
 put holidays homes council tax up!
 Unclear jsa familys should be paying 20% not 18% already []

Individuals and families are already suffering from the recession with minimal or no spare money available. The already applied reduction in available benefits to individuals adds additional stress and inability to cover costs. The central and local government relief that was provided before that resulted in those on a reduced income not having to pay council tax has already been removed. This has resulted in those suffering from the worst financial hardships having to find sums towards the council tax already. To ask these individuals and families to potentially now have to find further sums by an increase in the sums they would have to pay is deplorable and extremely unfair to these people and to place more financial stress on such people is not the objective of a local council who should have an increase duty of care to those electorate who are in need. Any increase to these people will only result in an increase in the inability for people to pay and additional costs to the council to seek payment via legal action against people that have no funds available and these people could end up having a legal conviction on the bases that it is not that they wont pay but cant pay which is not the basis of justice or the ethos of both the island and this country.

Agree People who are entitled to council tax support are already struggling with high energy and fuel prices, not to mention using food banks more and more. This increase if approved will only serve to squeeze every last penny out of many families who are already getting in debt just trying to get by. I believe wealth should be shared with the introduction of a maximum wage and stop giving tax breaks to top earners. They are very lucky to have those jobs which many more people could do for a lot lower cost. the poorest people can't afford to pay yet more money. they are often living below the poverty level already.
 Agree Can only say this from my own point of view.
 Unclear

Agree Both my wife and I are on disability benefits. There is no way we have enough money to pay Council Tax. It was hard enough to find the £10 I owed this year.
 Agree As I see it, if vulnerable people are made to pay more, irrespective of income, then it will cost the council more in paperwork/time pursuing claimants for non payment of tax. Those who already have very low incomes and difficulty paying will struggle even more I think.
 Agree All prices are going up each year with the cost of living a lot more than pensions do. Stop getting in outside advisers, there must already be somebody employed in the Council that can do the work, if not you must be employing the wrong people. this saving should help.

Dear Sirs,[]
 []
 We have studied the IWC Council Tax Reduction Scheme 2016/17 in depth and we find that it is essential for the Council to do their best to retain the Tax Support Scheme in the light of the older population currently in permanent residence, here in the I.O.W. Many of us who are retired and are subject to living off a non-earnable Pension, struggle to maintain a reasonable standard of living. This surely is not the way to appreciate the years of regular Tax and National Insurance Payments made by said Parties. Also, the considerable amount of money spent within the Island's commercial sector.[]
 []
 If it is the Council's intention to reduce this assistance to the Senior Citizens here on the Island then IT cannot conceivably consider offering residence to foreign Asylum Seekers or so-called Refugees, as IT is claiming that due to Government Restrictions it is necessary to carry out this action of redefining who is/or isn't justifiably eligible recipients of Council Tax assistance.[]
 []
 We, as many, are finding that the rise in costs of everyday living is putting constant strain upon our resources and we would find it extremely difficult if our Council Tax was suddenly drastically increased.[]
 []
 We can appreciate that from a Council point of view it is often difficult and virtually impossible to get payments from several areas that do not meet their Council Tax Bills, for whatever reason, but we cannot ignore the fact that these People are as responsible for receiving various Council Benefits as are the rest of Us. We must control these aspects of Council Tax Collections and not allow these People to dodge their responsibilities, therefore making the rest of us pay on their behalf.[]
 []
 In conclusion, we fully appreciate the predicament that this Tory Government has placed on our Island Council but that does not allow abuse of those of us who have appreciated their duty to the Island where we live, so we respectfully suggest that You continue to support the Older Generation, as They/We support You.[]
 []
 Yours sincerely,[]
 Mr. & Mrs. D.M. Childs

Agree you seem to be forgetting the very reason the scheme exists in the first place. people on very low income simply cannot afford to pay council tax. personally i accepted that some money needed to be recovered from such schemes because the country was in economic crisis and i paid the 20% willingly because it was the least i could do given the circumstances

Agree If we had to pay council tax we would have very little to live on, it would squeeze us to existence level without any comfort in our old age.
 Agree I appreciate the problem But as a beneficiary of pension credit I note this is protected at the moment But this proposal is to reduce CTR for exisiting claimant. I believe will be paid for out of benefit of the poorest making them even less well off in fact reducing their benefit overall
 Agree I would like to say yes but if the need arises then cuts to help or raise money from other resources is the only option.[]
 The options of 1a and 1b seem to raise the most money in a fair way. []
 I don't know if raising money on holiday homes is a option. []
 I think counting Disability Living Allowance and carers into income is not a option. These benefits are giving to help with cost arising due to illness and disability. These allowance are not counted in any assessment of any benefits, so it seem very unfair that our council would see it feasible to alter this system and count DLA into this assessment.[]
 There are a lot of people scamming the council tax system, maybe this is a good place to start.[]

Agree Claimants for those who are too ill to work and single person discount should be continued
 Agree some people are on the breadline as it is and if their reduction is cut they will have to find the money from their other 'pot' ie food, clothes, heating.
 Agree people like myself who is a single parent and full time carer for my disabled daughter would not be able to find the money to cover any more costs and would therefore be in poverty. it would be so unfair!
 Agree The poorest and most vulnerable in our society must be protected the burden of benefit cuts the bedroom tax and cuts to care packages have already impacted on the disabled and sick[]

Agree Not all people can afford for the council tax amount. its not fair for people who are struggling to pay their bills which is why they need the help in place so they can afford to live.
 Agree

Let's be clear on this, most people who claim council tax reduction are already on very low income, or no income at all. And for the most part are receiving income which is well below the National average. Whilst we (my wife and I) understand the difficulties produced by the austerity measures imposed by this Government, it seems totally unfair to move such burdens now being placed on local Government coffers to those who can least afford to pay for these measures. My wife and I for instance are pensioners relying on state pension and a very small insignificant private pension - and my wife is on a reduced Government pension because she was wrongly advised not to pay a self employed stamp, so for us, we are indeed living out our retirement on less than the minimum working wage. []

Any changes to the council reduction scheme will certainly put a burden on those who can least afford it, and who are the most vulnerable in society to begin with. So our views are quite simple, and could easily save the Council much more money in both the short and long term. For example, reduce council wages and staff membership overkill at higher management levels; take back control of Road Maintenance and other areas that are now being farmed out to the private sector. And where this isn't possible, renegotiate better and cheaper contracts. Also take a closer look at office wastage: paperwork, etc; purchasing; postage, printing etc, throughout all departments. Reduce staff where possible until such a time as departments can show that they can afford to employ more people. We are certain some good savings can be made this way and the council will become keener and sharper in all areas of its delivery.[]

We are told by Mr. Cameron that we are all in this together, so the cutbacks must come first from the top and then slowly filter downward. Not the other way round. We are both sure that any in-house cuts will be enough to cover the majority, if not all, of the proposed cuts on council tax. []

Best regards..Keith and Pauline Towers

Its only fair to help the elderly who are being penalised again

surely the people who need this protection are on very low incomes or are elderly and have paid all their lives and have struggled to meet the payments over all their working lives

My example. I am a single pensioner that has 2 children under 12 years old. No private income, just government state pension. My income each year is means tested to a certain limit. I could not up payments in any way to cover council tax. Then, if this happened and I had to pay something towards the tax, I couldnt without reducing food for myself and children. Not paying would bring me into the courts system because of refusals to pay. Then I become criminalized through no fault of my own.

Everyone should have a liability to pay whether in work or not as it pays for the services that they use. Currently IOW have 4.8 million outstanding in uncollected payments, increasing the liability to 25% to someone on £73.10 per week will place residents in poverty but equally will encourage them that work pays. This is an Island with a lower than average salary compared to the mainland and whilst I appreciate their is poverty on the mainland that can travel far easier than you can do from the Island. Public transport have withdrawn their 1/2 pass bus travel for those trying to find employment. It will put residents in poverty

Simply, cannot afford to pay any more.

The money needed to make up the shortfall needs to be raised by other means DEFINATELY not from those that cannot afford it. Even now it seems that people are being made to pay even though they are receiving the bare minimum in money per week. (JSA claimants etc) Please get real. There is far too much poverty now on the Island. Do we as an Island want that increased. There are two music festivals on the Island, add a surcharge to the tickets & use this money for the deficit. This way the Island benefits. This is just one idea.

This scheme is very important to the recipients and any reduction will increase hardship for many claimants

WHEN ON BENEFITS HARD TO MAKE ENDS MEET WITH MONEY PROVIDED BY BENEFITS OFFICE

Everyone uses the services and therefore everyone should pay. I'm sick to death of seeing people on benefits, standing smoking, while moaning about paying a small portion of their council tax/housing costs. They seem to manage to drink, smoke, eat well enough and dress themselves in clothes that cost more than what they should be able to afford.

Old age pensioners with only gov pension are a particular case, and must be protected

Council tax reduction should remain unchanged and who earn more should pay more in order to face the decreasing Government funding.

The council tax is very high for people on low pensions and they really do need all the help and this reduction is very important for quite a lot of the population.

I am 62and on disability and other benefits my wife doesnt work and cant claim any benefits so we scrape by on my money. At present we get 100% council tax benefit and would be hard pressed to find the money if we had to.

The present scheme has been deemed to be fair by previous councils especially for people on low fixed incomes and or disabilities. As for any savings, many people, especially pensioners are having to use these regularly to pay for every day expenses including food, utility bills, repairs and renewals etc. Money saving can be made by other means. One example is the cost and waste of electricity, example, the festoon lights along Sandown Esplanade, even after you being notified last year they still are not timed properly, some come on during daytime, what a waste! what's the cost?[]

I am sure a lot of money could be saved if you look at your own unnecessary expenditure more closely, most people believe councils should look at themselves first and be independently audited and investigated openly.

We've already had cuts all!

Over the uk and doing this will drive more families into poverty

Stop cutting benefits for those already struggling. Where is this councils compassion? Find the money by increasing council tax for band D and above properties.

If our council has had significant funding decrease, then it up to our council to find ways of saving in other areas. This may or may not be via council tax schemes, it could also use other schemes. Sometimes things have to change, just the way it is im afraid.

There are many people living on the bread line now this will make matters worse maybe cuts in other services may be another option i.e selling of land or selling some empty properties.

The Scheme is very important and needs all the people on it.

Yet again the vulnerable are targeted. It seems to be a trend be bash anybody that has to claim benefits. But sometimes there are genuine cases such as illness and to put more financial pressure on people who have enough troubles is cruel. Perhaps councillors could cut back on their expenses. Or a good idea might be that the free Isle of Festival tickets they get could be sold and put back into the budget.!

As a pensioner I have had an 8 pence pension rise this year and this hardly covers any rise in council tax

I know it hurts some people far more than others and those that it may affect to the point of endangerment(health & otherwise) need to be protected. At same time due to these difficult financial times, I cannot overlook the fact that we are all in it together ? Therefore councillors(even if eventually they too have to pay increased council tax) should ALSO take a % cut in their salaries at same time as any increased council tax.[]

To me it makes no sense, in fact I see it as grossly unfair, that those running the administration should be continued to be paid salaries without contributing from those salaries which exceed the incomes of the majority of those who may have to pay increased council tax.[]

Any increase in council tax or reduction in councillors salary to be on a 18 month basis,that is reviewed every 18 months & NOT permanent. Its an historical fact that such changes become incorrectly permanent![]

Increase the amount due on substantial properties two to four times (million plus market value properties) []

Add a tax to holiday homes of a realistic rate of what it costs councils to deal with homelessness and what these non contributory occasional visitors take up of Island housing stock which could be used as rental property here for residents. Consider compulsory purchase of holiday homes to reduce council spending

All income should be taken into account before any reduction in Council tax is calculated, that includes Child allowance, Disability allowance, etc.

I think there should not be such reductions if a person is getting a large amount of benefits and is not working. This should also include people on PIP and DLA as they seem to have a large amount of disposable income. As a single mother who is working part time, I struggle but still magage to pay my Council Tax and think it should be the same for everyone.

I think there is a case for means testing, i.e those receiving benefits across the board where need does not exist. Not in the remit of the local councils perhaps, but an argument they can put forward to central government to protect the island vulnerable. I refer not only to council tax relief, but child benefit, pensions, and bus pass concessions are handed out to poor and wealthy alike which is a nonsense.

it must be taken in account that a great deal of over 60s on the island recive only a basic pension and would have no means of paying any excess

You have already cut support for the most vulnerable the sick, disabled and those with mental health issues in our society. They have reached a point where they have no more to give. Now you must target those who are earning with bigger properties and substantial savings including those of pensionable age.

There are people on the island claiming that are not entitled to and the capital limit needs to be set at £6,000 because if you have over this limit why cannot people use this money to pay their own council tax and not rely on a over cash scrapped council and the government.

What happens to the un-employed people who can NOT get a job, because of various reasons ! And can NOT afford to pay anything ? (What happens to them?)[]

This could be anything from disabilities, mental health, lack of training on offer for the unemployed, Ect.. Ect..

I have mixed views, maybe a slight increase to what everyone pays maybe but not include child benefit or tax credits as these are given for the children.

without this reduction many people would face even greater hardship

people will not have the money to pay therefore will get into arrears. This will then lead to county court judgements causing more hardship for people and the council will have to wait longer for the money as payment schemes would have to set up.

We are a working family of 3 with a disabled son surviving on less than £200 a week and using food banks. We could not physically pay more council tax

	The scheme is essential for low income people who already struggle with many bills and costs. It is already based on tiers of reduction percentage and so is as fair as it can be. With such a large disparity between income and cost of living for many people under the present austerity climate, having to pay more council tax would be a major financial problem for those receiving help under the current scheme.[]
Agree	It is important to remember that most people on the reduction scheme have paid full council tax all their lives before falling on hard times and so have already contributed to the council's costs for many years.
Agree	Why should the disabled suffer and not the elderly some elderly are much better off how about means testing the elderly once again lets take it from the disabled its not on
Agree	The dla is a government benefit and should be protected it is not awarded unless needed and the amount is what the government deems is fair ,it would be in effect a reduction if included.
Agree	Disabled people like myself who genuinely cant work due to their disability on benefits should still get the council tax benefit
Agree	The council take enough money as it is the little bit extra you get the more they want to take when the wage goes up they take it and more[]
Agree	Cut hostel funding
Unclear	Because murder is against the law.
Agree	council tax should not be charged to people on gauranteed pension credit
Agree	My husband and I are both pensioners and do not have an increase in our pensions to cover any more cuts the government proposes to make. The living wage is going up to £9 but unfortunately we will not have the same amount of increase in our pensions. My husband is disabled and I sincerely hope that any future reductions should not include pensioners and disabled people .
Agree	I am claiming pension credit as I have no other pension . I am also paying £90 a month from my basic pension towards my private rent . I applied for council housing but nothing was available . This was the CHEAPEST property I could find .[]
Agree	I cannot afford to lose my Council Tax relief . I am living at a basic living standard and cannot afford to make any more compromises .
Agree	I do feel it is time to take PIP / DLA into consideration as an income. There are many people living a better quality of life because this is classed as an exempt income, when many people on low income struggle. []
Agree	If it is necessary to put a 5% increase in payment for claimants, then I feel we would all adjust accordingly.
Disagree	This is preferable to raising council tax above two per cent
Agree	if the council tax reduction scheme is cut, those who are already on benefits and low incomes will find it more of a struggle to make ends meet. this intern will course more stress depression and anxiety for these people. []
Agree	the government say that there is a minimum level of funds that a person or family need to live on per week, if further cuts to council tax support are put in place, then this will then lead to the claimants being below the minimum required to live on.
Agree	People can barely afford to pay CT now when on low income. Rent /mortgage is priority to keep home
Disagree	Council tax should stay the same for all working, retired and single parent families and nobody should get a reduction
Disagree	Bring in some of the changes listed all groups to pay a minimum charge.
Agree	People are really struggling at the moment. All of the options are really cruel, but especially the one for self employed as there is no work on the island so lots of people try to make ends meet this way, but that doesn't guarantee a living wage. Taking any support off would mean even more hardship to a lot of island families. Please don't do it.
Disagree	The people I know on the island on benefits always seem to have far more ready cash available than those of us who work full time and pay tax and NI. Most of them I know could afford the 30% of their council tax. This appears to be the opinion of most hard working people on the island as well
Disagree	I think that lowering the amount of benefit, eligible people pay is the only way to claw back some of the money that is desperately needed.
Agree	Many people simply could not survive if you stopped this support. A lot of people are only just surviving as it is now.
Agree	People who are currently eligible are not suddenly going to be able to find the extra needed if this scheme is abolished, they are already on very low incomes and that is why they need the help in the first place! What would be more sensible is if the amount that the upper bands have to pay is increased, the discount for second homes is abolished and the discount for empty properties is abolished. Let the well-off pay their share.
Agree	Don't hit working age claimants, it is deeply unfair and immoral given how difficult life is at the moment.
Disagree	Protect to a degree. But agree cuts can be made in several areas
Agree	Council tax is a nightmare for low income homeowners especially single people who are just above the level where they are ineligible to qualify for benefits. This cliff edge is horrendous. Even with the present eligibility these people fail to qualify because almost no housing costs i.e mortgage repayments are allowable.Single person's discount is at 25% where in actual fact the income is clearly 50% less and living costs similarly. So the council is between a rock and a hard place but the impact on low income homeowners can be there is no help available from benefits and they literally have to choose between heating and eating. And they cannot maintain their homes with no help for repair costs.
Agree	We are currently eligible for the council tax reduction scheme, but will not be if any of these changes go through. Our income is very low indeed and we struggle to pay even the small amount of council tax that we have to at present. I know many people who are in the same situation as ourselves.
Disagree	It is unfeasible in the current financial climate to continue to offer benefit claimants such allowances. It is not an incentive to seek work!
Disagree	No as protecting the existing scheme would mean cuts would have to be made in other areas
Disagree	Protecting the current scheme will mean the Council have to make cuts in other areas

Common Theme agree It was felt that if the council tax reduction scheme was not protected, many vulnerable residents would suffer financial hardship.

Common Theme disagree It was felt that in the current climate some changes were required to reduce the current level of council tax reductions.

If you agree, what level of minimum payment should be applied?

Category	comment
Disagree	Take the £7000 wage rise the M.P.s got and give it to the people who need it.
Unclear	Another con by Bacon see above comment
Disagree	Is it just fire fighting? The cuts from government are going to get worse up this by 10% now how much higher will it go when the following year more savings have to be found?
Disagree	as stated before , if they are already on the minimum money how can they afford to pay more ?
Disagree	Working age people on low income are going to suffer reduced income with the proposed tax credit reduction.¶
Disagree	This will affect the same group of people even more.
Disagree	it is morally wrong
Unclear	Letter only sent to council. No survey attached.
Unclear	Letter only sent to council. No survey attached.
Unclear	No form returned, only a letter.
Unclear	No form returned, only a letter.
Unclear	Have entered the 'Don't know' box on questions 2 - 5 as no option has been chosen
Disagree	This will create hardship for people already on a low income
Disagree	People already struggle pay the amount they have to without an increase in this.
	I agree some people should have to pay more tax mainly people on ;¶
	Disability Living Allowance Personal Independence Payments Employment Support Allowance¶
	Severe Disability Allowance ¶
	But people who are working & are struggling to make ends meet shouldn't have to pay more tax .¶
	If council strangles the life out of hard working people then they can't be blamed for going on dole if there no better off on dole .¶
Agree	people on low income who travel off the island should get tax reduction or travel grant .
	What's going to happen to people who genuinely can't afford to pay? Are they all to become criminals?! Do they pay their council tax and then starve or freeze, or do they buy food and heating and then go to court for non payment of council tax. At least if they're starving or freezing they'll have the comfort of knowing their money is being put to good use, like paying the council leaders large salary, or being spent on advisers.
Disagree	All users of the services should pay for it somehow or another
Agree	Same as the rate of inflation as people already pay too much
Agree	An increase to 30% would be unaffordable for those on lowest income and may cause difficulties in collection
Agree	25% seems right and matches a number of other schemes across the country
Agree	Raising it by 1-3% would make it less of a strain on poorer earners
Disagree	If people are on a really low income I do not know how they will find the money.]
	any increase to either 25 or 30% would be catastrophic for me.I would have to buy less food(really)¶ I have no savings and am always overdrawn with my bank.I just live from fortnight to fortnight
Disagree	None of the options are good for everyone, this appears to be the "least bad".
Agree	People on low or fixed income could find it very difficult to pay increased council tax.
Disagree	I don't agree with your options.
Disagree	People who work and are on very low wage should not have to pay too much
Disagree	Live on low income and single and no other money come, They family that work and have work tax credit sure pay more.
Agree	I think if you are in work a small increase can be managed.
Disagree	It is high enough at the moment for most people
Disagree	Not sure if the above applies to only those who work, but if they are in my situation then I disagree (question 4)
Agree	Many people who are claiming a reduction based on their or their children's disability do not need the benefits and are already wealthy
Disagree	Disregarding someones ability to pay when setting payments would be sheer madness and plain wrong.
	As a lone parent on a low income no longer in receipt of child maintenance from my ex husband, I would struggle to pay much more than 25% of my council tax. I understand an increase maybe necessary due to the stringent cuts being enforced, but perhaps if it was means tested, some people may be able to afford 30%
Agree	Any increase in the minimum level of payment shows a total disregard for people on a very low income through no fault of their own.
Disagree	Other schemes across the country seem to limit support to a lower level than the IW and an extra 5% does not seem unreasonable and may encourage people to find ways of coming off benefits¶
Agree	this could affect those on the lowest of income, full time carers are on very low carers benefit, and already having to pay, any more and these people could not survive, they cannot work due to being full time carers.,,.,¶
Disagree	families on benefit are already struggling, there is a bigger picture , it is not as simple as saying lets increase the percentage, loss of tax credits ?
Disagree	Why penalise those who already pay?
Disagree	This is penalising those that can least afford it
Disagree	People are willing to pay a fair proportion of actual income, people can't pay increased charges if they don't have the income
Agree	This seems to be the fairest and most worthwhile saving option
Disagree	People obviously would not apply for help with their Council Tax if it was not needed. Look elsewhere for savings.
Disagree	I don't see any reason to increase the minimum
Unclear	please see previous comments
Unclear	I am not a working age claimant.
Agree	it may be applicable for a slight rise for working residents but NOT for pensioners who sorely require this help.
	I think that all benefit based people should be protected especially as we are not necessarily getting an increase in our benefits and if we are all struggling how can we afford more from what we are getting when we don't have enough to live on now.
Disagree	
Agree	I seem to find that most people I know on benefits seem to have far more disposable income than those who work. They should be contributing more than they do
	You cannot take into account any benefit given to assist some one who is struggling everyday with their living. Their benefit is their life line it provides them their help or transport, ect. As for child benefit I believe that is just as important it may provide the family enough to clothe or feed their child but I also believe it should only be given to those in need.
Disagree	This affects the poorest, they are already having their money cut by benefits cap & the upcoming cut to tax credits
Disagree	People are struggling to eat and stay warm with the pittance they earn already.
Disagree	This could lead to more people on low incomes losing their homes because they can no longer afford to pay Council Tax and therefore will result in more people having to rent and claim housing benefit.
Disagree	SMALL SIZE OF LOW COUNCIL UNITARY AUTHORITY IS INEFFICIENT. AN IMMEDIATE AMALGAMATION OF FUNCTIONS WITH MAINAND AUTHORITY IS NEEDED TO GIVE NEEDED WIDER DEMOGRAPHIC AND ECONOMIC BASES AND GREATER EFFICIENCY AND EXPERTISE.
Unclear	all to easy to go after the poorest
Disagree	People receiving the benefits listed above have a struggle to cope with the ways in which they have to adapt to live their lives. Having to pay more council tax will add to their problems.
	All income should be included but!!! none of these proposals take into account the tax band a property is in.¶
	If someone just happens to live in a higher rated band and still has minimum benefits to live on they are in a worse position because the property is worth more.¶
Agree	Any amount decided should be based on a personal situation I.E. everyone in this situation pays the same regardless of what the property is worth.
	I think rent is very high and you have to consider council when renting. If your a low earner or on benefits it's alot of money to pay out each month. If you start to fall behind on council tax then it leads to debt and bailiffs and even more struggle. I feel 20% is high enough. For any household.
Disagree	
Agree	I believe it should be increased across the board BUT still based on people incomes and circumstance
	I believe whatever anyone says in this survey will be disregarded and the Council will still do what they think....¶
Unclear	Whatever amount is decided everyone will suffer and find it hard to pay the amount proposed...
	I am on Benefits , Disability, and as said in an earliar Comment, I can only just manage to live on ¶
	what I recieve at the moment, I have paid my council tax for this year , at a reduced rate, if it goes up , I can only see that I will fall behind with future payments , as I can only see in the future that ¶
Disagree	Disability payments will get Less in payments , and not increse as they should do if the Council tax is to increase with less reduction on the Bills for peopel on benefits,

Disagree Those on benefits have been victimised enough.

Disagree this option will further compile the problems of low income families & individuals to pay all necessary bills.

Disagree It is appalling that the Council will not consider a referendum to seek an increase of Council Tax beyond the 2% whilst choosing to penalise the less well-off of our society. Bad move.

Disagree the amount of money a benefit claimant receives has not risen in the last 5 years but the cost of living has. By asking claimants to pay more you are just asking these folk to get themselves further into poverty - as a claimant myself I am already struggling to keep up with gas/electricity/water/rent and food. What do I not pay in order to pay extra council tax? Would you rather i go without heat? Should i not have food for another day each week? That is the REAL cost.

Disagree it seems like yet again those struggling to get by will be hit the hardest as usual.

Disagree DO NOT CUT THE LEVEL!!

Disagree Agree in principle but still have concerns about claimants ability to pay.

Agree I believe that a 30% reduction in Council Tax relief would produce the savings needed by IWC without causing undue hardship to those involved.

Agree Not averse to an increase but it should be phased in - not an enormous leap. 10% per annum perhaps.

Disagree Just plain WRONG, to impose a payment on a Group who, by definition, are among the poorest Island residents. Much better to increase council tax above the 2.5% limit, and tax a group who can better afford to pay. I consider that if you proceed, costs of enforcement could offset sums raised!

Disagree What about pensioners on minimum pension. Basic pension not enough to live on. Single parents get too much money. I had to work to keep my children could not get benefits. So when you stop giving out hundreds to them you would get more money in. Bus passes need to be for folk on basic pension. So many pensioners have private pensions and can pay full bus fare they should not get electric benefit if this is done save thousands. Folk who don't look after council accomdation and wreck it. Should be kicked out and not allowed anymore with you.

Disagree People are told to go out to work.... those with children as a single parent... get a low wage due to part time work..... fitting work around school..... so they need every penny to support their families!!!!

Disagree Family's are struggling already and you want to make it worse for them!

Disagree This is penalising the poor again.

Disagree I disagree

Agree everyone no matter what there circumstances are should pay a 5% -10% of council tax asking those to pay 5-10% more when they struggle to pay currently is unacceptable. !!

Disagree Please see previous answer regarding these options at the start of this survey.

Disagree more funds should be taken from corporation taxes and top earners to cover this shortfall. Max income tax back up to 50% and close the tax loopholes.

Disagree poor people simply can't afford to pay more. surely the more wealthy people can afford a bit extra towards council tax payments?

Disagree services are becoming less so why should we pay more?

Disagree Although I agree some changes need to take place, as my comments on first question say, it has to be a manageable increase or it's going to lead to more difficulty for those already struggling. 30% is quite an increase,,

Agree maybe 15-20%

Agree A 5% increase would not be a sudden increase in the bill. Plus there has been no increase in council tax for a while.

Disagree those with genuine disabilities have a higher outgoings in other areas. the money they receive for care is used for care or should be and the mobility component is usually used for a car to get around. taking any money from them in respect of that could make health worse if they cant get out or their care is cut. as for the benefits assosicate with forces they should not be touched, they have done enough for our country as it is

Disagree By increasing the minimum level of payment more people will fall into arrears, so costing the council more money trying to recover.

Agree Any cuts to the council tax should be first tempered by cuts to management costs.

Disagree the trouble with this scheme could be whilst many higher earning people will just moan a little then carry on paying it, but a low earning person it could mean having food or going without

Agree Working people have at least some income which can be disposable.

Disagree I think you should remove the vulnerability from the scheme. Those in receipt say of DLA for Care & Mobility plus ESA and in WRAG or SG will be on a far greater income than someone on £73.10 per week. They still use the services that those on a far less income have to pay for but they are not liable. Everyone needs to pay apart from those in receipt of pension.

Agree See your own drawbacks.

Disagree Increases hardship for most vulnerable claimants

Unclear See last answer.

Disagree THIS - (Where claimants are on a low income it may be that the level of payment is high in comparison to their income, irrespective of their ability to pay.)!!

Disagree If an increase was applied then in my case it would be taking food out my mouth, even getting single person discount an increase in the minimum level of payment would be hard to bear.

Disagree leave it as it is

Disagree People who are on a low wage like me will have less money and will probably not be able to make ends meat and pay rent etc.

Disagree I was on long term incapacity benefit and exempt. I was then put on esa income based and am liable for council tax.!!

Disagree I have the same disabilities as before, in fact I'm now worse as I have to do without heating in order to pay council tax and also contribute towards my rent since the Local Housing Allowance was introduced.!!

Disagree I'm getting further into debt all the time and can't cut back on anything else.!!

Unclear Why should someone in my position have to subsidise the many wealthy people living here?

Disagree Will the cut backs never end. What happens when everything has been cut and there is nothing left to cut!

Disagree Administration costs will increase as it usually does when anything like this is implemented, just look at Government historical figures on these types of changes.

Disagree Many people can and will be affected if this goes into circulation. However as previously said changes do have to happen/occur. Its the way things are at present, its not just our council that has had government funding cut, it is right across Great Britain. I myself have the council tax paid, however if i do have to pay some, then that is just the way it is. There could be other options, but the lcts is a viable/good option to start council money spending/saving.!!

Disagree I am prepared to pay a little out of my benefits then rather see public transport cutbacks, community cutback which are far more needed then paying a little extra council tax.!!

Disagree I am all for supporting our council

Disagree This will effect low earners

Disagree This is a necessary move and I am sure that if you need to find a little towards your c/t then they would make cuts in there own spending.

Disagree if people cannot afford to pay this tax the staff/time and in the end the non recovery of monies will end up costing the council more.

Disagree It depends on something that would probably never be acceptable to County Hall administration ...can a percentage of councillors salaries be contributed ? If so then how much would that help to minimise the amount of contributions levied upon the general public ? If not a considerable help then at least assist the most vulnerable which includes single mothers & children.

Disagree The council are being forced to squeeze money from people who will simply end up in prison for non payment.Those who are wealthy must be forced to eventually take their share of a burden and pay more

Disagree I don't think people should be able to get away with not paying anything towards their Council Taxes.

Disagree Too many I reckon 'hide' income. If they can buy new cars, the latest gadgets for themselves or their children, then they can afford to pay more for their council services.

Disagree It uses too broad a brush and is unfair. Council tax replaced the old rates system which was nowhere near as costly for householders as it is now.

Disagree also it should be taken to understand that most over 60s worked and paid taxes !!!!!

Disagree This is the only possible solution and remain part of a humane society. Those who are sick and disabled simply have no other way of raising their income. Where do you think they would get it from, eat less, go cold? We should be asking what kind of society we want to be living in.!!

Disagree I am ashamed to what this has come to. The Isle of Wight Council needs to go back to Central Government and say what they are asking local councils to do is not acceptable. We surely are entitled to assisted status given that we are an island.

Disagree All benefits, which are income, just by a different name, should be taken into consideration when calculating!! any discount to the current council tax levels, to ensure that equal treatment of all constituents is carried out.!!

Disagree This means no favouritism or discrimination for one group or another.!!

Disagree It costs the same to empty a persons bin, each week, whether they are working, claiming partial benefits or full benefits. One group should not be expected to subsidise another.

Disagree

Agree It is a good option that needs to be done to save money.
 Disagree How do unemployed people survive ?
 Agree This way I believe is far more fairer to everyone.

Agree they are allowed Sky and mobile phones when going for debt plans, which I class as a luxury, so why should they not pay a fairer amount towards Council tax
 Disagree It's hard enough to survive on benefits without having to pl
 Disagree pay extra council tax
 Disagree If like most on p.l.p you already use the food banks. How are we going to find money we don't have to pay more c'tax.
 Disagree do not charge people on low income ref garaunteed pension credit
 Agree I do feel PIP/Dla should be classed as income. This is in addition to sickness benefit people get or even a wage if they work. It seems unfair to make the low income people pay more if these benefits are still classed as exempt. It is extra income and should be treated as so. There may be other benefits that are extra income also that this could apply to.]]
 Agree Should any income whether it is benefit or wages not come under the same rule. Income is income regardless
 Disagree Maybe this should be done in stages so that people can plan ahead eg 25 per cent one year, 30 the next

as per my previous response, by getting people to pay more towards their council tax support will lead to more cases of depression anxiety and further illness, that will not help them try and find full time work.]]
 Disagree again asking people to pay more that they cannot afford to pay may also lead to more people defaulting on their council tax leading to bailiffs and enforcement of the outstanding accounts, and what with the charges that are levied in these cases, will lead to more people taking their own lives as a way out of it.
 Disagree Do you want more homeless? Pay C T and can't afford rent, pay CT and rent can't afford heat and eat.... Take more off holiday home owners

Agree 20% is a very low amount to pay compared to those who are required to pay the full council tax amount. I believe that it should be increased to at least 25%, if not 30%.
 Disagree Working age people are being squeezed left right and centre and are now asking for help to pay their own bills which is making the situation worse.
 Agree I feel individuals claiming PIP or DLA should contribute the same as anyone else as they actually recieve more income than the average working family
 Agree Council's funding from Central Government is being cut savagely. Council provides services for ALL. All should contribute to the cost of provision of these services. The increase to 30%, based on the figures supplied, results in an average of 25 pounds a month per household, or less than one pound a day. This is achievable in just about any household.
 Agree If your income is low enough that you are eligible for CTR it is unlikely that you will be able to afford the meet the new payment. I would also foresee that extra money would be spent trying to recover what people cannot afford to pay.
 Disagree

Unfortunately, even those that work, are under more financial pressures, so I don't see why those who have certain benefits shouldn't be also squeezed. We can not continue with this level of help for people, there is no money left! Also, if it was increased to 25% then actually this over the year is not a huge increase.]]
 Agree However, I do feel strongly that the above group of people, pensioners, carers, disabled etc should continue to be protected.
 Agree I think this is the most beneficial way to save the money, but you cannot hit people too hard. These are the people who can least afford to lose the money.
 Disagree person on low incomes cannot find the extra money necessary
 Agree I do believe this could make the necessary savings needed and by only changing by 5% from 20 to 25% it's not going to have any major financial implications on those receiving it. I don't believe that the 5% rise is enough to cause anyone financial hardship
 Disagree The irrespective of ability to pay is the flawed principle for this. Benefit claimants are often multi person households who have several wage earners/benefit payments to share out the council tax liability. Single people have to pay the whole lot under pain of bailiffs with no account of their means. Administration in council tax recovery is hardly a factor, since you outsource the lot to private profit making enterprises as soon as two instalments are missed. It is not rocket science to realise that if you are behind on instalments then demanding the whole lot is counter productive. And causes undue misery
 Disagree I feel that a 70% reduction is still a huge reduction in council tax.

Common Theme
 agree it was felt that a small increase in payments would not cause significant hardship.

Common Theme
 disagree It was felt by many who disagreed, that this option would increase financial hardship to a vulnerable section of society.

Do you agree, or disagree with removing the family premium for all new working age claimants?

Category	comment
Unclear	As above, but decrease what the other parasites, the lords get!
Disagree	See previous comments Bacon sits pretty in his castle in St Helens and robs the vulnerable sheriff of Nottingham style!
Agree	If they never had it they will never miss it. Its harder for those who already have it, you spend to your means
Disagree	again , if people are already poor enough to be eligible for help then how will they be able to pay for normal living if they have to pay more to you
Unclear	I am not clear if this is applied generally or is means tested
Unclear	Letter only sent to council. No survey attached.
Unclear	Letter only sent to council. No survey attached.
Unclear	No form returned, only a letter.
Unclear	No form returned, only a letter.
Unclear	No option chosen for question 7
Agree	People who work should get family premium NOT people on BENEFITS .! SOCIETY NEEDS people to produce children who are good parents .! People who work are statistically more likely to bring up there children well .! people who are on dole are more likely to breed scum bags .
Agree	Simplifies things
Agree	Matches the government changes
Agree	these would discourage people from having loads of kids just to get bigger houses and more benefits
Agree	Maybe this is the fairest plan.
Disagree	I would be concerned that it could put some families into dire straits, but as it is would not affect those on income support it seems relatively acceptable.
Agree	Some familys should be discouraged to keep having children
Disagree	If they are in work and have a low wage it should not be removed. They are in work and not spunging off the government.
Unclear	no comment
Disagree	New claimants with children may be struggling financially and in need of extra support. The scheme needs to replicate national benefit changes otherwise it will lead to confusion and different expectations!
Unclear	
Disagree	again this could have an affect on families
Unclear	An adjustment to allow for a provision for children in the household is absolutely necessary
Agree	I agree this should be introduced to bring both schemes into line, but IN addition to Option 1 i.e. increasing the minimum contribution to 30%.
Disagree	Why penalise the poorest in our society?.. It is not just or fair
Disagree	The government are also doing away with tax credits which as you know will mean families on low incomes will be over £1000 worse off each year...don't make this worse for those low income families by reducing this subsidy.
Unclear	Not applicable to our circumstances.
Disagree	While this option simplifies the scheme it would affect those who may be in work but need help due to low wages and receive benefit to help them to survive
Agree	£17.45 over a year is very little, but I'd like to see that added to the education budget.
Disagree	It won't target those it should, just those consistently targeted by government cuts! An unfair proposal.
Unclear	What are the savings in administration? could the saving be passed on?
Disagree	They can't afford it.
Disagree	CREATES DISCRIMINATION BETWEEN OLD AND NEW CLAIMANTS, ESPECIALLY CASUAL AND SEASONAL WORKERS.
Disagree	again...hit the poor
Should apply to all	It should be removed for everyone! could be open to discrimination legal case.!
Should apply to all	Also why should one get it and not another in a similar position just because of a date? !
Should apply to all	End it altogether.
Disagree	people who work and earn money should not have deduction for having kids. Families with children make more rubbish and should contribute more
Disagree	this would be unfair - all changes should be made across the board
Disagree	If this Means Less top up money for Low income Working people , then its wrong. My son and his wife are working on the minimin wage and should be intitled to some help with the council tax costs,
Disagree	Those on benefits have been victimised enough.
Disagree	the family premium is so important as the claimant is not merely seeking assistance for themselves, but for their family. the future & life of their children have a knock on effect on the economy as these grow up & are nurtured as future wage earners & tax payers. they are rearing the future, so supporting families in this respect will benefit the council & UK economy in years to come, it is an investment, instead of giving up on these children & compiling future problems in the economy.
Disagree	This is once more a case of compelling increases in payments from those less able to pay. The benefit is not generous but enables new working age residents to "survive".
Disagree	dos-sent sound like it takes in to account individuals circumstances.
Disagree	DO NOT REMOVE THE FAMILY PREMIUM.
Agree	It seems a fairer way of making the cuts.
Agree	It is a more equalising proposal.
Disagree	I believe the Council needs to foster the efforts of working age claimants, as well as operate in line with current Housing Benefit regulations.
Disagree	It should be assessed on individual needs - children going hungry is already something we are seeing and I never thought I would in my lifetime.
Disagree	This is a tax on a group of Island residents who can ill afford it, and who, despite a pay increase with the inception of the National Living Wage, will see steep cuts to Tax Credits, and actually be worse off because of this, BEFORE any imposition of any percentage of Council Tax
Agree	If working they can pay. I worked three jobs to keep my children. This generation are used to,too many hand outs.
Disagree	Same as I previously said more family's will be put at risk
Disagree	we need people to make the world go round, yet this is another strike against starting a family.
Unclear	Don't really get this option.
Agree	Will hopefully stop the culture if "have a baby" get free this and that. If they can afford a other child they can afford not to have a reduction in ct
Agree	This would seem in line with central government and if the family are receiving additional benefit this should be taken into account with regard to council tax benefit as part of their income.
Disagree	the money paid to the council should reflect a person's ability to afford it.
Should apply to all	If removing family premium it should be for all not just new claims. To apply to just new claims is discriminatory.
Agree	new working age adults should learn that they have many bills to pay and not expect handouts
Unclear	Children have a big impact on income but other benefits like family tax credits do boost the income by quite a large amount.
Disagree	some people transferred from IS to ESA have been put on the contibutory rate of ESA due to the IS being taxable. so even though the promise was made that they would be no worse of they are as they are classed as having an income and having to pay rent and council tax. so those with families would be even worse off.
Unclear	No comment here
Disagree	There are changes coming about in 2017 for those with 3 children or more. This will not work and place families into poverty
Should apply to all	All claimants with the same criteria should be treated the same and not penalised just because they didn't get in before a certain time.
Agree	Again this is a massive change for many youngsters. However as related in previous pages, these changes could take place and the youngsters would just have to adjust to way of live im afraid
Unclear	this would work if more jobs provided by attracting companies to the island
Agree	If this is the central government policy then we have to try and comply with it
Unclear	who is this proposal going to affect? single working people who already get nothing but give (in tax) the same as others.
Disagree	Bad enough that a mother with a child(especially if she has no other family) would suddenly lose such benefit but her/he, would be degraded further and create more poverty along with other problems.
Unclear	I am a single person with 2 children and benefit from the family premium. I don't get any help from the father and think this is a good idea.
Agree	unless you put in to the pot should you be able to take out it should not be a automatic right
Disagree	No this is not an acceptable option. What are we going to increase family poverty as well?

Disagree	It is an unnecessary administrative task that will cost more to implement and additional savings will be made by removing it.
Disagree	What would those who are currently struggling do ?
Agree	It makes sense to use this option as it is a relatively small amount for those on family premium to find but will allow the council to save considerable revenue in order to protect the existing main reduction scheme.
Agree	Hopefully more people would make an effort to find employment
Agree	As these claimants will get child tax credit I see no reason not to remove the premium
Unclear	Familys that are working are the ones that require more support and reductions, working families find themselves struggling, people claiming benefits are usually better off than working people
Disagree	Again the island families need help not more financial trouble.
Disagree	The saving is pretty much inconsequential.!!
Disagree	New working age residents have already been well and truly hammered by the Government and should not be further punished.
Disagree	This would target those on low incomes with families
Disagree	Would affect poor families on tax credits disproportionately.
Disagree	Disgraceful, this will only affect working claimants.
Disagree	This would affect families who are self-employed and claiming WTC and/or CTC?
Agree	Ease of administering in line with housing benefits

Common Theme	
agree	Many of those in agreement felt it would encourage people to live within their means
Common Theme	
disagree	Many of those who disagreed felt that this would cause additional financial pressure to families on low incomes.
Additional common theme	It was felt, amongst many who disagreed and those who agreed that it would not be appropriate to treat new claimants differently from existing claimants

Category	Do you agree, or disagree with reducing backdating to four weeks? comment
Disagree	Could it not be backdated in between the four weeks and six months, surely there must be some compromise.
Agree	Do away with the royal lot. = more money for those who need it !
Disagree	See previous comments Bacon robbing the poor from his castle
Agree	All backdating has been reduced, cant see an issue with this
Unclear	surely this would depend on why some one had asked for a back payment
Agree	Depending who's fault the application was. If the applicant didn't apply in time then that is their fault and four weeks backdating is sufficient !!
Disagree	If the applicant has put in a claim but the council has not processed it quickly then it should be backdated to the date of the claim however long that is.
Disagree	It is not clear why some claimants might not claim earlier. This could be bereavement , illness, inability to read or write etc
Unclear	A lot of people in need may not be able to claim on time.
Unclear	Letter only sent to council. No survey attached.
Unclear	Letter only sent to council. No survey attached.
Unclear	No form returned, only a letter.
Unclear	No form returned, only a letter.
Unclear	No option choosen for 'Question 9'
Disagree	Claimants will incur a debt and experience great financial difficulties from this.
Disagree	no its unfair
Agree	4 weeks is plenty of time to claim
Agree	Keeps in line with other benefit rules
Agree	This will ensure that people claim when necessary and not leave it to the last minute
Agree	this is perhaps would help
Unclear	Without knowing what constitutes a "good cause" this option is difficult to assess.
Unclear	I think that it is better to stay as it is once a fortnight some might go mad and spend it too soon
Agree	I was unaware that claims could be backdated up to six months, 4 weeks seems a fair amount of time for backdating a claim.
Agree	I think four weeks is okay.
Unclear	no comment
Disagree	Longer backdating is required where claims are not processed quickly enough and due to administrative errors. Four weeks should be enough time for people to sort out their claim, if not feel backdating it by 6 months is too long - may be 3 months maximum!!
Agree	!!
Agree	I do think this is a good idea, and a way of saving the council money - there should however still be a clause to allow extenuating circumstances, if a claimant has good cause for not claiming earlier.
Agree	Keep scheme similar to national benefit changes!!
Agree	
Disagree	When there are errors, papers lost and other issues the claimant has an unnecessary burden placed on them!!
Unclear	Just because Government does something it does not make it morally or ethically right
Unclear	I think it should depend upon the circumstances and if they were capable of claiming on time
Agree	I believe this option should be implemented in addition to Options 1 and 2. !!
Agree	Claim backdating for both benefits should match, and 4 weeks is still more than a reasonable length of time for someone to assess their circumstances and make approaches to relevant bodies for financial assistance.
Agree	This is one option that might help.
Disagree	No one should be refused back dating if they are unable to claim on time without the reasons being checked out properly
Unclear	Use your discretion, if you do go along this route at least bear in mind that there are circumstances whereby 4 weeks maybe be unreasonable, so some flexibility would be preferable
Unclear	Not applicable
Disagree	I think that the backdating scheme needs to be in place due to the paperwork involved slowing down the process of course if the council employed more staff to cope with this problem then maybe it could be revisited to look at it again but the system needs to be able to work effectively & efficiently to reduce the backdating option, also does this option take account of those coming in to the IOW or anywhere else who might not understand the system or how it works.
Unclear	This is a way of reducing benefits with no rationale. If people could have claimed within 4 weeks of being eligible, they would have done so.
Agree	If you need help you would not of waited 6 months for it. So 4 weeks should be plenty of time to sort out all paper work
Disagree	What if the claimant wasnt able to pay and is being pursued through court? If its proven he should have had the benefit this could be awkward? EXPERIENCE SUGGESTS THAT BENEFIT CLAIMS CAN OFTEN NEED LONGER THAN 4 WEEKS TO CLAIM E.G. SICKNESS,WHERE DOUBT EXISTS ABOUT OTHER BENEFITS, CORRECT DOMICILE AND FOR EXAMPLE WORK/SICKNESS/OTHER STATUS. ON THE OTHER HAND ALIGNING WITH CURRENT NATIONAL REGULATIONS IS LOGICAL.
Disagree	do i really need to say it again???
Disagree	It should be backdated to the date of claim.
Disagree	If you find yourself in a position where you've had to apply for housing or housing benefit then you need every penny for bills and how should you be expected to find the 4 weeks that u have not been paying it. It should be back dated or another debt that will mount up and will lead to a struggling.
Agree	yes, this would be a simple change that if clearly stated claimants would be aware of the proposal and act immediately
Unclear	In this case it could be that poor Working people who are of no fault of there own , will have to borrow money , from loan shark bussineses such wonga to be able to live for a month with little or no money.
Disagree	Those on benefits have been victimised enough most often the system takes so long to respond on citizens needs 4 weeks would only make those in need of help to suffer more.
Agree	this could be an option as it is the claimant's responsibility to do the legwork of seeking assistance in a timely fashion. as long as there is a system of notifying all low income families & individuals of this important change, equipping them with this knowledge perhaps even through tv & radio media so that they can make informed decisions.
Agree	If we adopt this provision then it is right and proper that the council ensure that potential claimants and claimants are made more aware of the need to claim as soon as they believe CTB should be paid. A general information sheet, freely available + a web page on the Council website should be very clear on when people can and should claim. Introducing a reduction in backdating to four weeks must be clearly emphasized so that those who are entitled claim what they are entitled to. Fairness and honesty must be at the heart of Council communications.
Disagree	This could cause a few individuals severe hardship
Disagree	Why should people lose money if in some cases they have not been given the right help in the first ,as it happend to me years ago.
Disagree	what if it is not there fault but a council or some one eases fault that would be unjust.
Disagree	BACKDATE TO 1st DAY OF CLAIM.
Agree	Unless in exceptional circumstances, ie in Hospital etc.
Agree	Actually I didn't realise that it could be backdated for this length of time. It makes sense to bring it into line with HB.
Disagree	If people are entitled, they should recieve tfull amount.
Unclear	I believe that the provision needs to be uniform and in accordance with Housing Benefit regulations.
Unclear	This provision is poorly understood by this group of Island residents, and take up will be poor
Unclear	Same as before
Unclear	will agree 6 mths is a bit long, but I think it should be at least 2 mths, due to the fact that it takes you to long to give out the right amount of council tax to pay, unless its someone totally unemployed and single.
Agree	Well 4 weeks is long enough.
Disagree	If we stopped letting illegal immigrants stay in the country & giving them everything then there would be no need for any of this!! !!
Disagree	I've heard it costs us the (tax payer) around £25,000 to 30,000 for each asilum seeker to apply for asilum here. If the government refuse, they just stay here & keep re appealing until they get a YES!!
Disagree	Why dont we send them back home after they have been refused the 1st time....? There you are, i have pointed out a few things so far so an answer to all this would be greatfully received!!
Agree	Get their act together. No excuse for not claiming on time
Agree	unless there are extreme circumstances and reasons such as illness or hospitalisation the backdated time of claims should be limited four weeks.

Disagree as it can take a long time for all benefits to be processed i think it would be fair to reduce this to two months in order to assist in a meaningful way.
 Agree I can't understand why anyone would wait up to 6 months before claiming but if there is a valid reason then they do need that benefit.
 Unclear "You cannot have your cake and eat it)as they say, if you are to help people to cope with the enevitable price increases you must still allow for some flexibility; and allow people a chance to afford the increased payments. Remember we are dealing with people who are vurnerable, a carer looks after their budget (PIP) or indeed are already using food banks; the IOW is one of the countrys highest providers on this.

Agree This is a simple method and if everyone knows the timescale then it is in their interest to get the application in ! Four weeks is a reasonable amount of time.
 Disagree On the basis that for some substantial reason that the claimant could not claim the reduction earlier
 Agree depend on if there are extreme circumstances as to why the delay was. if no good excuse then yes 4 weeks is enough time to apply
 Agree these days with all the technology at peoples fingertips there is no excuse not to get it claimed on time
 Agree People should apply on time.
 Agree If a claimant can show "good cause" then it should be backdated, for the others then it should be restricted to four weeks. Residents have to be responsible and be made to be responsible in understanding and coping.
 Agree I don't understand the drawback.
 Disagree People may not be able to catch up with the council tax payments if you reduce the back pay.
 Agree 4 weeks back dating is ample enough, this will reduce a hefty amount of pay outs, and then save on the council money.!!
 Agree However there must be an alternative for people who may of not been able to claim in those 6 months back date. This topic of change would have to be looked into alot more.
 Agree make the process quicker and let people know this and then if they not claim in time carry out above ideal]

Agree This should certainly be done. 4 weeks max is more than enough time to get things sorted for any household.
 Agree if you are in dire need for assistance you should be able to fill in the paper work or register a claim within 4 weeks even if you cannot prove your circumstances at that time
 Agree This would help reduce the reliance upon such benefit as this change is adequate UNLESS a medical reason can be proved.
 Agree They should claim on time. I do not think there is any excuse for this. Council tax is a priority and should be paid as soon as it is owed.

Disagree The proposed changes in council tax reduction and housing benefit will cause more misery to people already living on the absolute minimum amount of money and in some cases below the poverty line. With little social housing available for people they are being forced into insecure private tenancies having to use more and more of their meagre income (which was set as the lowest someone can survive) to pay the top up rent and now possibly council tax. I don't think so.
 Agree This will ensure that claimants are more timely and efficient in their claiming process and save a considerable amount of money by not paying out the other five months worth of backdated claims.
 Agree This would only work properly and efficient, if paperwork was dealt with, within the month timescale.!!
 Agree So the landlords would receive there money on time.
 Agree If everything can be turn around in under 4 weeks I don't see a problem, it is when you have been waiting for a decision and it takes longer not the claimants fault.
 Agree people must take responsibility for claiming punctually
 Agree I think a 6 month backdate is completely unecessary.
 Agree my concern would be if it is genuine they didnt know or for what ever reason they would still have to pay back missed months again leaving people short of money
 Disagree When the dole office stops your benefit for 6 months while the appeal goes through, and you end up with £3600 in debt to your landord and he throw's you out who will pay then?
 Disagree I believe that 4 weeks is ample time to claim backdated support.
 Agree the amount awarded in claims should only be backdated to a max of the 4 weeks, but again if this is done then the council will need to make allowances for those claims where there may be a shortfall in the amount owed to the council , and the claimants given the time to clear the outstanding balance in an affordable way without involving the courts or bailiffs....for example if there is £200 outstanding o the bill then, let that be paid back at an affordable rate. but only enforce the debt owed if there has been a significant break since payment has been received, currently this is 2 months ..would suggest extending this to 6 months...this would also allow for any benefit changes

Agree Takes bloody weeks to sort claim for HB and CT. Or get info..backdate should stay same
 Disagree / not appropriate If your not working or working part time there is no reason you cannot complete the paperwork on time.
 Agree Four weeks is more than enough time to apply.
 Agree Reduce it to two weeks. Two weeks if more then enough time for people to sort themselves out and get a claim going
 Agree Should be claimed for at earliest point required.
 Unclear why wouldnt they be able to claim on time, we all have timescales to meet
 Agree Agree, but only if its not their fault that the claim is in for longer.
 Agree If you need the money you will not wait more than 4 weeks to claim it. Assume the backdating of 4 weeks applies to the date the claim is first made, not the date when it is approved.
 Agree I thin this is OK as long as claimants are given the information they need in order to make a claim in a timely fashion.
 Agree But there may be exceptions, e.g. claimant may have been incapacitated/hospitalised preventing the claim
 Agree If people find them selves in a situation where they need this help, then they should sort it quickly. There is no reason that people can not make a claim for 6 months, it must be down to laziness!!!!
 Agree There is plenty of advice and support for people to find, if they simply look!!
 Agree]
 Agree However, the council must be able to process claims in a timely manner (within 4 weeks) so that people are not put under extra hardship.
 Agree Possibly this would be acceptable.
 Agree Agree with this.
 Agree Yes. Absolutely should be restricted to how far back can claim. 4 weeks max is ideal
 Agree If there was no other option, this would seem the best of the bunch.
 Agree There is no reason that I can see for a claim to be backdated any further - I can't see anything that would excuse not submitting ASAP.
 Unclear There will be the opportunity to apply for a discretionary reduction

Common Theme agree It was felt that people should be making claims in a timely manner and four weeks was sufficient time.
 Common Theme disagree There was a general feeling amongst those that disagreed that delays beyond the control of the claimant would cause financial hardship. However, where reference was made to delays in administrative processing over the 4 weeks this would not impact on the claim start date and is not a backdating provision as a claim is considered usually from the Monday following date of receipt.

Do you agree, or disagree with the principle that claimants who are self-employed for more than one year should have a minimum income floor applied to their claim?

Category	comment
Disagree Unclear	As long as it helps those self-employed, we need to provide support especially to build up business and if possible make it easier. Perhaps offering other schemes. Self employment is a joke these days, a con by this stupid government.
Disagree Unclear	The self employed are the backbone of the economy they need help to start with Bacon would not know this he draws his council income whatever the financial situation. Suppose it helps to run his castle. Assuming an adjustment can be calculated ?
Disagree	They may not earn a living wage, especially in today's climate. They have to submit accounts for tax this figure should be used. You can't decide just because they have been self-employed a year they have earned the living wage when they may not have. How would they pay their council tax with money that isn't there? Have you any idea how patronising and insulting this comment is !!
Disagree	"It should encourage self-employed working age claimants to grow and expand their business" This could deter start-ups - not all small businesses are able to pay. Full time salary even at the minimum wage for much longer than a one year period. More so on the island where opportunities are limited or contained and where transport costs are exceedingly high. One quarter of the income from my small start up went to transport costs alone in the first year - and I had no income whatsoever
Disagree Unclear Unclear Unclear Unclear Unclear	Letter only sent to council. No survey attached. Letter only sent to council. No survey attached. No form returned, only a letter. No form returned, only a letter. No option chosen for ' Question 11' This is beyond a joke. You can't just assume they work those hours when they don't! You're going to cause a negative impact on their financial state which could result in their cease of trading.
Disagree	No it's a crazy policy !! The policy has gone from one extreme of people doing less than 10 hrs work each week to expecting people to do 35 hrs !! There just isn't enough work out there for people to do that many hours . people will go back to the DOLE in DROVE'S !!! Council need to be more reasonable & meet people in the middle .
Disagree	MINIMUM of 20 hrs is fair
Disagree Disagree	We should be able to access the "books" of the self-employed to determine their equivalent in salary - this will penalise those trying to work on a self-employed basis There is a lot of people who are self-employed who do not own the business but work for a business.
Agree	Self employment income should be genuine and not subsidised through the LCs awards to aspire people to increase their income. If someone is considered to be in genuine hardship then the other exceptional hardship policy would support them if implemented
Disagree Disagree	Many self-employed people earn less than the minimum wage This could force people who are struggling with low income self-employment businesses to fail and therefore become officially unemployed.
Disagree Disagree Disagree	If you penalise self-employed they lose their businesses which are hard to keep as it is. Result : No money for anyone. Being self-employed some weeks no money come in because weather and outgoing on machinery I don't think it's fair for self-employed people who are struggling to make a living to be assessed on a higher income than they are making.
Disagree Unclear Disagree Disagree	I would think being self-employed is very difficult and there are a lot of self-employed on the island and each case should be judged differently if that were possible. no comment This would discourage small business It doesn't seem fair to assume this is the case and the reduction should be based on actual income.
Agree Unclear Unclear	It seems some self-employed people abuse the system and indicate they have less money than they actually have to increase their benefits. This option will make them review what they do and try to increase their income. If it is a national requirement through UC then this should happen with this benefit otherwise IW residents subsidise those that should be paying or doing more. Assuming something to be true, even when proven to be false, is a laughable default situation As stated previously
Disagree	It would assume that they are working a 35 hour week, are earning the living wage and do not have any debtors. It is unfair because it is not applicable to actual income and the tax does to represent a fair proportion of the income earned.
Disagree	The self-employed would welcome the opportunity to expand their business, fiscal studies reflect that the average business expects to break even at 3 years and generate a profit by 5 years.
Agree	I am aware from my previous work experiences that many self-employed people do not declare all their earnings. Also changes in benefits and their calculation should be aligned.
Disagree Unclear	Again use your discretion, don't make assumptions, many self-employed people are struggling financially. I'd also like to point out that many people who have chosen to go down the self-employed route have done so because of pressure from the jobcentre not necessarily because they have the ability to earn a decent living. If you have never signed on you have no idea what it is like, please don't punish people for trying to help themselves. Not Applicable
Disagree Disagree	The problem with this option is that no person can guarantee that their earnings are at a regular level and can fluctuate from week to week or from year to year meaning that the council would be relying on the wages being consistent when they are not necessarily going to be like that , as no one can guarantee a regular income from a business unless it has parameters that absolutely guarantee a regular level of income. I am self-employed and work over 30 hours a week but earn far less than minimum wage! It is wrong for the council to assume I earn at least the minimum wage. I fear I will be forced to give up my work and go on the dole, due to no fault of my own!!
Disagree	"In effect this means that if you are self-employed and you have been in business for at least a year, when calculating your council tax reduction, the council will assume you have a gross weekly earnings of at least the minimum living wage multiplied by 35 hours per week." Why? This doesn't make sense either. The idea is good but one year is not long enough to establish a business. (Don't know if this still applies, but at one time even the taxman used to allow three years of trading before assessing a business for tax purposes.)
Disagree Disagree Disagree	I feel that a new business owner where any profits are ploughed back into the business for at least the first twelve months should not be considered as earning the minimum wage for the first twenty four months at least. How can this be fair or right? Why penalise someone who is trying their best to make a go of it, encourage them in a couple of years they may not need your help.
Disagree	Again not targeting groups of people fairly, you can't just assume someone is earning at least the minimum wage living wage. If used it should be means tested. Also this is another group of people targeted by government restrictions and cuts. Unless very successful being self-employed is difficult as support is difficult to access due to the hoops they have to jump through don't make it harder otherwise what's the point they may as well pack it in.
Disagree	Making benefit decisions on assumptions of hours worked, is not a good idea, it can lead to massive under and over payments and cause backpayment issues etc, I don't believe anything in the 21st century should be based on an assumption especially if people's food and shelter may depend on it.
Disagree	Perhaps look to extend start up period to two years to allow business to be properly established. Don't think that apart from odd periods benefits should top up the self-employed when they could be working being paid minimum wage
Disagree	the self-employed workers are the people who keep this country going yet they cannot claim any benefits at all, before I retired I was self-employed and not once did I claim any unemployed benefits, it was the government who wanted people to go self-employed then they stab them in the back
Disagree	MANY SMALL SELF-EMPLOYED BUSINESSES EARN VERY LOW GROSS/NETT INCOMES. THIS PROPOSAL COULD SERIOUSLY DAMAGE THESE BUSINESSES WHICH OFTEN PROVIDE VERY VALUABLE AND VITAL SERVICES. GREATER ENFORCEMENT SHOULD BE CARRIED OUT OF SELF-EMPLOYED WORKERS TO ENSURE CORRECT INCOMES ARE DECLARED AND CORRECT BENEFITS PAID.

Unclear still!!!!

Disagree some self employed persons have very erratic -sometimes seasonal-incomes
You cant assume income! it either exists or it does not! you cant have or demand what does not exist.¶
How can someone pay if they have not earned or got it!

Disagree no it would be unfair to those that earn less than the mif

Disagree We all know self employed work is not steady, reliable and is doing alot of hours for nothing in return. I strongly disagree.
Not all self employed people can rely on this expected figure! I for one would love to say that I can afford to pay each bill regardless of price BUT unfortunately some self employed strive and strive and cannot meet the expected living wage but will carry on to provide an island with an affordable service and to keep a roof over my families heads! If all bills were to increase due to this living wage expectation I would end up on job seekers allowance and for how long as we are all aware that job opportunities are vastly sought after on this county!!
I would expect that most businesses dependant on services offered would take over 1 year to establish themselves and grow a respected name and client database. 1 year simply isn't a realistic timescale especially on the area we live in!

Disagree I cant comment on this , as I am not self employed ,

Unclear Those who are self employed often struggle to make profit for at least 3-5 years and a reduction in benefit would again bring stress & suffering to them

Disagree Some people are not in a position to work full hours either for themselves or for an employer, such as carers, and should not be penalised for it.

Disagree This will be a retrospective claim/income for the council but it will be a significant level which can be linked to HMRC data. Similar to DWP data being used currently for claimants of state benefits and allowances.

Unclear

i would say that the first year in starting up a business, which should be supported & encouraged by the council, is one of the most important times for the entrepreneur to receive support so that it can get off the ground sufficiently. one could suggest that after 5 years support would cease or be re-evaluated on viability of business.¶

Disagree

It is unpalatable that, if a S/E business passes through a difficult time, an assumption of minimum income be presumed. If this were the Inland Revenue there would be an outcry to assume a certyin level of income is achieved based on monies that may not have been earned.¶
This is a terrible and disgusting proposal. S/E businesses are just as likely to suffer downturns of income in recession. Why assume something that may not be true. ¶

Disagree

Disagree once again your talking about hitting low income people and family's.

Disagree SELF-EMPLOYED INCOME IS NOT LIKE AN HOURLY WAGE.
This would act as a disincentive for claimants to come off of employment benefits to become self employed. As someone who was previously self employed for a number of years, I can appreciate the impact this is likely to make.

Disagree Any such blanket ruling would potentially have a serious impact on new businesses. The Council should be supporting self-employed people in new businesses and take actual earnings into account, not some arbitrary figure, which may be unrealistic in some cases.

Disagree I believe that this measure would not be unduly hard for newly self-employed people.

Disagree Many Island residents in nominal self employment, are in fact employees forced to accept self employment as part of an employer's tax efficiency programme, and as a means of the employer evading liability for paying the Living Wage. Self employment is increasing in Society, for precisely this reason; not an increase in individual entrepreneurial spirit. This Group of Island residents can be characterised as The Hidden Poor
You make it hard for businesses to start up anyway, a family member wanted to start a business up you wanted £60 per day on the days he'd work and also wanted it in a months advance. Say he did earn just over £60 in a day you would have taken all his earnings and also what if he didn't have the money up from your stopping that's person from starting their own business. The council are a joke
once again you are not taking into an account we live on an island, its not so easy to drum up business, and for someone who is trying very hard to stay afloat, and maybe getting help from friends or family, may not be doing 35 hrs work and therefore putting them under more pressure

Disagree Probably hiding their true income anyway!

Disagree new businesses are having a pretty rough time at the moment any extra expenditure could be the straw that breaks the camels back and another business goes belly up yet another empty shop/building which could result in no cash forthcoming for the council

the calculation for self employed benefit should be based on actual income not assumed. To base it on assumed income is unfair as many self employed individuals find that a new business can take 2-4yrs to become established and profitable. Self employed income is variable at best and as per a employed person benefit is based on actual not assumed. The government is encouraging people to become self employed and start businesses to assist the recovery from the recession to unfairly discriminate against self employed persons by the assumption of earnings is not fair. Lets treat every body equally please.

Disagree why should those who go out to be self employed be comparable to those who cant or wont go and get a job?

Disagree it should only be calculated on their actual earnings.

Disagree I myself am self employed for 25hrs per week on approx £8500.00 PA. so this would indeed affect me, my wife is currently on a "zero hours" contract too so overall we would certainly lose out.

Disagree but if they cannot grow their business!?

Disagree Income from self employment does not rise to a minimum living wage level automatically after a year. People are usually prepared to work longer hours for less and make cut backs to try and make a success of their own business. Self employment income is erratic and dependent on numerous external influences. To make a blanket judgement on all achieving the national living wage over 35 hours a week is not realistic and is grossly unfair. This will lead to more people giving up self employment and claiming benefits as there are not enough paid employment opportunities on the island. I believe this will cause serious problems for the Isle of Wight Council and its services.

Disagree I think the administration of this system would be very difficult

Disagree It would stop people underpaying council tax by miscalculation of earning, but it will put pressure on self employment on the second year

Disagree I have no knowledge on self employment of business to comment fully on this one

Unclear because if after one year the claimant cant earn more than the minimum living wage they could be deliberately doing this to keep their benefits

Disagree Should be calculated on their nett profit after expenses etc. They do need to produce accounts to properly verify this. Being self employed can be quite dubious and the production of a set of accounts should be used as a must.

Disagree I strongly disagree with this. If a self employed claimants earnings fluctuate on a weekly basis then assuming they earning the minimum living wage is wrong! they should be assessed on their actual gross income as it is now.¶
Forcing the self employed to find more money to pay their bill is not as you put it - going to,'encourage self-employed working age claimants to grow and expand their business'.

Disagree Self employed people do not let the council know the whole truth about there income so fully support this idea

Disagree However this is a difficult one as some do earn or get enough work. in certain months

Disagree if you are not earning the minimum wage pack it in and get a job

Disagree Seems a very dubious assumption to make. Council tax benefits should be based on factual income, not assumed income.

Disagree Assuming and proving are keys to fairness. Self employed must provide SIMPLE records that fall inline with income tax filing.

Disagree anyone who is working but on a low wage deserves help

Disagree NO many self employed people's income is erratic and many are just about managing to make ends meet. You want to encourage more of this kind of employment on the island not less.

The figure of the minimum living wage is higher than the current national minimum wage level. The figure used should be the lower of the two, so as to ensure that a person making the effort to run a business and support themselves, are given a level playing field against someone being paid the current national minimum wage.
But what would happen if that person or business did Not make any money within the second and so on years ?¶
Would they still get taxed on the minimum wage, even if they have Not earned any money ?

Disagree yes but would have to show proof of earnings if any different.

Disagree If you earn less than £10,000 how are you going to pay £1,500 c'tax?

Disagree i am over 65 and on a low income cannot afford to even pay for my emergency device which I desperatly need as I live alone

Disagree As many self employed do not work 35 hours this many be unfair.

Disagree Seems unfair and could drive people out of business?

Disagree Many business struggle for the first 3-4 years not just the first list and its usually the self-employed person who doesn't take all thats owed. To grow the economy we need to help rather than hinder new businesses.

Disagree People who have health issues and self employed may not be able to work 35 hours each week. Also you can't get blood from a stone, if they haven't had money in how are they expected to find the money to pay more tax? You will just end up with arrears.
Depends on the job, some self employed people do not earn a regular wage, self employed people seem to be penalised and receive no support for trying to be independant and earning a living, im referring to small businesses (one man bands) not large flourishing companies that employ others

Unclear

Absolutely disagree with this one. Our family as well as many this would drive to worse financial hardship than you can imagine. Please don't even consider it. There's no jobs available which pay a living wage and though being self employed brings some money in, its not normally enough. Adding council tax to that would be incredibly cruel. I can hardly afford all the things I need to get the kids, let alone pay council tax more than I do.

Disagree
Agree
Disagree

Should prove overall positive for the Council, but there will always remain some people who see it as another way to get benefits.

Disagree

It sometimes takes longer than a year to grow a business and would penalise very small businesses.

No! I am self employed and work many hours, however I do not earn minimum wage.!!
This is incredibly unfair to set a level.!!

Disagree

Each case needs to use exact figures from tax returns.

Disagree

Self employed people are under enough pressure, especially on the island where opportunities are limited. Many self employed people are on a much lower wage than the national minimum, and have to work so much harder to reach that threshold.

Disagree

I know many people who are self-employed with families who do not earn the minimum wage level - where are they supposed to get the extra money from?

Agree

Agree with this, so many self employed conning money at the moment

Unclear

I have no information regarding self employed status and wouldn't want to comment on how this one could affect them as its not a situation I have ever been in and therefore I am unaware of how this will effect in reality

Disagree

This would hit us very hard indeed, as we are self-employed but do not reach the minimum wage threshold. Penalising people who already earn less than the minimum wage is very unfair.

Agree

Otherwise the scheme is open to people being 'economical with the truth'.....

Agree

Otherwise why continue in self employment

Common Theme
agree There were suggestions from some respondents that those in self-employment may not be declaring all their income

Common Theme
disagree It was felt that this option could disadvantage self-employed claimants who may not be earning the minimum wage and should be based on actual income.

Do you agree, or disagree that the blanket protection for certain claimants should be replaced by a targeted protection scheme based on exceptional hardship?

Category	comment
Agree	Yes this would be a good idea providing that those most vulnerable; ie those residents, disabled and on low incomes with no savings could still receive adequate help regarding council tax payments. Including those on certain other benefits such as pension credit and income support.
Disagree	I didn't chose to become disabled, over the years I have paid in MOOR than my share.
Disagree	All these groups are vulnerable exactly what Bacon says he is going to protect he speaks with forked tongue difficult for him to be in touch with reality from his castle . It should be tested against income!
Disagree	Cuts to social care is already affecting those vulnerable on disability living allowance. Once again you are targeting vulnerable people already limited on what they have. If they are not fit for work and their dla is not living wage how can you justify targeting the severely disabled and the family who care for them? Not all family are entitled to carers allowance because they work.
Disagree	This smacks of means testing and I would assume would put the council to extra expense of assessing each case.
Disagree	This is targeting those most vulnerable which sadly is in line with current government thinking-
Disagree	Many fall into this group daily through no fault of their own. This system will probably cost more to run than it saves. People will suffer. Letter only sent to council. Comments below :
	Dear Sir,
	In reference to your card about the possibility of reducing the council tax support,
	I am writing to you as I cannot afford to be on the Website and also can't afford to buy a computer. If it is really necessary to put up my council tax I could possibly manage a few extra pound a month to about £5.
Disagree	I read in a magazine recently a financial column by Paul Lewis and he said that the government had several millions of pounds set aside to help towards Pension Credit and Council Tax Support. Letter only sent to council. No survey attached. See comments below:
	Dear Sir,
	A reduction of my Council Tax Support would prove to be very distressing to me, as I really do have a limited budget.
	Reaching the age of 77 years, I live alone and receive basic pension of £448.20 per month also £144.60 per month , Pension Credit Guarantee.
	My monthly rent is £575 plus a compulsory contents insurance of £10. By the time I have paid Electricity/Gas, Water, Death Insurance, Repairs, food, cleaning & travel expenses, mobile phone I have £4 per day left for emergencies.
	I do not own any modern commodities , I do not have a landline , Car, dishwasher, nor clothes drier. Nor do I smoke or drink.
Disagree	Fortunately - I do have good health and spirit. Comments from letter sent to the council:
	Dear sirs,
	I have received a card regarding council tax support , and asking for my views on the subject. I am a bit at a loss what to say !
Disagree	I realize everything alters (We have just lost the dial a bus service) causing a big change in my life. I am a 88 year old pensioner , and am grateful for any help. I have no one on the island and already have your wight care service. My views ?? Please try to treat me with care. I want to carry on caring for myself. Coments from letter received :
	Dear Sir,
	In response to your pc. I would like to say how very grateful I am to have received help with my council tax these past few years. my income is very small and my savings have dwindled to £400. A rise in my payments would be crippling.
Disagree	I do know that certain people abuse the mobility allowance section.
Disagree	This would disadvantage some of the most vulnerable people in our community
Disagree	People in receipt of these benefits already struggle to pay what is expected from them. All monies are accounted and budgeted for leaving nothing left so you'll put them in crisis and debt
	These people should NOT be EXEMPT
	Disability Living Allowance Care (higher, middle or lower rates)
	Disability Living Allowance Mobility component
	Personal Independence Payments (from April 2013)
	Attendance Allowance
	Employment Support Allowance (support component)
	Incapacity Benefit (long term rate)
Agree	Severe Disability Allowance
Agree	Given that these current exceptions receive benefits to cover their "exception" they are in effect getting a further subsidy if this continues.
Disagree	I can't believe you are targeting this type of person and including people that fought for our country
Agree	The basic benefits are the same for those on disability benefits therefore extra protection should only be for those in most need rather than a blanket protection You need to ensure that those who have a genuine need for extra financial support receive it while everyone else should be treated the same and assessed on their ability to pay through the means test. Don't forget these people currently have disability benefits disregarded from the income calculation and receive extra premiums in their level of applicable amount so receive additional protections with these alone
Agree	Many disabled people require their DLA and other benefits to pay greater gas, electricity and water bills due to their disability. the mobility component is used to retain some of their independence.
Disagree	it should stay the same, these benefits are disregarded for a reason, with us its to help me pay for taxi's for my husband when his mobility is bad, and to help keep the house warm for him, and other needs that he has, if you take this away, he will be housebound for very long periods of time, which affects his mental health issues
Disagree	Because you put these options forward does not make them right!
Disagree	You should protect those who need it most
Disagree	most of these people, would not be able to pay, but a this would depend on the level of income they receive
Disagree	This attacks the vulnerable people in society and if you are in one of these categories it would add extra difficulties. I would think it would cost a lot if it were properly administered and if it wasn't it could cause serious financial crisis problems for all concerned.
	It only just works as it is!!
Disagree	Any changes have to be administered, which has to be paid for !!!
Disagree	Should be used for people with not much coming in
Unclear	On employment support allowance you have to pay bus fare now but you sure pay £10 a month.
Disagree	Would not help the poor
Disagree	Again this would mean I would be unable to afford my council tax and would struggle to live! Having finally found somewhere suitable for my disability needs this would be a massive problem for me.
Agree	I don't agree with a blanket scheme because every claimant is different, but it depends on what is classed as exceptional hardship.
Agree	Not all claimants in these categories are facing financial hardship, so a blanket policy is inappropriate. It should be targeted in order to make it fair.
	Some of these people although disabled will not necessarily be deemed vulnerable and may have greater capacity to pay than some other people on much lower incomes. This option treats all the same whilst providing some support in genuine need cases whether disabled or not
Disagree	totally disagree,, those listed above are most vulnerable and suffering ,,,,majority are severely ill,, appalling to consider these,,
Agree	Due to the increase funds available to these claimants a small increase in their payments would have less impact than that on those on an income 1/2 than the above listed people.
Agree	For administration purposes I think that that all claimants should be considered equal and assessed on their actual income.
Disagree	Having worked most of my life at DWP, and having connections with various Disabled Persons and charities, I feel that the majority of these specific groups require the additional benefits awarded as they have exceptional needs and circumstances.
Agree	some people's circumstances aren't covered by blanket protection
Disagree	DLA is paid so that people who are ill and who cannot work can pay for help and mobility problems it should not be counted as income
	People who receive these benefits do so because they need the extra money. Although in saying that it is a possibility that some may be able to contribute something. The worry is what you will impose. I for one receive £125 per week. I get this because of my health condition which requires me to buy products that are not available on prescription and because of the extra washing I have to do. Please also remember that many people with health problems have to pay very expensive prescription charges. However I would be willing to contribute £1 per week to help keep vital services going but please do not ask those people on the basic £73 per week to pay anymore they simply cannot afford it.
Disagree	This would be a fairer way as some people have quite a lot of income from various benefits. People on genuine hardship should be better off, and hopefully stop people claiming fraudantly.
Disagree	All people on these benefits are by necessity on them for a reason they don't need more hardship in their lives they need less hardship
Agree	Yes each case should be assessed individually
Disagree	Again, people receiving PIP do so because they need it.
Disagree	All those groups are vulnerable groups that need their benefit, you would take away from these people their assistance their ability to get out or to enter work placements, no they should be protected, only a greedy well paid able person would take away the life line of a disabled person.
Agree	I agree, they get lots of extra financial help....

Agree If they can afford it then they must pay it, it is not fair to hand this out to people who really do not need it.

Disagree I agree cases should be looked at individually, but i think this may take up a lot more time and money in admin

Agree Sometimes working people find themselves suffering periods of hardship for short periods and it would give a way of assisting these people and perhaps keeping other costs to local services to a minimum

Disagree WHILE GREATER SELECTIVE TARGETING OF BENEFITS IS DESIRABLE, THE TERM "EXCEPTIONAL HARDSHIP " IS LIKELY TO BE UNSELECTIVE AND NOT CATER FOR MANY EXCEPTIONAL CASES. ¶ E.G. VETERANS IN RECEIPT OF WAR PENSIONS MAY BE ADVERSELY TREATED DESPITE GIVING THEIR HEALTH FOR THEIR COUNTRY.¶ POSSIBLY A BETTER WAY IS TO HAVE A MAXIMUM INCOME RULE FOR A CLAIMANT ABOVE WHICH A BENEFIT IS LIMITED.

Unclear make amazon/google/starbucks pay their fair share of tax and not just bullishly do what they like. get a grip of them!!!!

Disagree claimants receiving these benefits have already complied with the requirements for receiving them

Agree Regardless of personal situation, and we all sympathise with this, tax must be levied on ability to pay not personal sentiment.

Disagree It is grossly unfair to punish disabled people who use their dla or pip to live on and support their individual needs with the threat of money being taken for council tax. If they are on the support component of esa they are obviously not fit for work and need there money to live on

Unclear I would not like to state yes, however I believe all income should be counted to make it fair across the board. I am not in the situation to comment as I am not familiar with ill health and disability payments and if the income received is of a level above or below the living wage figures quoted.

Disagree Those who earn High wages can afford to pay , but those on benefits and low income should benefit from this scheme.

Disagree The authorities should always be targeting protection to those that needed it the most but evidence shows that this is not the case & any reduction would bring suffering.

Disagree It is hard enough to get adequate support for Disabled persons and Carers as it is and to involve them in having to justify their hardship is only adding to their suffering and feelings of being treated as second class citizens.

Agree it is definitely worth investigating personal circumstances of each claimant to ascertain their payment ability.

Agree Where monies are tight, rational distribution of benefit is right.

Agree the targetted scheme should be generous

Disagree The group of people specified are already on the minimal amount of income and those with disabilities have enough to cope with already. Please do not place a further financial burden on us.

Disagree LOOK AT EACH CASE ON ITS OWN MERITS.

Disagree In particular I disagree with removing the blanket from: ¶ War Disablement Pension¶ War Widows Pension¶ Armed Forces Compensation Scheme payment¶ ¶ These people have given so much for their country it is diabolical to remove anything from them. They have served their country with pride and honour and being injured in bravely doing so (or even killed giving rise to the War Widows Pension). They should not be included in blanket withdrawal. To do so flies totally in the face of the Armed Forces Covenant signed by the council.

Disagree Severe concerns about claimants abilities to adequately claim what they would be entitled to if the blanket protection was removed. In reality they may qualify but there would be likely to some that fall through the net.

Disagree It is unfair.

Agree I am all in favour of individualised and targeted assessments.

Agree This is fine as long as it is not administered by the companies who are currently declaring very sick people fit for work.

Agree This would require careful means testing, to exclude the genuinely poor

Disagree If you are on low D.L.A. It helps with dressing having someone come. Those I know who are on higher disability benefits are away on holidays three times a year. And UK holidays four times a year. They get too much. New cars. Car tax paid for them. Come on wake up.

Disagree Even if they do get benefits it isn't easy they still struggle and they put their family's first, by doing this bills don't get paid

Unclear A bit confusing.

Agree There are a lot of people out there that shouldn't receive DLA & I think its a good idea to do this on an individual basis however ive seen lots of awful stories of people whom have lost their DLA & they really are suverly disabled.. this is shocking & i hope this does not happen to us!

Disagree Dla etc is paid to help people with jobs they cannot do themselves. Is gardening/cleaning/personal care etc

Disagree No. I am already on the UK's government legal poverty line. If you take any money away extra then you will be breaking the UK's own laws for the minimum amount a person is legally required to live on. I promise you now that I will consider taking legal action against the Isle of Wight County Council if you so do.

Unclear things should be as fair as possible for those who cant get a job because the jobs aren't there for them. this problem is going to increase with population growth and migration to this country and it is unfair to separate people who are all in need of benefit. The government should be catering for this on their high salaries and expense accounts and sadly they seem not to be. It is their responsibility to not only govern but understand the masses needs and support this by job function.

Unclear It all depends on what your policy is with regard to ability to pay. if a person is well off but claiming these benefits then they should pay something towards council tax, but if they are not, they shouldn't pay. I ticked 'don't know' as you need to provide more information on this for me to make an informed decision.

Agree It is better to have a sort of individual assessment of needs, but currently I have no faith in the current system or available manpower to ensure everyone is assessed fairly. This I feel will be key to its success.

Disagree Both my wife and I are on disability benefits. There is no way we have enough money to pay Council Tax. It was hard enough to find the £10 I owed this year. ¶ ¶

Agree Also what would be the criteria for " exceptional hardship" . who decides this and how? And does it change from one person to another?

Disagree It should be based on individuals need, people like me whose only income is Esa need more help than those who get several benefits., People with disability and hardship should be left as it is. Theses benefits are not counted in other assessments. These benefits are targeted at the sick and disabled that have higher costs to daily living due to there individual needs. I think using this option is not one of the best. It is targeting people who cannot work due to disability and illness, especially when there are other less abrupt options available.

Disagree Do not feel that any DLA should be taken into account.....this money is to use for our help....ie gardeners.taxi fares..help in the home....paying for things that the IOW Council or our Housing Assocaiaon does not pay for

Disagree Cases looked out for individual merit will cost more in time and resources. In addition more appeals will me made (more time). Further, unfair decisions made.

Agree again if they are receiving a lot of other benefits ie having lots of children ect then maybe they can afford a bit more towards their council tax but if their only income is the above then cutting their income means cuts elsewhere in their care ect.

Disagree Means testing is always the wrong way to go. Hardship cannot fully be determined by a fixed amount. For example, if someone earning the limit of £X is covered by the allowance, but suddenly earns a few pence above the limit, their hardship hasn't changed at all, but the criteria for them has so help won't be given. So we disagree with this fully and wholeheartedly. There has to be some room for flexibility in this matter, so leave this well alone and keep it as it is.

Agree maybe some would but it would be a fair system alround

Agree They are on a far greater income and as they use the services these should be paid for. Everyone is liable and it is unfair that those on a lower income should be possibly placed in poverty. I appreciate that these benefits are to pay for their care, transport etc, but they don't always use the income for that.Cruel I know but we need to be practical. Someone in receipt of ESA WRAG and DLA Care & Mobility could earn £200.00 per week opposed to someone on JSA earning £73.10 per week. I don't mind people who genuinely can't look for work getting paid but please! Have you seen some of the so called disabled? I work in a school and watch them drop their disabled children off. They have anger issues, these disabled kids, the parents have sports cars. ¶

Agree There is always enough money for what they want to do. I'd scrap most of their benefit and encourage the parents, with school age children, to put down the carers allowance and get a job. Be able to pay it all then.

Unclear War widows, war pensions and armed forces compensation scheme and some other cases should continue to be protected

Unclear If savings above £16000.00

Agree Some claimants get a lot more money than others or have savings etc

Disagree All of the above groups are vulnerable and fixed income, they need this support

Disagree People in this bracket cannot earn much money to offset the difference so not an option i feel

Disagree These groups are very vulnerable now and adding more pressure will only hit harder. the government is already targeting these groups on the amount they receive now. however the staff and benefits package needed to sort through a war widows pensions for a small saving of council tax may be counter productive

Disagree Some people receiving certain benefits are actually in full time employment, and as such are relatively financially secure and could actually afford to pay more (or full) council tax. However, others in receipt of benefits are totally reliant on them and should not be required to pay any council tax. It would seem sensible that people in employment who receive any of these benefits are not automatically completely exempt.

Agree

Disagree Very strongly disagree. These are the most vulnerable group and should be protected. They did not set out to be ill or disabled and you should show compassion.

Disagree Especially all military(war vets) should get high priority. They put their lives on the line whether they went to war or not...they made themselves available.

Agree Fully agree with this statement , removing the blanket protection and replace with a targeted protection scheme.

Disagree To my knowledge many of the people that are on these benefits have a very large disposable income and should not be able to claim extra amounts of money towards their Council Tax.

I know of some (not from the island) who don't work and claim PIP, ESA benefits etc, although they are perfectly capable. There should be far stricter controls on these benefits.

Agree most benefits only allow you to live just above or on the poverty line. With the bedroom tax already in place a further reduction of council tax benefit will only serve to cause more hardship for most families

Disagree I notice you do not include over 60s on basic pension even when we paid tax all our working lives

Unclear

No they are already poor enough. You can't go on bleeding the poorest in society. They have no way of earning extra money to pay top up rents or council tax. They are claiming these benefits because they need and are entitled to them. Not be a source of money for the council to make up their deficit.

Disagree Irrespective of a persons situation and benefit they claim, it is still an income, whichever way you dress it up. The total figure a person receives should be taken into consideration before deciding on whether the costs of council services, such as bin collections, road sweeping etc, that they use, be subsidised by other groups council tax payments.

Disagree Disabled groups etc. have fought long and hard to be treated equally, in line with all others and therefore should have all income taken into consideration, just like everyone else.

Disagree This will ensure fairness and equality across the board. Disabled groups etc, will be paying the same as everyone else claiming and will therefore be treated equally.

Agree Having income excluded (benefit) would be a discrimination, against other groups.

Disagree the most vulnerable must be protected

Disagree I have strong reservations about this working

Disagree As said we are a British 3 person family working 16 hours a week and getting carers allowance and we are having to use food banks already to survive.

Disagree This is going too far, people will suffer more than other options propose

Disagree People on said benefits should continue to get council tax benefit and by the way sda doesnt exist now it was replaced esa why is always the ones in genuine need that get picked let some of the more wealthy pay for a change

Disagree It would mean that the 47 councillors and thousands council office staff on the island would be causing genocide.

Disagree vulnerable people should be protected. think of the extra stress,pressure,hardship, worry this will have to people that are on this scheme.

Disagree I suffer from Schizophrenia and Long-Term Depression and so have great difficulty in understanding this survey. All I can explain is that the current situation of not paying for council tax is extremely useful for me and so would welcome the continuation of the current scheme but I understand there are some changes on the way. I am currently on Income Support and Disability Living Allowance and cannot afford to pay council tax.

Disagree This would be fair and I feel many people would welcome this change.

Agree in principle...if there is a wage earner earning a significant wage and claiming DLA or PIP then the claimant is capable of paying their own council tax bill, if however the claimant is on a low or benefit income then the protection scheme should still apply to them.

Unclear

Not every one receiving benefits is hard up. In many cases those receiving benefits are better off than people work. Each case is different. The exception is!

Disagree

- War Disablement Pension!
- War Widows Pension!
- Armed Forces Compensation Scheme payment!

Disagree

Agree If you fight for your country, it and all who live there owe you.

Agree Taking account of individual circumstances is a very good idea.

Disagree With the Government cutting the above benefits this will only increase the hardship to those already suffering the most and will increase the amount of people being homeless.

Disagree It is hard enough coping with ill health and disability without having to jump through more hoops to get financial help. What is 'exceptional' hardship anyway and why should disabled people have to suffer 'exceptionally' to qualify? We should support people with disabilities, it isn't a life choice like starting a family is.

Disagree It is grossly unfair that people on benefits continue to drain the country without putting anything in, working people are left to foot the bill for most things, in my opinion this especially refers to people claiming PIP and DLA who ARE better off than the average working person.

Disagree Having my partner with a disability that affects his work life so much, I would find this very unfair. He is self employed as no one would hire him with his gaps in work history (medical and though you're not supposed to judge someone for mental illness, absolutely all potential employers did). We try to make ends meet, having to pay more council tax, wouldn't be possible as we're struggling already.

Disagree Although I would agree with this, I believe that anyone getting this at the present based on armed forces service to the country should continue to be protected no matter what.

Agree Some people who qualify for protection now may not actually need it.

Agree I think it should be based on case by case

Disagree You missed the drawback that this would be costly in an administrative sense.

Agree Agree broadly in principle - the counter argument is how much you are going to pay out in assessing people's claims - not only assessors but the quangos and committees who will meet to discuss what you should do and policy and outcomes etc

Disagree The vulnerable should continue to be protected.

Agree I think it would be fairer if all claims were means tested, as someone may be in receipt of a protected benefit but have a higher income than someone who is not. It would be fairer if all claims were assessed by the same criteria.

Agree A fairer scheme as some people may be able to afford to pay in the current scheme even if they have previously had the blanket protection.

Common Theme
agree It was considered that means testing was the fairest approach based on ability to pay rather than blanket protecting all in the current category who may not be the most vulnerable.

Common Theme
disagree It was felt that this would be detrimental to the vulnerable and those most in need.

Common Theme There was a common concern raised from both respondents who agreed and disagreed that this would create a very costly administration process.

Do you agree, or disagree with the principle that the capital limit should be reduced to £6,000?

Category	comment
Disagree / not appropriate	£6000 ? When M.P.s get a £7000 rise ?
Disagree	Hitting? People that have worked hard and saved some money 16 thousand is not a lot leave it alone castles that you build so high are just to steep for me to climb
Disagree	put saving limit to 10,000
Disagree	10,000 is a substantial savings to me. 6,000 is rainy day and a buffer for redundancy where the redundancy payments are insignificant now
Disagree	People have worked extremely hard to save and I do not think they should be penalised for this.!!
Disagree	The reduction is too great, this is penalising people from being thrifty or saving for emergency such as moving house or family crisis
Disagree	Savings of only six thousand would in all reality only support an individual for three months if for some reason that was their only income. Even 16k is probably only equivalent to just under one years financial support.
Unclear	Letter only sent to council. No survey attached.
Disagree	Perhaps reduce the capital limit to £10,000. !!
Unclear	£6,000 is so little now if something goes wrong.eg. car, repairs to property etc.
Unclear	Letter only sent to council. No survey attached.
Unclear	No form returned, only a letter.
Disagree	No form returned, only a letter.
Disagree	This is a considerable reduction from £16k to £6k
Disagree	NOT FAIR
Agree	Surely any such "savings" are for a rainy day and therefore should be used for this sort of situation.
Disagree	People have worked all their lives for their savings and have already been taxed on it
Agree	I agree with this unless they can show there is a need for these savings for mortgage deposits or house modifications etc.
Agree	if they have that kind of savings, they don't need the benefit, i can't afford to save at all and am in debt, why should they be allowed benefit, if you look at it in another way, your actually giving them money for them to save it and then go on holiday etc
Agree	I agree in principle but I feel the the savings level could be a little higher.
Agree	I think, this is a very fair to bring this down to a £6,000. or may be a little high to £8,000
Agree	but the level of £6000, should be lifted to slightly higher level, ie approx. £8,000
Agree	If you've been lucky enough to accrue large savings then perhaps you can afford to pay a small increase.
Agree	Seems vaguely fair
Agree	If you have money over 6000 pounds in savings that could be used for paying your bills then why should you receive support with your council tax?
Disagree	I think that is fair.
Disagree	A more moderate reduction in limit should be considered.
Disagree	People should not be penalised for having savings. They could be for a specific purpose EG a long awaited holiday or a car that has been saved for over a long period of time. They may still be on a low income, but put some money aside every week/month to save for the future. If it is going to be reduced !!, then a figure of £10,000 would be more appropriate.
Disagree	This is just too much of a reduction - a small decrease in the level of savings would be sensible, and save the council money, but a sudden drop of £10,000 is ludicrous!
Disagree	working persons i agree,, but not if that affects pensioners with life savings
Agree	If they have over £6,000 saved why do they need CT support?
Disagree	The £16,000 excess has been in force for a long time and is of lesser value than when introduced. It is not a large sum and if lowered it would be harder and more complex to administer.
Disagree	This could be a possibility, although £6000 seems to be too low a figure, maybe £10,000 would be a more reasonable figure
Disagree	A reduction in excess savings is a good idea but not right down to \$6,000 I think that is a bit low as some pensioners still need help for heating and food in the winter months. Maybe put it down to £10,000 for a trial period and see what the outcome is for the council.
Disagree	Maybe a drop to £10,000, not £6000[big drop]
Disagree	Most strongly disagree, too much of a reduction.
Disagree	It seems that this part of the scheme works as it is meant to currently and if the level of help is reduced the more savings the claimant has this seems to work well now why change what is not broken
Agree	This has the advantage that you'd be taking money from people who actually have it.
Disagree	I think that £6,000 is a bit drastic. How about a compromise of £10,000 ?
Agree	Agree if you have 16 thousand in the bank you don't need help to have 6 thousand is debatable.
Disagree	Mean test their income not how much they have been able to save or how much they have gained through inheritance.
Agree	I have zero savings :(if i didnt have to pay bills, i would have savings. If people have over six grand in the bank they do not neex benefits.
Disagree	what is the point of saving for your retirement and pay tax on it, then stop any benefits they! are allowed
Disagree	PROPOSED £6000 CAPITAL LIMIT IS EXTREMELY LOW AND UNREASONABLE.!!
Disagree	CURRENT LIMITS ARE BARELY ACCEPTABLE.CURRENT ASSESSMENT OF CAPITAL IS INACCURATE IN MANY CASES. MORE EFFICIENT ENFORCEMENT OF CAPITAL LIMITS COULD BE MORE PRODUCTIVE.
Disagree	yeah that sounds fair!!!!NOT!!!! if people have worked saved and then fallen on hard times help them dont punish them in to selling the family silver!!!!
Disagree	16000 pounds is already a very low threshold
Disagree	someone has a small amount saved up for emergancies and the council want to take it in tax because they are so incompetent and weak willed, that they wont raise money or reduce costs, that may effect themselves or there popularity.!!
Disagree	You must be so proud of yourselves.
Disagree	No way.
Disagree	Disgracefull!
Agree	£6000 I belive is fair!
Agree	In my opinion those on benefits should only have £1000 in savings, any more then they can support them selves, £16000, Would mean I would have enough money to live on for over three years, Based on the Money I get to live on for one Year on Disability.
Disagree	Some people may be trying to save towards their own property of in rented and capping that would stop this happening therefore leaving them claiming CRT when they could come out of rented and not have to claim it
Disagree	every case should be assessed independantly
Disagree	Reduce it to £10 000, not £6000
Disagree	£16000 is not a great deal of money, even more so in these economic times we live in & the gov. praying on the poor only makes more poor !
Unclear	For people on Income Support and other benefits, there is already a disparity in the amount of savings they can have in relation to people not on benefits. A drug addict or alcoholic can legally spend their money in pursuit of their chosen way of life, but a disabled person is already penalised for saving for emergencies.
Agree	saving is so hard in today's economic climate, if families or individuals are able to save, especially above the £6000 level, they should be able to pay council tax.
Agree	if someone can afford to have savings then they can also afford to pay more
Agree	as long as this change is applied fairly to all know matter who or what they are.
Agree	Anyone with savings over £6,000 are in a position to pay!
Unclear	LOW EARNERS NEED HELP AND SUPPORT TO SURVIVE.
Disagree	£6k is not much to have put away for a rainy day (or even their funeral). £10k would be a more realistic amount.
Disagree	This might encourage claimants to spend money on unnecessary items just to fall below the limit when the protection of savings in case of hardship should be a priority.
Agree	If you have this amount one dosen't need thehelp.
Disagree	I feel that many individuals who have worked hard to save for their retirement might be prejudiced by this measure.
Agree	A least worst option
Disagree	The savings claimed will in all probability not be as high as claimed as this change will impinge on the individuals ability to pay for their own burial.
Unclear
Disagree	£6,000 is too low. Where possible everyone needs savings for emergencies ie redundancy. I would agree to lowering it to £10,000
Disagree	£6,000 is not that much. We have more, but most of it is for the bills.
Agree	I agree with this
Disagree	It is a backup for some families that will be eaten into. Will encourage people to spend on non essential items or indeed squander it

if a person has savings of over £6000 then their ability to pay or have any benefit for council tax is available. I don't believe people should be able to sit on large sums of money in savings and at the same time get benefit. Benefit should be available to those who are struggling or on reduced income not those who have large sums of spare capital and available savings.

Agree

again why such a large drop. i have always wondered why it was 16,000 as i have never had anywhere near that much money, however bring it down to 10,000 as people who do have that have probably worked for it, paid tax on it and still deserve assistance as they have paid their way.

Disagree

but again, it depends on their total income, not their savings. they may need that level of savings for something urgent but otherwise then I agree.

Disagree

The jump of £10000 is too great.

Disagree

Perhaps 50% reduction would be more realistic i.e. £8,000

Agree

Yes this is another lower impact option.

Disagree

No. Why should people be penalised who save.

Agree

if they can save £6000 regardless of if on certain benefits or not then they can afford to pay towards council tax. would love £60 in savings lol

Disagree

I think these day £16,000 isn't a lot of money and is certainly not a life changing amount. If it has to be reduced at all, then we feel by 1/3rd would be much fairer.

Disagree

This is not fair. It is a large drop in capital possibly too much. Reduction to £10k is what I would propose

Agree

They've got savings, spend them.

Disagree

Reduce to £15000.00 perhaps.

Disagree

As I turn the pages of this form the ideas get worse and worse. Why dont you just abolish it.

Disagree

I think this is too low, maybe make it £10000

Disagree

I am sure in an emergency £6000 won't go far, some people save these amounts of money over many years for emergencies of any kind plus funerals now cost an average of £3000.

Disagree

A lot off well of pensioners live here so could probable afford this option

Agree

I feel that you can not take from the system just to put it in a savings account .

Agree

times are hard for councils

Disagree

This could very quickly put some people in quite severe financial difficulty. Other options would be a higher level of savings (e.g. £10,000) or perhaps a sliding scale of payments - the more savings, the higher the percentage you pay and vice versa

Disagree

IN PRINCIPLE...YES.. and depending upon if disabled & working or if WAR VET of ANY war.** 10,000 would be more reasonable.*****

Disagree

Agree in principle but reduce it to £10,000

Disagree

If people want to save for things or their future they should not be penalised. Many people waste/fritter their money as soon as they get it but get more benefits to pay their bills which I think is unfair to the sensible people that actually save for their future.

Disagree

10,000 would be fairer and less drastic

Agree

if you have that amount of savings you do not need help

Disagree

Possibly but this would discourage people saving to provide a blanket against unforeseen problems in their life and those trying to save for a mortgage. What would be fairer is to reduce it to £10,000. Coupled with increasing the rate for working people to 30%

Disagree

Having over 6k in the bank, means you can afford to pay for your services. The previous 16k limit was too generous and should have been reduced a long time ago.]]

Agree

]]

Agree

I think this would make it fairer to reduce it

Agree

Yes as 16k is quite a bit in savings and if I had even half of that I wouldn't expect a discounted tax bill.

Disagree

I think £10,000 would be a fairer amount

Disagree

£6000 in savings won't last long so should not be counted for these purposes,

Agree

If you can afford to save the you can afford to pay your c'tax.

Disagree

Should this not be for everyone. Esa etc claimants included. Would 10k not have been a fairer figure or even 8k, therefore reducing it by half.

Disagree

Might discourage saving but 16k does seem high. Any middle ground?

Disagree

Gives people little incentive to save for the future and £16000 is not much savings for a family.

Disagree

I disagree with the reduction being cut back to £6,000, I think reducing to £10,000 would be more acceptable

Agree

If you have £6000 in savings, you can afford to pay council tax.

Unclear

Do not understand why this would simplify the administration, other than having less persons to deal with.

Disagree

I would aim for £10,000

Disagree

16,000 is a lot of savings!!!

]]

Agree

To be honest I think the savings threshold should be reduced to £2,000

Agree

Anyone who has that much money in savings can afford to pay more.

Agree

Possibly.

Agree

Fair enough as the savings cd b used for paying council tax

Agree

Yes, if you have a good amount of savings you should not need help with council tax payments.

Agree

How on earth can someone be allowed to have £16,000 in savings but still get money towards their council tax?!! this is absurd. I would suggest even £6,000 is overly generous!

Common Theme agree	It was felt that £16,000 savings is excessive, and if people had the money they should be paying for their services.
Common Theme disagree	It was felt by many that disagreed, that £6,000 wasn't a lot of money and would represent a significant decrease with a compromise of £8,000 to £10,000 suggested as a more appropriate level.

Do you agree, or disagree with the principle that both disability living allowance and person independence payments should be included as income within the scheme?

Category	comment
Unclear	Does this include second homes for M.P.s Leave the disabled alone they are vulnerable the ones that Bacon said the council will protect reduce councillors allowances they will not do that castled cost lots to live in!
Disagree	Dla etc is not a living wage.
Disagree	Disgusting...need I say more!
Disagree	I know of several people claiming DLA and they certainly do not spend their money as intended.!!
Agree	So yes I do agree but I think people should provide proof of their expenditure so the genuine people who rely on their DLA will not be included in this.
Disagree	Personal Independence payments are not personal income but used for disability purposes and so should not be included in the calculation. DLA and PIP are designed to help with costs of any extra needs a disabled person may need again if you take this into account it is effectively cutting their disability allowance so cutting the extra help they may get
Disagree	Another penalty for being infirm.
Unclear	Letter only sent to council. No survey attached.
Disagree	These benefits are given to people who have a long term illness or disability and the money is often used towards things like Motability Scheme, hire or purchase of equipment.
Unclear	Letter only sent to council. No survey attached.
Unclear	No form returned, only a letter.
Unclear	No form returned, only a letter.
Disagree	My DLA is used for my mobility car which is imperative for me. I cannot use buses because I am stable and my balance is affected.!! I am also diabetic and cannot wait for buses.!! my DLA is to help me live as normal life as possible and should not be affected by the government cuts. I have not chosen to be disabled. My doctors have advised that I am not fit to work. I also care for my 79 year old family member
Disagree	These benefits are awarded for a reason and should never be taken into consideration. You're robbing them of their entitlement.
Disagree	I still say we should go back to the councils of 40 or 50 years ago, run by volunteers. That way, practically the whole budget could be spent on providing services, and taking money from disabled people wouldn't be an option.
Unclear	The benefit is being received already so why should it be further subsidised?
Disagree	These people have some sort of disability and I feel sure that given the choice they would rather be normal and well than receive any allowance at all.
Disagree	this goes against the basic principle of DLA for disabilities This would cause more of an issue as the benefits are for disabilities and should remain disregarded to enable them to decide what they use the money for around their needs.
Disagree	Don't know why they weren't always included.
Agree	Disability payments are to help those in need. This should not be taken away from people.
Disagree	they are in most cases needed
Disagree	no if the person, is receiving this allowance, this should not be disregarded, this would be very unfair
Disagree	This is a horrendous idea. Only those fortunate enough never to have required DLA/PIPS would consider such a disgusting idea. These benefits are not counted because they are needed just to survive day to day living.
Disagree	That makes any benefits non beneficial.
Unclear	The partner can work 16 hours a week now and pay some money to the council tax. Disability living allowance is not means tested therefore it should not be calculated in council tax reduction schemes, same as at present. I think a lot of disabled people will struggle to afford to live if this is implemented!
Disagree	I think people with genuine disabilities should be given extra help particularly as lots of support groups and organisations are under pressure too.
Disagree	This will lead to many of our most vulnerable citizens being affected very badly, and for me this is not a society I want to live in.
Disagree	Disabled people and single people need as much reduction as possible People in these situations should not be made to be financially worse off and they do have high expenses in terms of equipment and living costs. However I think means tested is the fairest way to assess any reductions.
Disagree	Yet again, taking more money from residents who really need the financial help from these benefits - no thought at all as to where residents are expected to find the extra money to pay council tax. It's just showing no consideration at all for people already struggling to make ends meet, and adding more stress and worry as to how they are expected to manage!
Disagree	Remove the blanket protection but not take their disability payments into account as this is more likely to lead to challenge.
Disagree	NO I DO NOT AGREE,,,,, I HAVE DISABLED MEMBERS IN THE FAMILY,,,,, THEY DESPERATLY NEED THESE BENEFITS TO PAY FOR THEIR CARE EVERY PENNY COUNTS,,,,,ADULT SERVICES WOULD HAVE TO PICK UP THE BILL AND GIVE MORE SUPPORT ,,,,POINTLESS EXERCISE,,,,THE COUNCIL WILL BE FUNDING MORE COSTS FOR CARE PACKAGES..
Disagree	Costs of care should be considered
Disagree	Again I feel that in the main these benefits are in place to help bolster the additional expenses these groups of claimants have.
Disagree	DLA should not be counted towards council tax because people who are receiving these payments need it because they are ill in one way or another
Disagree	DLA and PIP are given to help people with disabilities live a life with some semblance of normality, please don't make their lives harder than they already are.
Agree	All benefits received by claimants should be means tested this is a fairer way for all.
Disagree	This funding is so necessary and much needed by the recipients.
Disagree	As previously people on these benefits need as much help as possible not less but it might be worth checking that any claimants are genuinely entitled to this help. those genuinely in need should be helped but those who are just playing the system should be penalised maybe making them pay back any benefit they owe. I am in receipt of Disability Living Allowance - I receive the Higher rate for Mobility, and this benefit is paid directly to Motability Finance, to pay for my Motability Vehicle. I receive the Middle rate for the Care component. Because I don't really see the money that goes directly to Motability Finance, I would consider it to be rather unfair to include this as income. I rely on the Motability vehicle to get to medical appointments, etc. (I am unable to use public transport.) I also think that it would be wrong to include the Care component of DLA as income, when calculating Council tax reductions. !! I am also in receipt of Income Related ESA, so have a limited income.!! I agree with all the Drawbacks you have listed above.!! Perhaps you could introduce some form of means-testing for this Option? For example, someone with a large income, or a lot of savings, could probably afford to have DLA or PIP included as income.!! However, this could probably mean added administrative expense?!!
Disagree	As long as the savings are not wiped out by the administrations costs.
Agree	As stated earlier no these people need it.
Disagree	This group of people also need to go through the same process as others. If their total income is in line with people who work it shouldn't matter that it is because their income is from benefits they too should pay the same as someone earning the the same amount. Make it fair!!!!
Agree	This allowance is calculated so a person can live, if you take from that, that person cannot live.DO NOT DO THIS we must never even consider taking from the disabled
Disagree	POTENTIALLY VERY DISCRIMINATORY BECAUSE OF HIGHER LIVING COSTS AND HOUSING COSTS AND INCREASING DIFFICULTIES CLAIMING DISABILITY RELATED BENEFITS. OBTAINING AND KEEPING WORK AND RELUCTANCE OF COUNCIL TO ALLOW FULL DISABLED COSTS.
Disagree	do i really need to explain why this is just wrong??? get a grip people!!!
Disagree	These payments are made for specific support required by an individual requiring extra help with day to day activities not income.
Agree	All income to a house should be used in calculating any reduction.
Disagree	it is immoral to use money ment to help DISABLED people live as a way of helping you get council tax
Agree	again I am unaware of figures of the said benefits - I believe all income should be counted to make it fair across the board
Unclear	I dont Know about this, as I get Disability, But not;; Disability Living allowance.

Disagree Again the gov. is praying on the weak !

Disagree The amount of support some disabled persons receive is totally inadequate to their needs and to further penalised them would be iniquitous.

Disagree I strongly disagree that pip or dla should be included.
DLA and PIP are intended to cover the additional costs which result from a person's ill health. If these have been assessed correctly then it is not simply additional income but income designed to support living with additional needs. It should not be taken to prop up council funds.

Disagree As a disabled person I already have other living costs associated with being disabled. I am already faced with the choice of heating or eating. Having a further financial burden will add a straw to the camels back.

Disagree this is there to help those who really need it when administrated correctly.

Disagree Disability benefits have historically gone into the family pot of income and are not used for the purpose they are issued, so I agree they should be taken into account when calculating the council tax. At the end of the day, DLA etc is an 'income'

Agree

Disagree ON MERIT.

Disagree I tend to disagree, particularly if the claimants are veterans who need to claim these benefits for some reason.

Disagree These benefits are vital for many of the claimants I meet during my work. They are not an additional luxury.

Disagree These benefits are paid for specific purposes to help meet additional costs and burdens faced by disadvantaged members of society.

Disagree It is unfair.

Disagree I believe that people on the above benefits should enjoy full protection from increases in Council Tax.

Disagree What a disgusting option this is it should not even be considered

Disagree Invidious!

Disagree I strongly disagree

Agree All income should be assessed regardless of the 'reasons' for its acquisition.

Unclear

Agree All income should be assessed

Disagree They are non means-tested. They are to help people to live. This is all I My husband gets.

Disagree As said previously these payments are essential for most people to help with jobs they cannot tackle themselves

Disagree No. I am already on the UK's government legal poverty line. If you take any money away extra then you will be breaking the UK's own laws for the minimum amount a person is legally required to live on. I promise you now that I will have no other option than to consider taking legal action against the Isle of Wight County Council if you so do.

Disagree Should be calculated as income.

Unclear does not apply to me.

Disagree most people on these benefits are struggling to get by. they simply cannot afford to pay. please ask those who are well off to pay more, not those on less than the minimum wage amount.

Disagree Both my wife and I are on disability benefits. There is no way we have enough money to pay Council Tax. It was hard enough to find the £10 I owed this year. ||

Disagree

Disagree Also we use the DLA or pip for a car which otherwise we would not be able to afford.
Taking from the most vulnerable is not acceptable.
Reason included on previous answer discussing these issues. This money is for used for things that arise due to illness and disability. ||
People with server illness don't get benefits like winter fuel plan and depend on money from these allowances to keep warm etc
Again this should not be taken into account
Very small amount of income. Not fair. Those who are too ill to work should not suffer
as said above this would not take into account the associated costs of disabilities
costly to administrate and unfair as the costs of truly disabled people are much greater just to live day to day!
Disability benefits are awarded to those needing help with the extra costs of being disabled and are not awarded to pay normal household bills
Leave it alone!
Ther use the services so they need to pay for them.
Targets the most vulnerable and has potential for severe increase in hardship
If it is going to be an administrative nightmare - walk away from it!

Disagree A lot of disabled people have not qualified for pip/dla even although they should be entitled. There is no legal aid for welfare benefits now so they are reduced to esa or even jsa through no fault of their own and are still unable to work because of their health. If you are on these benefits only you don't have enough to live on long term. If you get pip/dla it is meant to pay towards extra cost of being disabled so again its discriminatory to target disabled people who've born the most cuts.
Subject to the minimum income required to live... if benefits take income above this (and this could vary with some disabilities) then a contribution to CT could be reasonably expected.

Agree People judged to receive these benefits need them to pay for extra help or equipment or travelling ie; taxis, as you cannot rely on buses or safely travel on them or live near a bus stop etc for example

Disagree Not a very popular choice this is will be affecting a lot of unfortunate people

Disagree this would very costly to monitor and would the savings if any be worth it.

Disagree DLA and PIP are meant to help with health care costs, not go towards council tax.

Disagree very strongly disagree, again vulnerable should not be targeted.

Disagree The disabled and war vets should always get preference

Agree Fully agree that ALL income is included when calculating Council tax support.

Agree People on these benefits get so much money that they don't always need. I don't see why they should get any help at all with their Council Taxes.

Disagree Such a move would need case by case scrutiny to avoid undue hardship
DLA AND PIP are provided to enable disabled claimants the ability to manage their needs, ie buying in help/equipment needed to live as full a normal life they can without impacting on any other monies they have coming in so as they do not drop below the poverty line
What are you joking these are some of the poorest in our society with the greatest of needs. Where do you think they are going to get the money from. What the council fails to take into account is that these levels of income were set as the absolute minimum to live on. Even suggesting an increase in council tax for this section of society is outrageous. As it is many sick people are going without food, heating and adequate care.

Disagree All income irrespective of its designation is income and should be counted. This ensures fairness across all groups of people.

Agree People get this allowance for a reason, as there needs are greater, they would need more money to live

Disagree I feel this would unfairly penalise disabled people

Disagree Do not take dla or pip into account as its not means tested anywhere else

Disagree The government are already cutting the amount people are getting, to cut that even more is just an attack on those who can't fight back.

Disagree disabled people should stay protected. as stated above "DISABLED BENEFITS ARE EXCLUDED.

Unclear Admin costs not worth it?

Disagree those two benefits should still remain in the protected bracket, except where the claimant is a wage earner, then the DLA or PIP should be taken into account.

Disagree Disgraceful idea

Disagree My understanding is that DLA etc is not income its to balance the disability in which case to tax it would be to discriminate.

Disagree As these benefits are non taxable and disregarded in all other calculations the Council should not change this as DLA and PIP are paid to support disabled people to have a decent standard of living and to help with the extra costs of living with a disability and not for greedy Government and councils to attack.

Disagree Strongly disagree, these benefits are for the extra costs of a disability and barely cover that. This is why they are not means tested. They are not for Council Tax payments.

Agree Totally agree that people claiming PIP or DLA should pay the same as anyone else
This money is for the Disabled Person to use to pay for certain things they can no longer do themselves due to illness/disability. What I am saying is because a person has become ill/disabled there are many things they cannot do anymore so therefore have to pay others to do these things for them.

Disagree As said, my husband is self employed, in receipt of DLA and we're in receipt of child benefit. We would struggle with a extra bill that if not paid, has bailiffs coming to your door in seconds. I feel depressed enough anyway.

Disagree I think the disabled have been targeted enough already.

Disagree All income should be included in any assessment

Agree

We should not increase admin burden.[]

[]

Disagree Also people who receive this benefit are in need of that benefit for their individual needs, they have greater expenses than an able bodied person
Disagree the vulnerable need to be protected.
Agree As per my previous comment regarding protection, I think that all claims should be asseeed on the same criteria
Unclear Ease of administration.

Common Theme

agree Many of those respondents agreeing to this option felt that all income should be included in calculations.

Common Theme

disagree Many of those respondents disagreeing with this option felt that the payments were spent of specific expenses by the most vulnerable members of our community and therefore should not be treated as additional income.

Do you agree, or disagree that we should take child benefit into account when calculating council tax reduction?

Category	comment
Disagree	Leave it families need this to live on they can be vulnerable if they have more than one child and live in a castle
Disagree	It's bad enough the income threshold for working tax credit is supposed to be halved in April (though it's currently been rejected by the House of Lords). This would just amount to a further blow.
Agree	It is a regular income
Disagree	Again absolutely disgusting!
Disagree	Child benefit is to increase the welfare of children not subsidise the council
Unclear	you want children to pay council tax ?
Disagree	poorer families suffer again.
Disagree	Child benefit is for the child. You get single person discount when paying council tax as a single parent, therefore you do not pay council tax on behalf of your child, so should not be expected to use that small amount of money to pay towards it
Unclear	Letter only sent to council. No survey attached.
Unclear	Letter only sent to council. No survey attached.
Unclear	No form returned, only a letter.
Unclear	No form returned, only a letter.
Disagree	People with low incomes really need all of the child benefit they receive.!! Lots of people have a very good income and still get child benefits and I don't know why. It was originally brought in for the lowest pay sector, and I don't know why or when it was changed to include the middle classes let alone the upper classes.
Disagree	Child benefit is for the child, not to pay council tax. It should never be taken into consideration. It will already be allocated on items such as clothing, food, nappies etc for the child.
Disagree	I agree after person has more than 2 children
Agree	As before all income should be taken into account
Disagree	there would be a potential impact on child poverty
Disagree	It would remove any work incentive as only penalises those working and not those on out of work benefits.
Disagree	Child benefit is money for parents to buy uniform/clothes etc for the child. The child should not suffer.
Disagree	Child benefit is for parents to provide necessary things for their children, cuts were already made from it so surely they could have financial problems caused by what, in effect, would be another cut.
Disagree	Enough kids are endangered & in poverty.!!
Disagree	You already leave that to charity, now you want to exacerbate the situation !?
Disagree	Do not take money off the mothers.!! When I was a mother it was all I ever had as my husband never gave me a penny for the children. he only fed us & put a roof over our heads. It was a life saver to me.
Disagree	Child benefit shouldn't affect council tax support rates. I don't have children myself but I know how expensive life can be when you have kids, and parents don't need extra money worries on top.
Agree	I think if you have children you should budget for them as much as you can and not use them to get extra benefits.
Disagree	Personally I use my child benefit to feed and clothe my children, not towards household bills. If you are receiving child benefit and council tax support, then you probably need the financial support this offers.
Disagree	Ridiculous idea!
Disagree	This only affects those who are trying to work and therefore would appear to penalise anyone trying to work and devalue making a work pay.
Disagree	TOTALLY DISAGREE,,, CHILD BENEFIT IS WHAT IT SAYS ,, FOR THE BENEFIT OF A CHILD,,, TAKING THIS INTO ACCOUNT IS LIKE TAKING FOOD OUT OF THEIR MOUTHS,,, AGAIN APPALING
Disagree	Child benefit should not be means tested
Disagree	The administration of this would not provide savings enough to be worthwhile. Also there may be difficulty in administration if Child benefit is withdrawn for other reasons. It should be kept in line with other means tested benefits.
Disagree	Child benefit is paid for children, children do not have to pay taxes. This policy could very well be the deciding factor of taking a child into the child poverty bracket. Please don't do this. Tax the rich
Disagree	As previously stated all benefits should be added together and then means tested per individual.
Agree	Although I don't have children myself I know that you cannot hit children or benefits meant for them after all children don't reach tax paying status till they are of age so can work and contribute so hitting them or their benefit would be seen as penalising them for being children so surely the natural thing is to bypass this system and leave well alone
Disagree	I refer you to my comments for the previous Option - would it be possible to introduce Means-Testing, for people in receipt of Child Benefit?
Unclear	As long as the savings are not swallowed up by administration costs.
Agree	As stated earlier no.
Disagree	It will make it fair.
Disagree	you do this and only the child will suffer, do not take from children.
Disagree	CHILD BENEFIT IS ESSENTIAL FOR MANY ON LOW INCOMES.
Disagree	again,,,,people who claim this are not doing so because they are wealthy, they are trying to survive.
Agree	All income should be included.
Disagree	Child benefit is for children and to help with cost of raising children not for council tax
Disagree	No child benefit should never be taking as income.
Agree	all income should be counted Child Benefit , is for families on low income to feed Children It should not be included in as Income.!! In therey the money is to clothe Children and feed them . if the parents or parent, is poor.!! people who earn over £20.000 a year Should not get Family allowance, I know of couples who earn over £100.000 a year between them and spend the family allowance on a Good night out, Its Disgusting,
Disagree	Child benefit is not a huge payment as it is towards a child's monthly costs. Including this will affect young families and the children
Disagree	depends on other income of household
Unclear	Again the gov. is praying on the weak !
Disagree	Would the amount saved be adequately covered by the cost of including this sum in the calculations? If the saving is going to be small, is it worth penalising people who can probably ill afford to lose even a small amount of money.
Unclear	Child Benefit is designed to assist with additional costs of looking after children. This is accepted by society as useful to it as that child then is aided in reaching their potential (to the benefit of society). It should remain fully disregarded.
Disagree	this one dos sent seem to help either way when you add on extra administration costs.
Unclear	CB is an income - so should be included in the calculations
Agree	ON MERIT.
Disagree	Too many families use Child Benefit for the wrong reasons, ie holidays etc. I totally agree it should be taken into account. If people cannot afford children, then they shouldn't have them.
Agree	Child benefits have already been cut by National Government and those in receipt are in genuine need.
Disagree	I believe that Child Benefit should be taken into account when making an assessment because this moves to a more individualised and targeted approach.
Agree	OUTRAGEOUS!!!!
Agree	.All income should be assessed regardless of the 'reasons' for its acquisition. They get too much money. I over heard Eastern European say to friends.. Come to England they pay you to have babies.!!
Agree	,
Disagree	Child benefit should be for the child.... not the parents to spend!!!
Unclear
Disagree	Many parents need this to feed their children
Agree	But only after the 1st child.
Disagree	Child benefit is to benefit the child.... NOT to be used for council tax.

Agree More babies more benefit. Come on there are too Many scroungers out there
This should be counted as income and not exempt. If the addition of this allowance still shows hardship or a low income then benefit of council tax should be given. However if the income with this addition shows no low income then no reduction or benefit to council tax should apply. Benefit should be for those who actually need it not those that are just entitled to it currently and so get it.

Disagree again, 20.30 per week child benefit should be kept separate as it hardly covers anything anyway.

Disagree it all depends on what that family can afford.

Disagree Child benefit is payable usually to the mother for the sole benefit of children. This should not be taken from children to technically pay towards council tax. Often it is the only income a mother has to spend on the children as an individual especially where there is a situation involving domestic violence.

Unclear I think that a combination of these measures would be fairest

Disagree This is a benefit again that is given for helping with cost with raising a child. This and the disability changes are not the best of the changes stated .

Unclear On the proviso of 3 or more children

Disagree child benefit should be used for the children and taking it into account would take it away from the child

Disagree Child Benefit is a small amount of money and is there for the child and should remain disregarded

Agree Costs of bringing up a child is the responsibility of the parents not the taxpayer.

Unclear As the last question.

Disagree The extra administration costs could cost more than the benefits

Disagree Not a good idea this choice to expensive to put into practise

Disagree Providing the savings cam out way the cost of admin. Having children is a life choice.

Disagree I am not fully aware of what entitles a person to child benefit, so do not feel fully qualified to offer an opinion. If child benefit is means tested, then no, it should not be taken into account when calculating council tax payments.

Unclear Speaks for itself !

Unclear I am unsure if it would make much difference as the child benefit is rather low anyway.

Agree Might stop some from having more children who have them for the benefits

Agree child benefit is given to thousands of families not in need, yet is small enough not to impact to harshly on those in need.

Disagree Child benefit is provided to families to help with the costs of raising children, to take this benefit into account when making calculations would only impact on the child as there would be less money available for their needs

Disagree No because we are not making enough of an effort to reduce child poverty.

Agree child benefit is an income of sorts and should be included. A childs rubbish each week, still costs the same to be collected as an adults.

Agree Families that have many children. Should be able to support these children.!!
So they could only get money for the first child.

Disagree I believe child benefit and child tax are a boost to help low income families provide. If this were to happen then some children may lose out. Also means the bigger the family the more taken so would seem unfair especially for the children.

Disagree £18 a week child benefit??

Disagree child tax benefits in my household go's to my kids school uniforms, shoes, clothing,ect.!!
things that our child requires to help them thrive.

Disagree It would cost more to implement than they would get back.

Disagree Surely this is wrong as in most cases it will effect the children in a family

Disagree Council Tax is an adult responsibility. Technically Child Benefit is for the child and therefore it would not be ethical to tax it.

Disagree Same reasons as in the previous question Child benefit is for children not to be targeted.

Agree Agree but maybe have a scale so a single or double child family weren't effected but those with more were

Disagree It is and should be used to provide for your child/ children, not in household income

Unclear Children are a lifestyle choice so could do this but might disproportionately affect poorer children.

Disagree Child benefit is peanuts so should not be taken in to account

Disagree No. Child benefit is there to help with costs for the children. Its not family money, its for their clothes, shoes, school uniform.

Agree People who have large numbers of children to gain benefits will, at least, have to pay their fair share of council tax, since no doubt these are the same people whose children receive support from the Council's Children's Services.

Agree All income should be included in any assessment

Agree Although I don't want to increase the admin burden, child benefit can in certain cases be a lot of money paid to a person each month. Increasing that persons 'income' dramatically, Why should they then receive council tax reduction on top?

Disagree This money is for the children, not the adults.

Disagree Child benefit is to help children and alleviate child poverty. Should not be means tested.

Disagree Would have agreed if this measure were not going to make an expensive administration burden. If its going to be just cost neutral, its pain for nothing.

Disagree I don't believe this should be taken into account at all

Disagree Child benefit is a life saver for those on low incomes.

Agree I think that it should be taken into account as it is income into the household.

Disagree This helps families to budget

Common Theme
agree Many respondents in agreement considered that all income should be included in the calculation.

Common Theme
disagree Many respondents who disagreed with the option felt it would impact adversely on the children and therefore should not be included within the calculation.

Do you agree, or disagree that we should limit council tax reduction to a maximum council tax band level to either a Band B or Band C?

Category	comment
Disagree	Another cynical attack on the vulnerable Mr bacon
Unclear	How is the band level ascertained, if it is the property's worth on the market then surely this changes depending on the market.
Disagree	have you any idea how difficult it is to find places to rent on the island ,dont make it even hard by cutting out another lump of houses because they arnt in the right tax band
Disagree	Many elderly on the island live in areas banded d and above but do not have a great deal of income. More data is required on this to make a decision. For example my mother lives in one room all winter in her band d house to save on heating etc because of the level of her state pension which is not enough to support heating the whole house - the same can be said for many of her friends
Disagree	Property values are not a good indicator to peoples situation. More council housing would solve this better and give the council income and assets for years .
Agree	It's a good policy but need flexibility in it based on individual needs. Some people need support and need a property that is rated high that a band c. Other people live outside of their means because they have benefit payments allowing them to
Unclear	Letter only sent to council. No survey attached.
Unclear	Letter only sent to council. No survey attached.
Unclear	No form returned, only a letter.
Unclear	No form returned, only a letter.
Disagree	Some people living in higher than band B and C properties could still be subject to hardship through changing circumstances
Agree	People who are in higher band's either have too much money or too many children .
Agree	Should reflect the circumstances of the individuals.
Agree	let the more wealthy people in our community share a more equal burden rather than having the poor take all the suffering
Agree	Some people may need more space (health problems, disability, large families etc.) and should not automatically lose any right to help. Possibly a limited form of this idea?
Disagree	I dont agree with you at all
Disagree	By all means target people with money.I knew an old lady in the family farmhouse living in absolute poverty, she would not have been able to pay a high band.
Disagree	I live band C going to move but my son and grandaught have move in.
Agree	It could have an impact on house prices? Although I have to say it is not a bad idea.
Disagree	Just because someone is in a higher band council tax property, it doesn't mean they do not need the council tax support.
Agree	This is a bit of a grey area. Some claimants may live in higher band properties, perhaps a former family home, where parents have died, and they have continued to live there, but still have financial difficulties. I think maybe the band level could be changed, but to a higher level than B and C - maybe band D and above may be a more realistic option.
Disagree	This would be too great an impact on those with slightly bigger houses.
Disagree	THIS MAKES NO SENSE,,, A HIGHER BAND PROPERTY DOESNT RELATE TO SOMEONES INCOME,,,
Disagree	Its not relevant, suggesting that people renting a band D average family sized property are not entitled to assistance is unfair. I for example live in a band D property much cheaper than the average to save money.
Agree	This would be fairer to all council tax payers who would not be happy to subsidise higher lifestyles.
Unclear	I'm sorry I don't understand this policy. I was unable to read the case studies because I don't have the updated software versions that you have.
Unclear	Maybe this is somewhere the council is missing a trick. Instead of looking at the lower banded houses why not look at the higher banded houses that are at the limit of banding but should have higher bands applied to them after all houses that are offered on the market at over a MILLION pounds in estate agents windows may not be paying what they should be ideally but if the banding system does not take account of this maybe it is time it should.
Disagree	Unfair to people who live in a higher band but may be on very low wage, or have no savings, or have lived in family home for many years
Disagree	I don't understand what you're proposing. NO Council Tax Support for people in higher bands? I don't agree with that.
Disagree	Circumstances change. People age and people suffer health problems. Why penalise folk if they have worked hard, saved hard and bought a decent house (which they have probably lived in for a great many years.) [] There are a great many decent sized houses on the Island (as opposed to modern houses which are little more than boxes.) []
Disagree	You will be upsetting a lot of people if you restrict benefit to lower bands.
Disagree	The banding system is already flawed. Most council tax support claimants are renters not owners of the property.
Disagree	Does it matter what band your house is families tend to have bigger homes so the band tends to be higher the majority of claimants are in rented accommodation.
Disagree	If people could freely move house maybe this would work, but with the house market and lack of affordable rental properties this really seems a no go. Not only that you would look like your kicking poor people out because they have a nice home or are situated in the wrong area.
Disagree	This is not a good idea as it would result in more people on low incomes to lose their homes as they could not possibly afford to pay the full amount and therefore would have to go into rented accommodation which would result in more people having to claim housing benefit which would no doubt cost the council more. VERY ARBITRARY. MANY HAVE NO SAY IN HOUSING CHOICE. VERY HIGH RISK OF SERIOUS DETRIMENTAL EFFECT ON SOME CLAIMANTS. NEED FOR SOME FAMILIES TO HAVE LARGE HOUSES TO ALLOW CORRECT HOUSING FOR LARGER FAMILIES. GOVERNMENT POLICY OF RESTRICTING HOUSING BENEFIT TO CLAIMANTS WITH SPARE BEDROOMS.
Disagree	at last a little sense.
Agree	there are many cash poor persons living in for example inherited property,irrespective of bands
Disagree	With the combined intelligence of the council how do you think someone living on £71 pound a week job seekers allowance who just happens to live in a higher banded property can afford to pay more!!!
Disagree	NO BANDING SHOULD APPLY EVERYONE SHOULD PAY THE SAME IF THEY HAVE THE SAME INCOME!
Disagree	Don't think that's fair .
Agree	for administration purposes this seems an easy change
Agree	I live in a band B , Im on benefits. Those on benefits in a very high band House, should sell up and down size, Unless they are supporting a large Family of under 18 years old'
Disagree	Again the gov. is possibly praying on the weak ! Often each case is individual, making blanket decisions on people with a tick box on a screen does not deal with actual peoples needs.

With the so called bedroom tax already hitting many people in larger houses, it would be unfair to further penalise them, however, people in houses above Band C probably don't need support to that extent and should be encouraged to downsize if they do need support. Under occupancy does not do anything to help alleviate housing shortage

Disagree this would result in creating enlarged low income communities residing in certain areas which in turn will have an effect on overall health & safety standards in these communities.

Disagree It is possible that an individual may be passing through a unique set of circumstances which mean their ability to pay Council Tax would be made even harder by such a ruling. This is unfair.

Disagree Bands have in some instances are out of date so until all bands across the Island have been reassessed it is unfair to limit to B or C.

Agree If you are "property rich" then you have the option to reduce the property size

Disagree KEEP THE CURRENT BANDS.

Disagree People may be facing loss of income temporarily whilst living in higher banded homes. Reducing their entitlement to support may force them to move with adverse impact on individuals and family.

Disagree I believe that limiting the benefit to Band B or C may prejudice older people who live in bigger properties bought when their income was previously higher.

Disagree It would require careful means testing to exclude the genuinely poor

Unclear

Agree Just because you live in a higher banding doesn't mean you are rich with property values rising

Agree But only if you own the home, not rent it.

Unclear Unfair. Why should people have to move to benefit from a lower tax band. This would cause stress and hardship

Disagree should be individual and circumstances based not property based.

Agree this should cover up to a 3 bed house. anyone who lives in a bigger house should have to look at other options. maybe this might help control the prospect of single mothers or benefit families popping out child after child...

Disagree again, it should go on that person's ability to pay not where they live.

Disagree But does it take into account where people through no fault of their own through accident or personal injury have a life changing event. The house they live in might be an inherited home for example.

Disagree People cannot predict their circumstances changing regardless of where they live. Moving to a less expensive property may not be possible or practical and their lower income may be a temporary situation.

Agree Again a easy option. If you are managing to live in a band D then I should think council tax is not a expense. By doing it to level C you are still protecting families and people who have decided to live in a family home. This is another good option and easy to apply.

Disagree have no clue on council tax bands? if housed by housing you dont have a choice on the council tax band you take the house given to you.

Agree it would be a much fairer and just system for those living in higher value properties to pay a higher proportion of council tax

Disagree All band levels should be applicable. Some elderly people have lived in their houses all their lives and are not responsible for band allocations or increased property values. It certainly doesn't mean they are wealthy enough to be restricted from any form of financial help.

Unclear Normally those in Band A or B are on low incomes and those in C or above on a higher income.

Disagree Being in a Band D property doesn't make me anymore wealthy.

Agree They could sell up and buy something cheaper. Not fair expecting others to pay for you to live in your big fancy house.

Disagree We had no alternative other than to rent a property with a higher council tax band as there was no other accommodation available to us at the time and we would of been made homeless if we didn't agree to rent the property we are now at. (we weren't even aware at the time of signing the contract what the band was) The increase from band C to D is already now crippling us financially.

Agree Generally if you are above a C you can afford to live in more expensive house so should be able to pay

Agree I think band D and above would be fair

Agree not a bad idea this choice

Agree If you have a band in higher bracket then. I guess you have a bigger house, if you can not afford it then downsize

Disagree I live in a high cost band area - but my home is a 2 up 2 down that is falling down and is only worth a fraction of the houses surrounding me.

Agree The band they are in should be applied.

Disagree I know of a widow that is in a council tax band B and would not be able to afford to move into a lower priced property as the house is in disrepair.

Agree It is a little vague, but generally will keep the benefit amongst the more needy.

Disagree Because many people are now being forced to rent already using their minimum income to top up rent. There is so little security in the private rented market on 6 month short-hold tenancies that when someone has to move they have to take what's on offer on the market at the time. Not some mythical property within their band range.

Agree If you are able to afford to live in higher banded homes, then you can afford full council tax payments.]]

Agree Council tax payment discounts are for those on the lowest incomes, not those living in larger, more expensive houses.

Agree If you work and can afford to live in a big house with more than two bedrooms I think that you should pay your council tax.]]

Disagree But if you have two bedrooms or less I think that you should not have to pay any council tax.]]

Disagree This would help the single families also people trying to bring up there first child.

Disagree Yes and no I would say also would depend on income and if they receive benefits.

Disagree Council Tax banding is unfair as a C in Ryde could be the same type of property in Whitwell which is a D banding.

Agree A band is the disabled housing band we are ones who need the benefit

Disagree If you can afford to live in a big house then you can afford to pay.

Disagree Not sure how applicable the whole banding system is, think it needs updating in general so wouldn't want to Base new changes on it

Agree if the claimant is living in a higher band property and claiming benefit/support then they would need to seriously think about downsizing and moving to a more affordable property. why should the tax payer pay for a claimant to live in a mansion when the tax payer lives a 2 bed semi them selves.]]

Agree If your a regular Joe with no financial support and you can't pay your bills you move to a smaller house. Why should those subsidised have more right to a certain quality of life than those who pay for it themselves.

Agree People can always downsize.

Disagree I dont agree with that because some people have worked hard to better themselves and to be penalised because they have managed to accomplish this would be wrong

Disagree Again hitting families.

Disagree I disagree, although people should be supported/encouraged to live within their means and if this means moving to a lower council tax property - so be it.

Disagree I'm not sure on this, sometimes people find themselves in a house in a particular band through no fault of their own, however, it will encourage people to move to a more suitable house if they do not need the features of the property they are in.

Disagree Not fair on those who rent a band B or band C house who had no choice.

Agree This is a fair option. Those living in band d or above are likely well enough.

Disagree Problem again is low income homeowners in house which is their only asset

Disagree Seems a bit unfair, you can't always choose to live in a lower band if you are renting.

Agree I think that there should be a cap as if you are on a low enough income to receive help with your council tax you do not need to live in a huge property - I think Band B may be a bit low as this could cause problems for families with more than 2 children, Band C is reasonable.

Agree Consider moving to a smaller property if possible

Common Theme
agree It was felt that if people were in a high band house, they have the option of downsizing, particularly if the property is owned and not rented.

Common Theme
disagree It was considered that some claimants have been unable to find rented accommodation in a lower band that meet their requirements (family, location, disability) and therefore some of the most vulnerable members of the community would be disadvantaged.

Common Theme
disagree There were suggestions from those both agreeing and disagreeing with this option that Band D may be a more appropriate level.

If the council were to choose these other options to make savings, what would be your order of preference? (Please rank in order of preference where 1 is the option that you would most prefer and 4 is the least)

comment

Reduce the number of councillors and reduce the amount they get paid stop paying for babysitting for female councillors they all get paid too much and most of them are hopeless mainly the leader of the council who looks down from the turret of his castle and has no idea what happens in the real world
It depends on what services you would reduce funding to as most are cut to the bone anyway. I wouldn't want to see library's close
I do feel that any discounts should look at household income, dependants, disabled or elderly family (if in a home they would cost the authority far more, if you take away discounts you could force families to do this as they couldn't afford their own home with the financial burden of a person who was deemed not fit for work, not everyone is entitled to carers allowance)
you could of course look at cutting councillors wages and expenses ,if this was put into question 25 it would rank no 1

The council needs to increase its income? There are ways to increase income but cost of ferry travel would negate this for Council related enterprise as much as for the rest of us. How about cut costs by integrating the local authority with Southampton Portsmouth or Hampshire? How does our council tax and banding compare to those localities? How much do councillors and their services rather than direct services to islanders cost? Would the elected members be likely to vote themselves out of a position? Who made the decision to spend 10k on legal fees re out of school trips? Too many questions that need answering but council tax is an obvious easy option target. A sound business would only use reserves in extreme circumstances - we have no idea of reserves or assets this council is holding

Letter only sent to council. No survey attached. Please disregard above answers for question 25.

Letter only sent to council. No survey attached. Please disregard question 25

No form returned, only a letter.

Comments from letter sent to council :|

I realise you must raise revenue in order to pay for all civic facilities - but please, make it the least possible. |

May I suggest a way of raising funds? Namely, why not charge a hefty sum to all those households who in spite of having garages and/or driveways - insist upon parking their car on the road outside their properties? This practise is a hazard to other road users. |

I'd be interested in hearing your thoughts on this proposal.

Pay the bigwig council executives less. |

They earn more than the Prime Minister and its a bloody disgrace. If people dont want to do the job unless they are extremely highly paid then they are not in the job to serve the community are they?

No options ticked. Had to enter 'preferences' to allow remainder questions answered.

Making cuts to services yet expect an increase in council tax. What will it be paying for exactly then? It's already too high!

Make money from renewables there is potential in this . |

Offer (LCTS) to people who volunteer at waste recycling centre's would have thought that would reduce the burden of cost to the council . |

Provided the c.tax increase is not excessive it seems we need to consider increasing it.

Would not allow options to be left blank. |

|

See page 1. |

Represent us to government!!!!

Do your job , grow a spine.

Over the years the council has wasted a lot of money, I know you can't read into the future but so often i want to say 'told you so'.

increase the level of council tax two or three benefit come in

Answered :|

4 Increase the level of Council Tax |

1 Find savings by cutting other council services |

1 use the council's reserves (savings): |

1 Increasing income |

|

Would not let me enter these preferences

I do think you could increase income by keeping some loos open during the day and charging 10p to go in, we all need to use the loo and a small charge would be better than having no loos open, it can be coin operated so you would not have to employ someone to take the money.

Cut all the high rents hostels get for looking after people

We have to face facts that unless council tax is increased to a sensible amount of no more than a 5% rise then services/support will have to reduce. Perhaps the county press needs to begin focusing on what the financial difficulties really mean to us as residents and provide balanced views so that residents understand fully the issues faced for leading up to a referendum if the council needs to undertake this with the public.

the island needs to do more to generate income ,,tourism,, |

why is the govt not helping the island which has special needs unlike other parts of the country. |

landlords should pay an excess charge if charging over a specified amount.

Increasing council tax above 1.99% should b the last option due to the cost of a referendum. |

The previous suggested Options for cuts to council tax support should be the prime concern then other ways of raising income.

Why again should the most vulnerable of us be penalised. Please look at other options ie less to Police precept or massive payouts to Council 'Big Wigs' when they leave or retire.

Savings should be made in the council by reducing the amount senior council workers receive and by reducing the funds to the police.

I'm not sure how councils can increase income other than charging more for the services it offers and possibly there is some scope for this, I don't really know. However one of the possibilities that you are proposing is a reduction in the discretionary housing payment, this I fear will lead to more homelessness and I sincerely hope you do not adopt this. Have you looked at where investments could be better? Another possibility is encouraging more housing associations to build on the Island, I know for a fact that there are HAs that are looking for land in which to build. There are also savings that could be made in the natural environment, stop the pollarding of trees, stop street weedkilling, stop cutting hedgerows, stop mowing grass to within an inch of it's life, stop using that ridiculous energy using notice board. I'm sure that there are other savings such as these that can be made.

I think most people would accept an increase in council tax rather than see services reeduced else where.

Making ways of making money not wasting it.

I volunteer at the Classic Boat Museum and in 2012 we were moved out due to the council's wish to redevelop along with the bus museum and while we at the boat museum are grateful for the continued use of the Belfast shed next to the museum (rent from shed being paid) I note that the museum buildings both boat & bus are empty (no income coming in). Surely it is in the best interest of the council to maximise all assets on its books to help it out so if I can find two buildings not producing income what else is the council not getting income from that it could be getting income from and what else is available to the council to make use of , do they have redevelopment land sitting idle that could produce an income if developed , is there land being held back by developers or land owners who are stopping its use could they be hit for a land tax if this is happening. always look to your own resources before expecting people on benefits to pay more when our benefits are frozen effectively giving us a cut over the next four years.

I don't understand what you say about the last option.

Cut the money spent on some children's services, unruly ill disciplined youngster's who do not appreciate someone has to pay for providing free travel and a host of other things they get given i.e huge colour televisions.

Making self employed people have to declare a minimum level of income is my preference

Slight council tax increase but leaving support as it is especially for pensioners.

A difficult one every year the council tax increases by upto 2% , I think that is a fare increase, wouldn't it be lovely to have a reserve many households don't, reducing other services how you have broke so many. Increasing incomes yes take this opportunity to increase holiday homes council tax the revenue from that would certainly help,

Make it means tested including all normal monthly incomes (by normal I mean not savings) it is disgusting that it is not means tested including all incomes. Food, electricity, water, rent and clothing (life's basics) do not cost more just because you are on benefits. Someone earning the same as me through benefits don't need a big council tax break because they get their money from the benefit system. I m not saying the benefit system is a bad thing (as its not) I think the council tax system is wrong if I m paying council tax but 'Bob' down the road isn't paying the same as be despite having the same income as me his is just fem benefits. It's just another ridiculous policy in this country which wastes money (another case of money being handed out where its just not needed like free school dinners for all children up until key stage 2 - under current guidelines my child is entitled to this but we don't need this benefit what we need is the money being spent on more staff for schools or resources not a poxy school lunch). Increase income yes but it needs to be done by attracting more visitors not robbing the islanders with more parking charges etc
The council should monitor somehow the council tax long time applied to DLA kids. Some of those kids are growing up and if even the parent is acting as a parent and carry on taking the benefits and money, they arent acting with full parental responsibility, leaving the grow up kids to their own endeavors. Those situations should be strictly monitor by the council and therefore the benefit system. In other cases some adults getting full council tax are living in a luxury lifestyle while others are working to pay for their "benefits".

COUNCIL IS TOO SMALL A UNITARY AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE COST EFFICIENT SERVICE. IMMEDIATE AMALGAMATION IS REQUIRED WITH MAINLAND AUTHORITY. HAMPSHIRE HAS MUCH WIDER ECONOMIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC BASES PLUS GREATER EFFICIENCY/EXPERTISE . DELEGATING SERVICES TO SMALL TOWN/PARISH AUTHORITIES IS NOT COST EFFICIENT E.G. FOR TOURISM, YOUTH SERVICES, TRANSPORT STRATEGIES.

I am aware that some services are required by law but is it possible to a financial cap on these things???

If so, reduce the amount each service currently gets to the required saving level and cap it.!!

Yes this may appear hard hearted but nothing can have a bottomless pit of money.

I think this is great that residents have a say but how useful is this really as everyone can only comment on their own personal circumstance and to be honest will want to protect there own circumstance from cuts. I would have more trust in a well led organisation that could make unbiased, fair and honest cuts... Ok most will be affected but at least it will be a fair decision made by professionals who know the best courses of action to take!

Im not to sure about this, I chose my optains, but not Educated enough to make any Comment,

Why do we need so many taxis at special schools, and collages, when we have school buses, with wheel chair spaces.. My neighbour and I live in Newport and wondered how much this must cost us. THE school buses do have trained first aiders on them trained , a lot of parents drive so why isn't the council asking them to drive them in, or pay something towards the cost. We know a few people with mobility cars that they got, wont use them for school runs will use for supermarkets, or shopping. Our man up the road is a taxi driver he's doing alright thanks to his school runs two holidays abroad most years, so please look at this saving.

It is quite clear that we are being keep in the dark about the amount of money that the gov gives away in unclaimed taxes from large business, the public are tired of being blamed for the debt they say we are in.

The money has to come from somewhere and cutting services is not always viable, how about cutting the salaries paid to councillors? I seem to remember many years ago councillors did it for expenses only, now they get both.!!

And don't even think about amalgamating with hampshire.

Why can't you ask the government for more money as we are a deprived area with high unemployment and low wages, we are not the affluent south that many a M. P. s think we are and I think someone is not doing there job right.

Claimants on benefits such as Employment Support Allowance are receiving a larger amount of income than say someone working 30 hours a week on NMW. I think each benefit should be looked into separately, some being removed. Many claimants who receive, for example, ESA also receive DLA and/or other benefits and are in fact bringing a much higher income into their home than working people on low wage.

There are a lot of cost cutting measures the council could put in place rather than constantly putting the burden onto me. !!

1. Stop sending out silly bit so paper that are not necessary!!

2. look at the actual cost of the call center as opposed to bringing the call answering service back "in-house". For example, i call call center, call center has to ask department regarding enquiry, call center then come back to me = Chinese whispers. or the equivalent of 2 people answering every call. Not necessary and wasteful.

REDUCE THE LEVEL OF TOP COUNCIL STAFF POST (CEO) TO MAKE SAVINGS.

As a previous employee of the council, I am aware of the savings and cutbacks that have already been made to staffing and services. The council is at a crisis situation in my opinion and any further cuts to the provision of services would be a step too far for the majority of residents. With regards to increasing income, there are not a range of luxury services where an increase would be acceptable.

My view would be to protect essential services and raise the level of Council Tax to 2% whilst also protecting the more vulnerable residents by a means-tested and individualized approach to these problems.

The obvious method!. Shares the misery equally without disadvantaging the poorer Island residents. People & Groups should pay a commercial rate for using Council resources & services

The Isle of Wight Council should consider changing the Council Tax Band (upwards) for properties wher the front garden has been converted into a private car park. This would have the effect of discouraging the vast increase in the road traffic on the Island, reducing the costs of highway maintenance as well as increasing income.

i agree with the answers i have given

....

What funding. The council on the island don't do that much.

Stop letting criminal immigrants/terrorists stay here after being convicted!! !!

Why should we have to pay for them to live in our houses & collect benefits or take our jobs & use our skint nhs... this would save billions!!!

another option not listed reduce the amount councillors are paid

councils always pay much more than the going rate for all things in my 15 years work experience. beat suppliers down on prices by removing the controls for using these companies and make saving there.

the council should be able to set their own council tax rate. it is unfortunate that they can't. essential services shouldn't be cut.

Savings could be made by reassessing and streamlining administration procedures of the council and cutting back on wasted money spent on them.

to make money back by put in a restriction on the free bus passes to only given to people who are blind, physical disabilities like no limbs, and over 60s pay s 25% discount on buses or council tax not given free

These set of questions are very vague.what services would be cut.....you have given a too broad spectrum. by just say 'reduce funding available for other council services.I feel enough funding has been made....

Claimants on benefits who are already struggling to survive should not be affected

there has been enough cuts to other services, if level of council tax is increased then the level you are paying out in support will increase, if you use savings they will dwindle away to nothing. the only option is to increase income by maybe selling some of the properties that are empty. looking at top level bonuses and wage increases. allowing others to come into partnership on things like youth clubs, social care to share the costs maybe?

Would it be feasible to surcharge the many holiday homes on the Island? So many are being bought by mainlanders now, and the cost of houses and rents are increasing.!!

!!

Also, holiday lets business appear to pay only council tax rather than business rates. Is this right?

Thank you for bothering to ask us.

Please find and impose business rates on the multitude of holiday lets businesses which are appearing all over the island and which contribute very little to the local economy.!!

!!

Business rates for holiday lets.

option 3

Not sure about increasing income but I am sure a lot of income has been lost in certain car parks this year where new charges have been bought in. Many of those car parks have been virtually empty since, they must be losing revenue.

We as islanders put our trust in our council to do the right thing our opinion often will not always alter this so maybe an island vote maybe acceptable

sell county hall, move to Braodlands House.

It would seem the best option overall would be to increase council tax for those that can afford to pay for the increase, most likely those on good incomes in higher taxed properties, rather than increasing hardship for those on low incomes

The council should look to make saving internally too as i believe that there are savings to be made in this area and it has not been mentioned.

Reduction of council services has already been cut to the bone. Stop granting planning permissions to build property that isn't selling as that is not bringing in income. More houses built, the more likely that you will have even more claiming for reductions than you do now.

Council service cuts should also be investigated like this. Clear guidance on exactly where the fundings are being spent, ie more than enough has been spent on roads this year, a huge question, is the council allowing itself to be overcharged.

you could try cutting the wages bill!!!!!!!

I really do feel an outside of the box approach should be used to deal with the funding crisis. One being going back to central government and stating in more than strong words what they are asking and proposing is neither effective long term or economically generating or acceptable.

You can also reduce the amount of money spent on administration at the council offices. Streamline the services and make savings through job merging and wage savings. Highest paid officials need to see the amount they take from peoples council tax payments as salary reduced or the position closed and merged with another.

I think that any more than two bedrooms, then you should pay council tax.

And that it should be a on percentage basis, which would apply per each bedroom after the second bedroom limit.

but if you are unemployed for whatever reason, as it's hard enough to live on pennies! let alone pay all of the bills, food, etc

I think that you should Not have to pay any council tax.

Increasing income especially as everything seems to be so much more expensive and nothing getting increased. The buses fare are silly amounts if it was reduced more people would use it avoid them as the cost too much just another thought.

as a pensioner on council tax benefit i would be willing to pay something, i did not expect to get total benefit or have it protected in difficult times.

Stop hitting the hardest affected. Isle of Wight council is already in disarray for the island roads bill weekly!

Leave our care budgets alone some of ask for the bare minimum we need a life as disabled person is stressful enough without worrying if our hours are being cut because uve cut our benefit

Cut the number of council staff(no more job's for the boys.)

number 4 option seems not to be accepted on the list and jumps from one to another so to confirm my choices 1, 4, 4, 4,4

there are ways that the council could increase its income, although they have already increased the level of parking fees and the foot passenger fee for the floating bridge, the council could look at. reducing the wages of higher earning staff, reduce the level of expenses for the councillors and make the councillors account for all their expense claims.

the council should not waste money on consultations that are fruitless and unnecessary.

be more proactive in issuing fines for dog fouling look at having more services in house instead of contracting them out where the costs would be higher.

||

the option that have been given has not really given me the chance to express my opinion properly, as i put a number in one box then put the same number in another box and the first number is removed, the survey at question 2 is forcing the respondant to answer with the councils views and not their own.

Charge holiday home owners more and private landlords should pay up if their property empty for 3months

All this is dependent on what % increase on council tax as a referendum could be costly.

The reserves must be depleted already. The funding to other council services is also an open question and is again dependent on which dept and how much? Increase income but not at the expense of the motorist and parking charges as this could damage towns etc

Increasing Council Tax will create more people who need help as many of people working full time cannot make ends meet as it is.

This is pretty straightforward stuff, increase income, and use savings. It's what the council expects us to do if we have to go over budget. If the council cannot make these obvious choices by themselves, then why are they there at all?

I feel strongly that council tax should not be increased, I feel even stronger that people claiming benefits especially PIP and DLA should contribute to ease the burden on others that continue to be penalised for working,

Do not know about the use of reserves as not sure what the state of the reserves is. I think services have been cut to the point where further cuts will definitely be detrimental to the future of the Island, so increasing Council Tax and income are the only feasible ways of offsetting the further cuts expected.

I do think that the Council should have stuck with the original deal with ASDA. The addition of ASDA to the island will not make any positive impact from my point of view. Morrisons and/or the Coop will disappear so no net gain.

Trying to raise income by increasing parking charges is counter-productive and just plays badly with the public. If you are constantly charging people to park their cars, just to nip into a shop to buy a pint of milk for instance, you are just taking money out of the pockets of small businesses and local people, you are damaging the economy, and also increasing people's frustration with the council which will make it more likely that they will not support any rise in council tax, which is in fact the only real solution to the problem. Tell people what you would do with the increased income from a council tax rise, campaign on it and try to win support for it. Don't p*ss people off by constantly picking people's pockets every time they park their car.

The wealthy should help out more with this current crisis - those who live in the top band could well afford to pay more towards council tax. People who own second homes and/or empty properties on the Island should also pay full council tax on these properties.

Does the council need a managing director on £100k plus per annum?? Really???

You cannot keep increasing council tax and reducing services. Ditto business rates. You have got to make urgent representations to the government to debate this and come up with a solution that does not endlessly involve walking away from community responsibilities while demanding more and more money from a small segment of the Island's residents. The elephants in the room are the money paid out in past and future pension commitments to public sector workers and overpaid council management posts - chief executives going in and out and bungs of cash to overpaid quangos profit making like Visit IOW. As well as the council now being merely a shell for privatised services - including education - that cost millions to let contracts to, last for more than a quarter of a century, may go bust in that time are not project managed and rip off the council and local residents. Not to speak of grabbing people's homes to pay for their care costs when often that home is the only thing they have to show for a life of low paid overtaxed toil.

I don't want any other important services to be cut because of this when there are plenty of opportunities to save from these council tax proposals

Please use the space below if you would like the council to consider any other options.

comment

Sack the leader and get someone that knows what he is doing this one thinks more about keeping his job than making decisions because he needs the money for his castle!

As a lot of services have been contracted out of the councils control , i would suggest that a full review is carried out on all employees within the council services with a few to have everyone reapply for their jobs at a lower rate. Not only would this save the council significant money but you will be able to do away with any complacency and give the opportunity for new blood to enter the council service.

cutting councillors wages and expenses

As previous reply

Look for organisations or philanthropists who would like to pay for this scheme to continue.

Congratulations on already saving on salaries of chief executives.

I think it's disgusting that people who make any contribution to their council tax are expected to see an increase when it's already expensive enough as it is. It's bad enough that people in receipt of benefits can no longer receive full support and struggle to pay the contribution they already do. The law states that a person needs so much to live on yet the council wants people to pay out more so surely this is not in accordance to how much a person needs to live on. It will have a serious impact on anyone regardless of their circumstances. It will lead to financial difficulty and cause people to get on debt, affect their mental well being and impact people the same way as bedroom tax dos resulting in a lot of depression and people not being able to cope and resulting in ill health and possibly taking their lives. I feel this is what the government want!!

Make money from renewable's there is potential in this .!

Offer (LCTS) to people who volunteer at waste recycling centre's would have thought that would reduce the burden of cost to the council .!

i feel that the council should target the immigrants and any other non british born person, these people should only be allowed the benefits when they have been here a year, as to many foreigners are coming here to get our benefits and nhs treatment, and we are all suffering because of it

Do more checks on people who are self employed and not declaring their full income. !

If there are a husband or partner in a household both getting full DLA and it is used in assessing their council tax they shouldnt both be able to claim for both people.

!

I think there should be more fraud investigations as I have seen evidence that this is happening.

!

I do not know

Reduce councillors' expense claims. Spend no more on council premises (refurbishment of the council chamber at county hall was totally unnecessary for example.

I love the island and do understand that we all have to pay a bit more, otherwise the island will decline. I think the options available are very good and fair.

Why not put a 50p levy on all cross Solent fares to increase the amount of money for the council. An easy way to help in these austerity riddled times

Get public opinion regarding some issues before going ahead, ie. closing public toilets for one in the winter time. Also, why not instal 5p slots on all public toilet doors?

Means testing the free schools meals, if people work and earn over twenty grand they should pay for them. A lady who works in a school was saying that a lot of schools, waste a lot of books, paper for displays , after taking down the children 's work they rip the paper down and bin it. The deputy told her no worries they get top ups from the council, who's paying for all this. My friend who is a cleaner at this school said each department gets a budget like art every class will get the same amount to spend. why? Each school should be made to live within it means, if they go broke its miss management. So if all the people on the isle of wight cannot pay there council will we get help?

the council should reduce allowances to councillors by 50% and stop paying female councillors childcare costs. i object to subsidising the childcare costs of councillors when i am a pensioner. mr bacon your council leader said in the county press before the last council elections that their was a good reason to reduce councillors allowances, since then he has done nothing to back this up all he says is our allowances are set by an independent body. that is a cop out. he only said it before the election to try to be popular. the council should hold a referendum and intrease the council tax by 5% they are scared to do that because it might be unpopular instead they do it by the back door by getting parish and town councils to increase their precepts. devious i call it.

Please do not close toilets in this important tourist location

Maybe ask people if they could and by how much they can contribute. I have said I would be happy to give a £1 per week, anymore than that would cause me difficulty, I'm sure that there would be others of the same mind.

There are lots of holiday homes on the island do they still only pay part of the tax? If so I think they should pay the full amount, they can afford it!

Look at the number of County Councillors, their expenses and amount of monies paid to them, reduce.

Cut Council Staff, personal expenditure in the form of 'expenses'. Waste so much money on useless rubbish ideas and schemes. Do not let ANY immigrants or so called asylum seekers or refugees on to the Island - look after your own first!!

As with my previous option on the council using its own resources are there any sites of derelict or other brown field sites that the council could make use of , maybe doing a deal with a housing association or someone to redevelop these sites so that an income was coming in rather than sitting idly empty not doing anything and not producing income the council could use.

I would have thought that poor people make less use of Council services, e.g. rubbish collection and roads, because they buy less stuff and are less likely to drive.

So surely they should pay less Council Tax?!

Mainly, though, I think you should tax particularly rich people more. They can afford it.

why do so many schools have so many office staff, I can understand secondary, collages, but primary having four or more staff at ten thousand pounds plus a year. IT dose' nt make sense to me when the work could be shared out. There's a lot of floaters staff in schools, that could be used to better the schools, they should be rang up if the schools really need them or its another salary to find. my neighbour child goes to medina house where they have three floating staff, plus three classroom staff plus a teacher to seven children, this could be a saving if the council is broke. I know by law that the statements say what needed. My friend also works up at carisbrook collage they have eight taxis a day and afternoon why.? We do have school buses, it must work out cheaper than all these cabs. my friend kindly let me use her computer, as I don't have one. THANK YOU

It would appear that some departments cannot stay within budget, why can't they, are you going to keep funding anti social people that will never contribute to society?

There are folk employed within the Council or by the Council at senior levels (in may cases) who are simply not worth the salaries that they are receiving.!

!

I would suggest that cuts are made accordingly (hopefully they are not all hiding behind cast iron and overly long contracts ?)!!

!

We all have to 'do our bit.' They should not be any different.

Income from tourists, the island being a tourist island.

Please target holiday lets for business rates as there are some which do not pay this tax, yet make a profit from running a business on the island which impacts negatively on local residents, local businesses and especially the fragile hotel industry on the island.!

!

We will soon see ghost towns around our coast outside of school holidays.!

!

There will also be a huge increase in the housing benefit bill as rents are forced upwards.

Increase holiday homes council tax,

Means tested for all.

I think real consideration needs to be taken when it comes to low income low earners, the budget for them is already bad, moral is down people have had enough of feeling robbed.

SEE ABOVE

start charging charity shops the same rates. they are nothing more than filthy pyramid schemes that do little good and pay too much to people who truly do nothing charitable with their lives. (i am not talking about the poor front line staff i'm referring to the rancid middle management and above)

A large proportion of costs is in staff and their overheads. How much would be saved if the final salary pension scheme was ended for all staff?? and personal pensions replaced it.]]

This has been done by the majority of companies and there is no reason why the council cannot do it.]]

Yes, there would be outcry from the staff, but realistically what would they do? If they don't like it they can always leave and work somewhere else.]]

Also end free parking for staff, you are effectively giving away tax payers money for your own benefit.

Can the council up there game and make the working environment more rewarding so staff have a positive attitude towards their workload, lack of motivation in work places means less efficiency. I being a service provider speak to a lot of people in many different industries and it seems the council workplace in many areas are lacking. I also have experienced three council departments that have all made errors which is not what you expect of a local authority. Better training and more 'experienced' staff I believe could make a great increase in productivity and efficiency!

Increase Council tax for those in High Expensive homes, if your house is worth £2 million then you can pay the council tax, but those in band B homes on benefits, Disability, To keep the same Reductions as present,

collect tax from big business

Increasing Income by raising the cost of parking charges will have an increased negative affect on retail businesses unless a grace period before charges are imposed and higher charges after that.

Lobby parliament for an increase in our allocation of funds due to the fact that we are an island community with increased travel food and health costs. Our population increases each year due to a significantly increasing tourism trade, which this year resulted in a code black emergency status for our NHS Trust. If this effect is being felt in health provision imagine the statistics for council based provision/services and the increased costs which are reflected in the peak times of the year. Our beaches are closed to dogs from Spring until 1 October. If this period is deemed the tourist time of year our level of national funding should reflect this 6/7 month period i.e an annual increase of tourism % of population X 6 months.

People who represent us on the IOW Council should realize that this is their choice and their privilege. The removal of stipends from all Councillors, no matter what committees they serve on should be undertaken.]]

]]

Expenses only should be allowed that are receipted. Travel should be by public transport unless this would not be possible. All Councillors would then correctly be in a position whereby the public would be able to trust that they are standing and representing the public for the right reason. It should be an honour to serve your fellow Islanders.

As the government call this Hampshire and the Isle of Wight could we not get money off Hampshire council or split from them and just be the Island we might get more from the government that way. Another thought would be to Tax the ferry companies if this is done already then increase it, this might save you looking to the people of This Island being poorer and taxing the right company as they hype up the prices when they like, they should not complain if we do it to them. If you do get taxes off them do review them every year I would like to know thank you.

I would like the council to consider other options. I would also like to see a breakdown of the amount the council have spent in the last 10 years on the IOW as it looks so rundown.

None

DO NOT CUT CTS.

The Council should make very forceful representations to Government against the current austerity programme, which is unnecessary, unfair on the most disadvantaged members of society and puts Councils in an impossible position.

Get government to give less to foreign aid and more to the people of THIS country.

In general, use an individualized and targeted approach based upon means-testing.

See my comment on Section 26

Councillors need cut out their expe news. Have seen first hand what a crooked bunch they are. Cut their wage to twenty thousand not two hundred thousand. No one worth that. A big saving. Go back to small run councils like sixties. Volunteers run it. Like where did three years of sixty three thousand profit go missing and misused so there was no lift. Crooked or what.]]

Consider how low we get paid..... if we are on part time..... tax and insurance and pension take a lot..... not much left to live on!!! Everything is getting more expensive, food, petrol, living!!!

Stop taking more money from the poor. Start taking it from the rich.

As i have already stated before!!!

I would like the council to impose more tax on second homes, if possible, or on unoccupied rooms above shops. There are numerous empty apartments & houses in Cowes & across the island which are owned by mainland residents. It would help the shortage of accommodation if it deterred second home ownership and generate more council tax revenue if they were owner-occupied.]]

With regard to empty rooms above shops, and/or entirely empty shops; couldn't the Council be more actively encouraging owners to a change of use into accommodation that might increase your revenue? High Streets and town centres should be evolving into leisure and shopping areas now that online shopping and leisure habits are changing.

reducing councillors wages as they are too high

Sell all the empty schools to developers instead of building places like Penny feathers

I know of several cheats who are getting away with stealing from the public purse and it appears nothing is being done to stop it. One case has been for around 30 years. Come on. It's been reported several times and still they get away with it

Reduce Council Expenditure.]]

Privatisation of council services, although it is generally seen as a negative the facts are that privatisation of services reduces costs and generally results in current council employees being employed by the private contracted firms.]]

More targeted approach to spending on necessities rather than niceties.]]

Merger and centralisation of council administrative buildings i.e merge seaclose with county hall and the planning office into one centralised building reducing council expenditure.]]

Privatisation or sale of certain council assets such as Ryde Harbour.]]

Merger or reduction in Parish and Town Councils.]]

Make more schools academies thereby utilising private investment in the cost of the schools running costs.]]

Introduction of an Island tariff to coach firms visiting the Island owing to the increased wear on our roads and the congestion caused.]]

Increased incentives to businesses opening on the Island in order to bring in increased capital and employment providing ultimately increased funds to the council and economy.]]

Stricter controls on expenditure and applicable claims allowable by local councillors.]]

Reduction in Island wards and councillors numbers.]]

Increase Green Energy targeting of council buildings, street lighting etc.]]

Increased utilisation of online services available to the general public thereby reducing the paper load on council services.]]

]]

have a look at efficiency form all staff within the council, wages paid, taxing high earners and working for the people not squeezing them all the time.

could the council apply for special measures to the government as a poor area? isn't there nay way that government can help? it is a disgrace that central government won't help.

Councillors attendance allowance reviewed

put a restriction on free bus passes as that where most of the money is lost, the free bus pass only given to people with physical disabilities e.g blind, completely deaf, not given to over 60s who drive & walk properly and no free concessionary to people with learning difficulties as that is not classed as a need to rely on public transport they still get money so can pay.

I feel that some of your options are wrong....think you need to take in account the amount of pensioners that live on the Island.theres already been cuts on the bus service.not everyone drives ior lare past the lage when they can drive safely...you do nothing for the lonely pensioners that live here

Restructuring
Strick application of staff capability policy - dismiss staff that are not performing

Instead of filling the same potholes every few months with a temporary fix that costs a fortune to do, do a proper job on the roads and save money in the long term.

Save money within education by requesting all schools to buy supplies, food and other services from one main supplier for each type of supply or service. Same with NHS Hospitals.

Serving prisoners on IOW should support the community with roads, cleaning etc

Force ferry companies to reduce prices for travel, there by attracting visitors to IOW year round, build a "Bridge/Tunnel" ???

Look at number of cars on the Island!!! There are so many that maybe a congestion charge??? using odd and even numbers of reg plates to reduce vehicles on road each day. Many islands around the world use similar systems. Brings good revenue from those who decide to use their cars on any day they dont qualify.. (For example, using an odd number plate on an even reg plate day)
CUT COUNCIL WAGE FAT PAY CHECKS

cut down police and firefighting expenditure

Free buses for those who are disabled but working - scrap them. I know of several people, full-time jobs, minimum wage who have some sort of disability and get a free bus pass. Why? If they didn't have ADHD or whatever the heck else they got it for then they would be expected to pay, the same as everyone else who earns minimum wage.

Charge more for parking in the council car parks. They should all be considering a green option anyway and getting on a bus.

Monthly bin collections. We manage to make no more than a quarter of a black bin rubbish per week. Admittedly there are only two of us in the house but some families are putting out 9 and 10 bags. It's ridiculous. By washing out most things and recycling well, they would save lots of money for the council. Green rubbish does not smell, is not attacked by animals and can be easily stored until the rubbish truck comes.

employ more traffic wardens around the schools daily at drop off and pick up times to issue on the spot fines to those who breach the law, although there will be a cost of employment, this will be regained ten fold in penalties. Not only will this increase revenue for the council, it will make viability and our local children safer
Surcharge holiday homes.

Business rates and surcharge for holiday lets.

This will increase revenue and also reduce housing benefit bill as rents will not have the continual upward pressure exerted by these house hoarders.

There are apparently 20 people dying each week who've been sanctioned and/or found fit for work and lost their benefits (although still disabled, sick or vulnerable).
The government is currently under investigation by the UN for the disproportionate impact of its cuts on disabled people.

I would ask you to consider how much worse any more cuts to c.tax support/housing benefit/local housing allowance is going to make it for vulnerable benefits claimants.

Provide slim lined sevicees maybe contract out some services

Increase council tax for "second homes / holiday homes"?

Look at savings to be made internally as stated in previous question.

Instead of selling council houses to raise money, would it not be wiser to build more of them, providing work, and a steady income from rents, rather than killing the goose. The cost of labour would be offset by the drop in JSA claimants, and old buildings and land could be used as well as brown land development.

Increase Council Tax on bigger properties, second homes and wealth

Cut out all waste at the council level. Pointless focus groups, or quangos. Reduce council expenditure to the

bare minimum at all times and not waste taxpayers money on "fact finding trips" or "expenses" claims.

I think that I have covered, all that I can think of, at the moment !

Reduce funding for Arts projects and other non essential services. Reduce spending on councillors undertaking visits and trips etc.to inspect various schemes in other towns and cities.

As previous more income.

Under the restructure currently going on, why are top Managers getting pay rises of thousands of pounds? in the recent job evaluation the lesser paid hard working staff got pay cuts!! This needs sorting. All pay rises should be published to all Isle of Wight residents as we are paying their wages!!!! Why is this matter not being put to the same consultation as this option??????

Use the money properly, if they were in the private sector they would have to earn their keep.

More shared services and working with other providers. Reduce "outsourcing" as never saves money!

Maybe the council and ur high wages and the more wealthy of this island would could give more and then maybe the ordinary people of the isle could left in peace how about that as an idea?

A massive reduction in council staff and stop wasting money on thing like the undercliff and repairing buildings that are due to close or stop patching up the roads that need to be repaired properly.

Reduce councillors attendance allowance and expenses

With £461,458 claimed in 2014 to 2015 there must be room for large savings!

WHY IS THIS NOT A OPTION IN THIS SURVEY

It seems to me that the fairest system is to look after the most vulnerable first then progressively make charges for those better off . To target the poorest cannot be justified.

Three options which could be considered are : increasing the threshold of the top band; removing discount for second homes; removing discount for empty properties. Thus not putting the onus on the people who have less resources to start off with.

Strongly feel that option 7 should be implemented and the support in the community for elderly should be a priority because they have worked all their life and get no support in their twilight years.

Support for other vulnerable people should be restricted because often a dependence is formed that actually breeds a expectance that really is not a need.

Both just my opinions

Charge double rate on second homes.

Charge double rate on second homes.

Charge double rate on second homes.

Charge double rate on holiday homes

There are a lot of second homes. People who are not resident for at least six months of the year and own another home should be charged double the normal council tax rate. If they can afford a second home, they can afford double council tax

Increase council tax on top bands and charge full whack for empty properties and second homes.

Cut from the top, plenty of extraneous top heaving managers eroding council money.

Money wasted on forums for LGBT considerations and rights. These are just a small minority like numerous others. Why is this distinct in equality rights is beyond me. Why not the Royal British Legion, the poultry fanciers or any other faith or secular group.

I have just read your mail about the council tax reduction scheme. The council should do all the things mentioned in your mail. Every one of them. The council should also have the courage to hold a referendum and increase the council tax by a minimum of 5% I think they would be surprised how people think and it would work. The reason it has not been done is because this council is afraid to do it because all they want to do is be popular and keep their jobs. They need to have faith with the electorate. All they have done is increase the council tax by the back door using parish councils to increase the precepts. They could take a reduction in allowances by 50% but they will not do that because most of them are in it for the money. I have been suggesting this to Bacon for at least 6 years but he resists because it is income to him as he keeps saying to me. If you want any more ideas how to save money ask me I have lots.

If you have any further comments or questions to make regarding the council tax reduction scheme that you haven't had the opportunity to raise elsewhere, please use the space below.

comment

Just for the council to consider when making their decisions that some residents need more help than others, due to health and lack of financial support. Therefore the council tax reduction scheme is vital for those residents, especially those who are elderly and live alone.

The deficit should not come from those with limited income or capital, it should be spread wider amongst those that can pay extra that would make little difference to their lives.

We understand that some people will always try to misuse the system, but we believe that false claims can already be dealt with through existing procedures. Please remember this is to help those who really need it and please only make cuts when you really need to!

For myself I am on a basic pension with top up so I have to live very frugally which I don't mind, I would find it difficult to pay council tax. I could not make out if any of the questions would affect me. I am in a B band house.[]

I get cross when I see people who live near me who keep having babies yet the men have never worked. They should not get help.[]

Do not target the families on very low pay, so it won't be worth them working, I know a family like this.[]

There needs to be more help with childcare if parents work. Sometimes it's not worth them working, & I know family's who have given up work.[]

I say target the people with good money, but be careful, my son earns a reasonable wage but a large amount goes to his ex-wife who left him, so he is not very well off, as he's buying a house.

This council do not have the courage to make decisions and spend vast amounts on consultations about everything instead of making the tough decisions that are needed themselves.

I really think that you should encourage more housing associations to build here. Also, Brighton & Hove Council have adopted a policy of bring empty properties back into use, I would like to see you look at this and see if you could also do something similar. Inadequate housing doesn't lend itself to people being able to further the quality of their lives, if the quality of people's lives could be improved then revenue for the council could be improved too, as well as the need for HB, LHA and CTB.

National strike!???Force government to increase funding!

This is a crucial service that is needed by the elderly and vulnerable at a time of need.

Having recently moved to the island following a 14 year career in Local Government, this survey is not in plain English, hard to follow and really not user friendly. I would be surprised if the majority of residents understand the implications of their answers or even the questions. []

There seem to be a number of minor changes which need to occur anyway to bring the scheme in line with UC (so therefore why include these as options as they need to be done anyway?) and these should be put in place soon and the financial gain (or not) assessed before the scheme is reduced and the most vulnerable are impacted. []

We need a conservative council back to sort out Independents - get rid of.

I am aware that a while ago there was a suggestion that some of the council tax bandings were going to be looked at again (at least it was mooted) for instance splitting the band A into 2 different bands one for lower value houses the other for higher band A houses dependant on what they were like. I have heard no more on this in some time so has it been dropped or is it in a consultation stage, I don't know but with my earlier suggestion about increasing the council tax bands to take account of higher banded houses this maybe worth looking at in case it offers something that will help with the assessing of the council tax.

Raising council tax slightly, but not cutting support.

The Council should ensure that council tax is collected promptly and that residents who are either temporary or continually change their addresses should be effectively traced and required to pay their due tax. Non-payment should be promptly within a short time period.

WORKING AGE POPULATION IS LIFE-BLOOD OF ISLAND AND ESSENTIAL TO ENCOURAGE AND PROVIDE GREATER INDUSTRIAL AND HEALTHIER SERVICE SECTOR. AT PRESENT PROPORTION OF CHILDREN/YOUNG WORKERS IS DECREASING. COUNCIL FINANCIAL POLICIES MUST ENCOURAGE RETENTION ON ISLAND. MANY HIGHER VALUE HOUSES AND HOLIDAY HOMES COULD CONTRIBUTE GREATER COUNCIL INCOME.

Our MP should be encouraged to have the whole area of council tax grants from central government reviewed because it does not take into consideration the high level of older people and unemployment area in certain parts of the country like the Island.

I'm afraid to say it but bring in some new talent to be the voice of residents, there is a future for the island lets make it better!

Ask MPs / councillors to have a back bone, and if they cannot show this replace them...

If you want a source of income, how about providing some litter wardens? The use of them would reduce the costs involved in street cleaning and picking up rubbish which would also improve the Islands standing as a holiday resort.

More volunteers to carry out community services. There are many people on JSA and ESA (WRAG) and other sections of society like part time mums/dads, part time workers, people requiring supported work for their health recovery who could offer time and resources to support our island community. What about an Islander skills base database being set up for communities to log into (along the lines of Timebank). Resources both buildings and materials could be accessed by community groups with initial investment by the council, which could generate future income from arts and crafts groups, sports and leisure groups, hobby groups and education groups.

None

GOOD LUCK.PROTECT THE ISLAND AND IT'S PEOPLE.

I am aware of the difficult position that the council is in but still have grave concerns about the impact of these reforms.

This government is ideologically determined to continue hitting the poor, and disabled in Britain. It ill fits the Island council to be their footsoldiers

I think those on basic pension of one hundred and fifty pounds and low DLA should not have to pay out more money to council. We are robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Yet our government gives away money to Muslim nations who are using the money for nuclear power like Syria etc. fools take care of your own first. Charity starts at home. []

The District Auditors should never have been disbanded, you would not be in this parlous state if they were still around keeping a firm eye on how our money is spent, also councilors would not have been allowed to claim such ridiculous expenses, a sensible solution to parking would have been adopted and very expensive and wasteful consulted would have not even been considered. Our money is not your piggy bank.

as a working male why should I pay for those who can not be bothered to work, make it more difficult for them to claim so they can see what real hardship is when they haven't got the cash to buy fags, beer etc and go on holidays, as most hard working families who are proud to work have to put up with I think this will be a blow to thousands of people who are already getting in to debt or going without food so their children eat. I am one of those and I think it disgraceful the attitude of government towards the masses.

Ensure money is not wasted unnecessarily on administration and consultants.

Considering our Nation Health Hospital on the Island is at Full Bursting Point, as well as being a small Island with all other resources being stretched to the ultimate limit, we CANNOT and MUST NOT even consider taking in a surplus of Immigrants that will not contribute to our already strained limits. We must never forget one of the most famous sayings in our History which says "Charity Begins at Home".

Do think some of your questions are too broad so one could not really answer

The money has to be collected at the end of the day. By implementing something just to increase income may not necessarily work. By removing certain disregards may work better.

Does the Council still recover council tax from properties where there is no furniture but there are curtains up to the property? In my distant past the Council used to tax the last person in the property as curtains were classed as furnishings. Why did the Council opt to use an outside firm for waste collection? This latter question is that I used to work for the Council many years ago and we never used an outside firm for waste collection.

make sure you include as income diasability income or as you have stated every thing in option five is income so class it as income

do not raise council tax as families will struggle

Make use of school facilities during holidays and weekends and evenings. For instance the hiring-out of halls where financially viable.

I as an islander am very proud of what this island has achieved we cannot let this divide us we need to all be involved in this decision as it affects us all. Not being of pensionable age, I do not know what benefits are available to pensioners. It strikes me some pensioners are actually fairly comfortable and could possibly pay their fair share (if they aren't already of course)...

Think I've said enough on previous !

Go back to central government for more money and don't take no for an answer. It isn't acceptable to reduce discretionary services and then lay the cost of the shortfall on the least able to pay. It is a form of short sighted madness.[]

When more money in the future has to be saved where will you get it from?

A total income, upper limit for any council tax reduction claim, should be in place across all groups. If your total income each week, which includes all benefits, irrespective of the title of that benefit, is above the national minimum wage, multiplied by 35 hours a week, then no reduction should be given.

please see previous page.

My 73 yr old brother has dementia and gets attendance allowance, state pension and a couple of very small works pensions he pays his percentage of council tax, and he gets housing benefit, I am his full time carer, I receive carers allowance and a small pension from my deceased husbands works I also get some housing benefit any increase in council tax will make a difference to our already pathetic lifestyle

Working People need help with paying CT. They cannot afford to pay without help when on low wage, What's point sending debt collectors knocking and court cases they got to pay for? Folk ain't got money to pay or they would. You just cause more people to jump off Culver

If possible, keep a watch on increases by Town/Parish Councils making, in some cases, increases well in excess of 2% (eg Sandown Town Council in current year)

Can central gov take on council tax and rent services? Would save council money?