

Uttlesford District Council



Local Council Tax Support (LCTS)

A report on the public survey about Local Council Tax Support provision in Uttlesford for the year 2017-18

October 2016





Contents

1. Executive summary

Introduction

Results summary

Results actuals

Results priority analysis

2. Purpose methodology

3. Survey results, detailed findings

Survey results across all streams

Survey trends 2016/17 versus 2017/18 schemes across all streams

4. Appendices

Open text responses

Questionnaire

Profiling

1. Executive summary

In April 2013 Council Tax Benefit was abolished and replaced by a new local Council Tax Support (LCTS) scheme. The Government required councils to protect pensioners so that they would receive the same level of support as they did under Council Tax Benefit. This means that LCTS has applied only to working age people. Since the start of this scheme in 2013 the number of working age people in receipt of LCTS in Uttlesford has dropped by 40% from 1,321 to 789.

This is the fifth year that a consultation asking for residents' views on the provisions that Uttlesford District Council makes for local people within the scheme.

Following the success of the 2015 consultation on the 2016-17 scheme, information about the LCTS setting process and the survey was distributed to every household in the district as an insert into the Council's magazine *Uttlesford Life*. As part of the authority's continuing drive towards channel shift, the 2016 survey was also available through an online questionnaire which was publicised on the website. A small number of additional copies of *Uttlesford Life* were distributed to libraries and the council's CIC points across the district to ensure that all residents would have a chance to take part even if they had lost their original issue of the magazine. A copy of the survey was not, this year, included in the summer Citizens Panel questionnaire as it was considered that panellists could respond independently. The results are detailed below.

Local Council Tax Support Questionnaire

Introduction

Local Council Tax Support (LCTS) has replaced the national Council Tax Benefit scheme and each year the council must consult on the proposed scheme for the following year.

The results of this consultation will be presented to councillors in the autumn with the final scheme for 2017/18 being agreed in December, to start on 1 April 2017.

The LCTS scheme forms part of a wider reform of the welfare system. The government's aim of the reforms to the welfare system is to help more people into work, while supporting the most vulnerable. Since the start of the scheme in 2013 the number of working age people in receipt of LCTS in Uttlesford has dropped by 40% from 1,321 to 789.

The council wants to hear your view on this scheme so please take a few minutes to complete the form and send it back to us in the envelope provided. If your envelope is missing, please contact the council by phone on 01799 510510 or email uconnect@uttlesford.gov.uk

Alternatively you can complete this questionnaire online. Visit www.uttlesford.gov.uk/LCTS

This consultation is anonymous but collated results will be publicly available, including written answers. These will not be attributed to any individual but please do not include any personal or confidential information in your responses.

1. The Government has said pensioners on low income must be given full protection from the implications of this scheme. Uttlesford's current scheme also protects disabled people on a low income and carers on a low income.

Do you agree with this? Yes No

If you wish to add a comment, please do so below:

Please turn over

Results summary

The results of the survey have been analysed using Snap Survey Version 11 and are supplied as both counts (the number of people who answered each question) and percentages (the proportion of people who answered a question in a particular way). Data from both online and paper survey submissions has been merged to provide a single dataset.

The Uttlesford District Council LCTS scheme is the most generous in Essex providing additional protection and support for vulnerable working age people. Questions in the 2016 survey sought the views of residents and stakeholder groups as to whether this stance is generally supported and should be continued into the 2017/18 financial year. The LCTS scheme reduces the amount of money that town and parish councils receive as some households do not pay the full amount of Council Tax. For the last three years Uttlesford District Council has provided grants to town and parish councils to make up the difference. Additional sections of the survey asked for feedback on this approach and of the implications for claimants arising from central government benefit reforms. The results are given below.

Results actuals

Questionnaire responses

NB In a number of instances respondees who answered “Yes” to a question also added a comment in the box allocated to the to those answering “No” to that same question. This has led to an apparent disparity in the count return rates for a number of questions.

Headline results are highlighted in bold. Full text responses are available in Appendix 1.

Overall submissions	Result counts (percentage)
Total number of Paper submissions:	1115 (92.45%)
Total number of web submissions:	91 (7.55%)
Total number of submissions:	1206 (100%)

Headline question	Result counts (percentage)
<p>Q1 The Government has said pensioners on low income must be given full protection from the implications of this scheme. Uttlesford’s current scheme also protects disabled people on a low income and carers on a low income.</p> <p>Do you agree with this?</p> <p>If you wish to add a comment, please do so.</p>	<p>Yes 1098 (93.5%)</p> <p>No 76 (6.5%)</p> <p>145 comments received</p>
<p>Q2 For each 2.5% of increase the LCTS recipient(s) will need to pay, on average, an additional £39 of Council Tax each year.</p> <p>The cost to the council of keeping the rate at 12.5% would be approximately £340,000. For each 2.5% increase the cost of the scheme for Uttlesford District Council would reduce by approximately £5,100.</p> <p>Do you agree that the council should keep the rate at 12.5% for a fourth year?</p> <p>If you wish to add a comment, please do so.</p>	<p>Yes 824 (71.6%)</p> <p>No 326 (28.4%)</p> <p>247 comments received</p>
<p>Q3 In simple terms, parish and town councils set their budgets by deciding how much money they need to run their services and then dividing that amount by the number of homes in their area.</p> <p>The LCTS scheme reduces the amount of money the parish will receive as some households will not pay full Council Tax. For the last three years the council has provided grants to parish and town councils to make up the difference. In 2016/17 this cost £154,000. The council proposes to reduce this grant by 50% next year. The table on the opposite page shows how much each parish received in 2016/17 and how much they would have received if the grant had been reduced by 50%. It would be up to each parish/town council to decide</p>	<p>Continue to pay the full grant 729 (63.8%)</p> <p>Reduce the grant by 50% 413 (36.2%)</p>

Overall submissions	Result counts (percentage)
<p>if they wished to cover the shortfall in grant by increasing their part of the Council Tax.</p> <p>Do you think the council should:</p> <p>Continue to pay the full grant</p> <p>Reduce the grant by 50%</p> <p>If you wish to add a comment, please do so.</p>	<p>166 comments received</p>
<p>Q4. As part of central government’s benefit reforms, rules are being changed for housing benefit and universal credit (two other types of benefit people can receive). The council is proposing to make the same changes to LCTS. By doing this, the council aims to make the LCTS system easier to understand for claimants as the criteria for all these different benefit schemes will be the same.</p> <p>The proposals are:</p> <p>a. Reduce the time a claimant can be absent from the United Kingdom and continue to receive LCTS, from 13 weeks to 4 weeks. Do you agree?</p> <p>b. Reduce the period for backdating a claim from 6 months to 1 month. Do you agree?</p> <p>c. Removal of the family premium (an additional payment to people with children) for all</p>	<p>Yes 1066 (90%) No 118 (10%)</p> <p>Yes 842 (71.4%) No 338 (28.6%)</p> <p>Yes 712 (60.7%)</p>

Overall submissions	Result counts (percentage)
<p>new working age applicants. Do you agree?</p> <p>d. Limit the number of children within the claim to a maximum of two (so even if a claimant has three or more children they will only receive LCTS payment based on having two children). Do you agree?</p> <p>e. Remove the severe disability premium (extra money paid to a severely disabled person to assist in employing a carer), if the claimant's carer already receives the carer's element through universal credit. Do you agree?</p> <p>f. Remove the work related activity element for new Employment and Support Allowance claimants. Do you agree?</p> <p>If you wish to add a comment about any of these proposed changes, please do so.</p>	<p>No 461 (39.3%)</p> <p>Yes 936 (78.8%) No 251 (21.2%)</p> <p>Yes 502 (42.6%) No 676 (57.4%)</p> <p>Yes 613 (59.3%) No 421 (40.7%)</p> <p>206 comments received</p>
<p>Q5 Further comments made regarding the LCTS scheme</p>	<p>96 comments received</p>
<p>Q6 Postcodes data entered</p>	<p>1177</p>
<p>Q7 Are you in receipt of LCTS?</p>	<p>No 1079 (92.1%)</p> <p>Yes 93 (7.9%)</p>

Overall submissions	Result counts (percentage)
Q8 If you in receipt of LCTS are you in a protected group (pensioner/disabled/carers)?	Yes 75 (80.6%) No 18 (19.4%)

Results priority analysis

Previous surveys conducted in 2012 for the initial introduction of the scheme in 2013-14, in 2013 for the 2014-15 scheme and in 2014 for the 2015-16 scheme were conducted to determine the most effective resolution for recipients in Uttlesford. Questions have been varied during each of the annual consultations to seek specific views. The 2015 consultation for the 2016-17 scheme adopted a new format with wider ranging questions designed to more accurately gauge public opinion. Whilst not directly comparable, the 2016 consultation for the 2017-18 scheme in part revisits a number of elements of the 2015 survey, principally Q.1-2, in order to ascertain if there has been a move in public opinion.

Local Council Tax Support Priorities:

The basic tenant of the scheme has been maintained since its introduction with some elements being refined in succeeding years. Headline results across all consultation streams indicate that the public are broadly in favour of the local scheme as currently delivered. In December 2012, following public consultation, the Council adopted an LCTS scheme which included protection for pensioners (a mandatory requirement for all schemes) but added further protection for disabled people on a low income and carers on a low income. Respondents indicated a marked preference for the continuation of this discretionary element with 93.5% supporting ongoing protection within LCTS for vulnerable people on a low income.

The LCTS scheme for 2014/15 implemented an amendment to increase the minimum amount paid by LCTS recipients formerly entitled to full Council Tax Benefit from 8.5% to 12.5%. This has been continued across the 2015/16 and 2016/17 schemes and represents the most generous support package in Essex. The cost to the Council of keeping the rate at 12.5% during the forthcoming year would be approximately £340,000. Just under three quarters of residents (71.6%) indicated their continued support for retaining this arrangement.

A further financial implication of the scheme arises from the support Uttlesford District Council provides to town and parish councils in order to ensure that they are not adversely affected by the loss of Council Tax income. In 2016/17 this cost £154,303. The Council has proposed to reduce this grant by 50%, down to £77,152, from 2017/18 leaving each parish/town council to decide if they wish to cover the shortfall in grant by increasing their precept. Whilst there was a reasonable level of support for Uttlesford District Council continuing to support the town/parish councils, a significant minority (36.2%) indicated that they would be happy to see the grant reduced by half.

A subsequent section of the consultation sought to ascertain the current views of residents on forthcoming governmental reforms relating to housing benefit and universal credit. Uttlesford District Council is proposing to make the same changes to the LCTS. By doing this, the Council is aiming to make the LCTS system easier to understand for claimants as the criteria for all these different benefit schemes will be the same. Across all proposals there was a general level of approval voiced by residents, though there were variations in support for the different propositions. Nine in ten people (90%) supported the recommendation to reduce the time a claimant can be absent from the United Kingdom and continue to receive LCTS, from 13 weeks to 4 weeks. A further 71.4% approved of the move to also reduce the period for backdating a claim from 6 months to 1 month, whilst just 60.7% agreed with the suggested removal of the family premium (an additional payment to people with children) for all new working age applicants. A much higher level of backing (78.8%) was evident for a contingent limit on the number of children within the claim being pegged at a maximum of two. By comparison, respondents were very much against any proposal to remove the severe disability premium with almost six in ten (57.4%) indicating that they did not agree with any

such move. An almost similar level of support (59.3%), though, was achieved for the final proposal which posited the removal of the work related activity element for new Employment and Support Allowance claimants.

A number of question points offered consultees the chance to further expand on their responses in an open text box. These additional comments are reported verbatim as part of Appendix 1.

2. Purpose methodology

Uttlesford District Council has a statutory duty to consider annually whether to revise its Local Council Tax Support Scheme (LCTS), replace it with another or make no changes. If it wishes to amend or substitute the scheme in the forthcoming year the Council is obliged to consult with interested parties. The results of this consultation will inform the decisions made by officers and councillors when setting Council Tax spending for the year April 2017 to March 2018.

Following on from the successful consultation exercise run in 2015, the LCTS survey for the 2017-18 scheme was included as a centre page insert into the Summer edition of the Council's widely distributed community newsletter, *Uttlesford Life*, which is delivered to every household in the district. A copy of the survey was not, this year, included in the summer Citizens Panel questionnaire as it was considered that panellists could respond independently.

The consultation was run over the period 15 August to 30 September 2016. Respondents were asked to indicate their support for the scheme as it currently stands and to provide comments where they thought any amendments might be applicable. They were also offered the opportunity to make any further observations. For profiling purposes they were also invited to include a postcode and to state if they were in receipt of LCTS.

The following consultative methods were employed, in all cases the same questions were asked:

- Dedicated pull-out, four page survey distributed with *Uttlesford Life*. A reply paid envelope was also included so as to make it as easy as possible for residents to respond. Additional paper copies were also distributed to the Council's main contact points at the Great Dunmow Library, Thaxted CIC and the CSC in Saffron Walden.

1115 responses were received

- Open public consultation. The survey was promoted on the Council's website from 15 August to 30 September via an interactive form using the Snap 11 consultation platform.

91 responses were received

General promotion was carried out with a press release and exposure via the Council's social media channels and prominent placement on the homepage of the Council's website.

By the close of the consultation period, 1115 paper responses had been received and a further 91 online submission were registered. This represents a 10.7% increase in overall submissions on the previous year. It should be remembered that not all respondents chose to answer all of the questions and that in a number of cases residents opted to submit statements and comments in support of the 'No' option even though they had answered 'Yes' to a particular section of the consultation.

3. Survey results, detailed findings


Survey results across all streams

The results for each of the different consultation streams – paper and online surveys – are reported below as a single merged dataset.


LCTS substantive questions

This analysis comments on the responses received across both consultation channels. A further section then makes reference to the previous consultation and identifies trends. Results are broadly in line with the views of residents as reported in previous years, principally research undertaken with stakeholders and the Uttlesford Citizens Panel to inform the 2014/15 scheme and the district wide consultation for the 2016/17 scheme.

Q1 Protecting pensioners and disabled people on a low income and carers on a low income saw 93.5% support with only a 6.5% rate of dissent. Protection for pensioners is a mandatory requirement, though Uttlesford District Council has also opted to provide additional protection for vulnerable working age people – disabled, carers and blind people. Although only 76 people considered that this additional support should be withdrawn, some 145 respondents chose to make a comment. These comments ranged from support for pensioners who wish to remain independent to concerns that some disabled people might be well enough off to pay Council Tax at a full rate.




Q2 Maintaining the level at which non-vulnerable LCTS recipient(s) will need to pay Council Tax at 12.5% for a fourth year was supported by 71.6% of respondees. Those who answered this question were invited to supply additional comments on this aspect of the scheme with 247 people taking this opportunity to record their opinions. Again views were wide ranging, with quite a few respondees suggesting the rate a LCTS recipient should pay might be increased. Generally these responses proposed a rise to 15% to 20%, others made more generalised comments such as 'Bring rate in line with other councils. Uttlesford is the lowest band'.



Q3 Supporting parish and town councils to ensure that they do not lose money was backed by 63.8% of those that answered this question. This represents a significant melting away of support since the previous survey when the proposal was supported

by 93.5%. Some 413 people supported a 50% reduction in the grant that Uttlesford District Council gives to town and parishes, though it is clear from the open text comments that there may be some further support for a less stringent reduction. Comments left by those who wished to quantify their responses included ‘Why not reduce it by 25%?’ and ‘50% reduction is too big’. Some, though, were less supportive of the system just offering more pithy retorts such as ‘Parish Councils are a waste of time’.



Q4 As part of central government's benefit reforms, rules are being changed for housing benefit and universal credit (two other types of benefit people can receive). The Council is proposing to make the same changes to LCTS. By doing this, the Council aims to make the LCTS system easier to understand for claimants as the criteria for all these different benefit schemes will be the same. Consultees were asked to respond to a portfolio of six proposals and then to add, if they so wished, any general comments. Generally, support was high for all of the proposals with, for example, 90% of people who answered the question supporting the suggestion to reduce the time a claimant can be absent from the United Kingdom and continue to receive LCTS, from 13 weeks to 4 weeks. Only one proposal did not meet with public approval, this being the initiative to remove the severe disability premium (extra money paid to a severely disabled person to assist in employing a carer), if the claimant's carer already receives the carer's element through universal credit. Here just 42.6% of people agreed, with a majority 57.4% registering their disapproval. This was mirrored in the open text comments with statements such as 'Carers already receive a low allowance so cannot afford to lose any amount' being received.

A further trend noted from the open text comments, both in relation to Q4 and in general (as reported at Q5) is that many respondents continue to feel confused by the complexities of the LCTS scheme. Comments such as 'I do not understand what the implications would be here. e) I do not understand the implications of this situation' and 'Regarding e and f above – do not have enough knowledge regarding these benefits to make a comment either way' were not uncommon responses. Indeed some 26.4% of those who left a text response to Q4 voiced some level of understanding of the full implications of the proposals put forward.

Q5 Respondee were invited to make any additional observations on the scheme and 96 people chose to take up this option offering a range of opinions, from general comments on the delivery of the survey, 'Think this form could have been more user friendly – lots of figures but not much explanation as to the consequences of each decision. Surely each case can't be as black and white as you suggest - 4c and d for instance?' to 'Please don't stop the financial assistance scheme in rent and council tax'. It is clear that in spite of the LCTS scheme having been in operation for a number of years that there is still a general level of

confusion amongst the public. Comments in this section were indicative of this, though respondents had obviously attempted to complete the form – ‘More information regarding ‘LCTS’ would be helpful!’ and ‘What is a LCTS Scheme?’ are just a few examples.

Q6 Although 1206 responses were received via the paper and online surveys, only 1177 people chose to enter their postcode data. This still provides a comprehensive dataset and permits the plotting of response distribution across the district.

Q7 Of the 1172 people who answered this question 93 indicated that they were in receipt of LCTS. This represents 7.9% of those who replied.

Q8 In relation to the previous question 80.6% of those in receipt of LCTS, some 75 people in total, noted that they considered themselves to be in a protected group (pensioner/disabled/carers). As a group these respondents represent just 6.4% of the 1172 people who answered question 7.

Survey trends 2016/17 versus 2017/18 schemes across all streams

A comparison is made between the results of consultation run in 2015 for the 2016/17 scheme and that run in 2016 for the 2017/18 scheme. A direct correlation of any responses is only reported here where the same question was asked in both surveys.

Overall the response rate to the survey has increased by 10.7%, rising from 1089 in 2015 to 1206 submissions in 2016. Across the two delivery streams, though, there are some differential rates of return with a nearly 3% jump in web submissions. Although still very much the non-preferred route for the majority of consultees, online responses this year accounted for 7.5%. This is perhaps indicative of the aging demographic of the district where residents still feel happiest completing a paper questionnaire rather than utilising an online resource.





Support for protecting pensioners from the implications of the scheme remains high, only dropping by 1.7% from 95.2% to 93.5%. The number of comments received in relation to this question has, though, risen significantly from 90 to 145. A further question asking residents to express agreement or disagreement with the proposal that the Council should keep the rate at 12.5% was asked in both the 2015 and 2016 surveys. Approval levels for this course of action are still high but have slipped by 6.3% in the past 12 months, down from 77.9% to 71.6%. Supporting comments dropped just marginally from 250 to 247.




Approval for continued support for the town/parish element of the LCTS scheme has also slumped. This has dropped significantly from 93.5% in 2015 to 63.8%, a tumble of 29.7%. As with the first question the number of comments received has risen significantly, this time from 90 to 166.

Question 4 dealt with government benefit reforms and forthcoming amendments to rules. As this is a new section, no direct comparison can be made with results obtained in 2015.





As in the previous year, repondees were invited to make any further observations in a free text box. This has dropped from 123 to 96. Given that overall there has been an increase in the number of comments appended to questions 1 through to 3 there would seem to be a general trend in people focusing their responses rather than waiting to add them in a final catch-all box.

With regard to the basic profiling carried out at Q6 to Q8 for the survey, the general geographical spread of those responding is much the same as in 2015. There was also, as in 2015, an opportunity for consultees to indicate if they are in receipt of LCTS. A slightly higher proportion, 92.1% up from 90.3% noted that they are claiming the benefit, though a smaller proportion consider themselves to be in a protected group.

Overall submissions	Result counts (percentage)		Trend
	2016/17 scheme	2017/18 scheme and trend	
Total number of paper submissions:	1042 (95.7%) 47	1115 (92.45%) 91	
Total number of web submissions:	(4.3%)	(7.55%)	
Total number of submissions:	1089 (100%)	1206 (100%)	
Headline question	Result counts (percentage)		
<p>Q1 The Government has said pensioners on low income must be given full protection from the implications of this scheme. Uttlesford's current scheme also protects disabled people on a low income and carers on a low income. Do you agree with this?</p> <p>If you wish to add a comment, please do so.</p>	<p>Yes 979 (95.2%)</p> <p>No 49 (4.8%)</p> <p>90 comments received</p>	<p>Yes 1098 (93.5%)</p> <p>No 76 (6.5%)</p> <p>145 comments received</p>	<p></p> <p></p>
<p>Q2 For each 2.5% of increase the LCTS recipient(s) will need to pay, on average, an additional £39 of Council Tax each year.</p>	<p>Yes 800 (77.9%)</p> <p>No 227 (22.1%)</p>	<p>Yes 824 (71.6%)</p> <p>No 326 (28.4%)</p>	<p></p>

Overall submissions	Result counts (percentage)	Result counts (percentage)	Trend
<p>The cost to the council of keeping the rate at 12.5% would be approximately £340,000. For each 2.5% increase the cost of the scheme for Uttlesford District Council would reduce by approximately £5,100.</p> <p>Do you agree that the council should keep the rate at 12.5% for a fourth year?</p> <p>If you wish to add a comment, please do so.</p>	<p>250 comments received</p>	<p>247 comments received</p>	
<p>Q3 In simple terms, parish and town councils set their budgets by deciding how much money they need to run their services and then dividing that amount by the number of homes in their area. The LCTS scheme reduces the amount of money the parish will receive as some households will not pay full Council Tax. For the last three years the council has provided grants to parish and town councils to make up the difference. In 2016/17 this cost £154,000. The council proposes to reduce this grant by 50% next year. The table on the opposite</p>	<p>Yes 946 (93,5%)</p> <p>No 66 (6.5%)</p> <p>90 comments received</p>	<p>Continue to pay the full grant 729 (63.8%)</p> <p>Reduce the grant by 50% 413 (36.2%)</p> <p>166 comments received</p>	 

Overall submissions	Result counts (percentage)	Result counts (percentage)	Trend
<p>page shows how much each parish received in 2016/17 and how much they would have received if the grant had been reduced by 50%. It would be up to each parish/town council to decide if they wished to cover the shortfall in grant by increasing their part of the Council Tax.</p> <p>Do you think the council should:</p> <p>Continue to pay the full grant</p> <p>Reduce the grant by 50%</p> <p>If you wish to add a comment, please do so.</p>			

Q5 Further comments made regarding the LCTS scheme	123 comments received	96 comments received	
Q6 Postcodes data entered	1014	1177	
Q7 Are you in receipt of LCTS?	No 909 (90.3%) Yes 98 (9.7%)	No 1079 (92.1%) Yes 92 (7.9%)	
Q8 If you in receipt of LCTS are you in a protected group (pensioner/disabled/carers)?	Yes 83 (91.2%) No 9 (9.9%)	Yes 75 (80.6%) No 18 (19.4%)	

4. Appendices

4.1 Open text responses received

The following open text responses were received.

Q1 The Government has said pensioners on low income must be given full protection from the implications of this scheme. Uttlesford's current scheme also protects disabled people on a low income and carers on a low income. Do you agree with this?

Lots of OAP's and disabled have a lot of money and are well off.

I do not see why pensioners should benefit from this scheme. There may be a case for disabled people and carers, but including them in a scheme designed to "help people into work" is just another example of the chaotic way that support is managed!

It should be means tested for pensioners.

Difficult to understand what the financial implication is of this to either the council or the pensioners/disabled?!

Many carers and others on low incomes have well-paid alternative jobs and on which they usually don't pay tax. Most own a car which I can't afford to do.

However if the carer and the disabled person share the same house their joint income should be taken into consideration.

Although there is no reason at all why pensioners should be protected - should be means tested.

Don't assume that all pensioners are on low incomes.

What is considered to be a low income.

Yes I agree to a certain amount. I just think that a lot of these cases should be looked at a lot deeper.

There must be sufficient checks to ensure disabled people are continually disabled.

I agree for this year, but the simpler that overall provision for welfare support, the better. For next year, the benefits for the disabled and carers on a low income should be examined to establish whether these in fact provide adequate support without the additional element of LCTS.

Not if they have big bank balances.

Pensioners on low income should be helped.

I agree completely about all three groups described above, provided they are on low incomes. However there are instances where people are allegedly on low incomes, who disappear on holidays annually, still smoke and attend clubs regularly. This type of defrauding needs more investigating.

Within reason, but not at a level that would disadvantage other council tax payers. This level should be in line with other local authorities as a different mix of people will require spending in different areas e.g. recreational facilities.

Depends of how much are the income. If the person have a low income it is ok, but if not, the case will need to be studied.

There is to much abuse of the system. Genuine cases should have help. Charlatans need to be weeded out as they are taking away from the real genuine claims many that are in need get missed.

As long as these people are really on low income.

Your q is ambiguous! I agree with the Uttlesford position.

Councils should not walk away from their social responsibilities to line their C.E.O's pockets!

They should all be protected if necessary means testing should apply.

Some pensioners and the disabled have high levels of disposable income.

Agree

I also would like to see low income working single parents having a discount in proportion to what income under £20k they earn.

I disagree with the whole basis of the LCTS scheme. The explanation given above seems to regard the reduction in the number receiving LCTS as a virtue - I say it is the opposite. ALL those on low income, not just pensioners, carers and the disabled, should be given access to the scheme. I write as a "pensioner" myself and would be prepared to pay a higher council tax myself to protect all those on a low income.

The extension to protect disabled on a low income along with carers in similar circumstances is both morally and financially the right thing to do. People/society should be judged on how it supports its most vulnerable - well done.

I agree fully that pensioners on a low income as myself should be given full protection as the cost of living keeps going up, it gets a lot harder to manage.

All vulnerable household groups should be protected.

who defines "low income"? Is it nett or gross? Does it take a/c of cost of necessary support eg medical care?

I am unable to comment on most of the questions. See 4 only

No idea. I don't understand the implications of this scheme as referred to in the questions

We must protect the most vulnerable in our society.

As long as disability has been reassessed on regular basis.

It would seem from figures overleaf that Uttlesford is particularly protective of the named group.

What is considered the threshold of income for pensioners?

This should only be the case if born and paid NI etc tax in UK for last 3 to 5 years.

Those who wish to work at retiring age should be encouraged to do so. They so often have a stronger work ethic than many younger people.

As long as all claimants are genuine and have been fully checked and verified.

They should do that to keep people safe!

Pensioners should be fully protected and be able to have the council tax at no charge.

It is vital that all vulnerable people are protected, especially pensioners and the disabled, visually impaired etc.

It depends on the individual as to their background and history. Some people have spent their money or wasted it during their working past. This can be why they are on a low income. Some are just carefree individuals who do not save but keep any savings below £3,000 to get the maximum claims possible. Why should they benefit.

And as someone who can afford to pay council tax, I believe those like me should subsidise this.

I have never heard of this LCTS scheme but it sounds like a good idea. Pensioners and particularly disabled ones need all the help they can get as I have found.

I fear that not all low income pensioners and disabled people and carers will fill in form and therefore not show an accurate assessment. There has not been any publicity about the form and how important it is to fill it in and the outcome won't show a true percentage of disadvantaged in the district that has contributed to the survey.

Minor disabilities that do not cause impacts to income should not be covered.

I had full support as low income and low rate personal income payment from EHDC. I moved into Essex area and find this is no longer automatic support. Instead I am asked and told "Do you have a room specific for a wheelchair"! My disability (so far) does not include use of wheelchair. There are many disabilities as this for PIP.

Surely there is no question of changing this policy? Monstrous.

It is very important that the elderly and people who have a disability is protected because some of the people with a disability are not able to work.

PROVIDED that disabled people and carers are genuinely looked after and have a reasonable quality of life.

I am a disabled pensioner, after a 40 year working life on a farm. Over recent years the government has made quite a reduction in our, that is my wife and I, our living standards. The assistance that UDC has helped us with is invaluable and a safety barrier against extreme poverty. I do fear that amongst young and healthy, working people that there is not too much sympathy with the plight of elderly disabled pensioners and until you are such, then that is understandable. We need help.

What a waste of the excessive amount of council tax all this **** is.

I am very fortunate that although I am a pensioner (and pay no tax) I am not on a low income, but those pensioners who have only their pensions to live on must find it very difficult to make ends meet.

On balance yes, this in line with government policy to minimise the liabilities and obligations of the poorest - off in society. However, how does one weigh a pensioner who has run down his assets and is capable of work, against one who has always struggled financially in life and deserves his dues in later life? It's a hard call.

It is important to do so if you are a pensioner or disabled you still pay FULL VAT on most things if changed if change to be made could someone look in to this problem little hope but the problem is REAL.

Who could possibly object! One mans cut back is another persons job loss!!

Be very careful before equating or linking Uttlesford's response to government decisions, and the 'Government's' decisions themselves - the motives may be quite different. It says above: "the governments aim of the reforms" - as if this were accepted as the case. The government's 'aims' may be quite, quite different - and certainly nothing to do with 'helping' people into work! (by the way, it should be FOR the reforms, not OF - very poor grammar!)

I agree to Uttlesford's scheme of protecting disabled people and carers on low incomes.

Paving stones and man hole outside shops (indian restaurant) Great Dunmow High Road, are dangerous and a severe trip hazard, these have been reported but no action taken.

Why is it that 2 sisters living together on *****, pay little or no rent or council tax, have seven dogs and three cats to feed. Their income is more than some couples both working and pay full rent and council tax. Does this seem fair to you, it sure does not to me. They both also smoke, other people are not able to afford to smoke let alone have any pets.

I didn't understand the question!

I'm sorry, but although I am a university graduate, I feel unable to complete this form. It has not been explained on this what the consequences of completing this will mean to the area and to residents. I feel this is a paper exercise in consultation and not a true consultation.

I think there should be a caveat on pensioners - in line with the removal of the spare room subsidy. If low income pensioners are occupying above CT band A/B and the property is under-occupied they should NOT receive LCTS. I agree that disabled people and carers on a low income should be protected - but not passported so that LCTS acts as a disincentive to work. And why can't we extend to lone-parents on a low income?

What Scheme? Any scheme is unknown to me.

Only to pensioners, disabled and carers.

I feel that provision should be wealth based not income based. This is not a suggestion that provision should not be provided to those with assets, or that, for instance, a house someone strove years to acquire should be seized - work needs to be encouraged, but maybe state support could be levied against an estate upon death and assets frozen as in a CCJ until that point.

Agree with above and would want this to continue into new scheme.

I agree if you put into practice and be honest.

I believe persons falling into the categories above have few choices about their incomes and earning potential so it is right that they are protected from welfare reforms, i.e. government reductions to the welfare budget.

Uttlesford is one of the more affluent areas in Essex. We should be able to look after those who are in need or less fortunate.

Without this protection we would be extremely much poorer. I didn't ask for the illness to be so bad, and my carer looks after me. Without available support we would be even worse.

These groups of people deserve support like this as their lives are more difficult than most peoples.

With the bedroom tax, this is causing hardship to many people including ourselves (£110 per month) in receipt of disabilities income the figure above hits very hard! and comes straight out of our benefits - SCRAP IT!!

However, there should be rigorous checks to ensure those who state they are disabled, and carers, actually meet the criteria.

There should be more education for people in 50s to plan for retirement. I would not want any pensioner left in a difficult situation, this is leaving it too late. Help is needed earlier.

Having been a carer on my own - whilst I myself have a disability - looking after a disabled child, I have had to give up a career and income and paid my taxes into the 'system'. I now rely on the protection to disabled people and this must be maintained to all those who require it. The council could NOT afford to pay carers and parents for the care, protection and teaching they provide to vulnerable individuals.

Every month our real money goes less and less but very hard to get more help.

Financial assistance to low income pensioners will help them stay independent and in control of their lives.

Banning vans from council encourages fly tipping. If your dog fouls £1,000 fine. If you fly tip £200 fine should be other way round.

I would qualify my answer by saying that there are a number of people who make no attempt to save for retirement during their working life so care needs to be taken to subsidise them at the expense of those who have made an effort to save.

We need to protect the elderly and the disabled as they are the most vulnerable in our community and deserve our support.

Provided it does not go to benefit cheats.

Please continue to protect and help those who need it. We will all be pensioners one day and equally an awful illness could hit anyone of us at any given moment. Caring for a loved one is traumatic let alone having to worry about money.

Yes protect disabled people.

I believe severely disabled people on a low income should be protected.

Yes pensioners and disabled people get full benefits as they suffer enough as it is with health problems and many of us are on very low incomes and sometimes go without heating or food just so we can pay our bills.

As a pensioner on a low income I have to depend on my savings that I have saved through my working life. I need all the financial support I can get and often feel that the government forget about the elderly especially those like myself who live on their own.

No one on a low income should pay anything.

There should be a very comprehensive examination of claimants to ensure that they are entitled to the correct amount support.

Without full details it is hard to know what this means. However, it seems reasonable to protect pensioners if their income is poor.

As long as they are not taking the Micky.

Of course if pensioners (of which I am one) Are on low income they must have support - Prices - keep going up - our income hardly moves.

People who have disabilities are not themselves disabled, but do need (and merit) support to help them to manage their problems and live as independently as possible. 2. 'Carers' covers a range of situations. Some give support to help their people live independently, even to be able to work; some carers provide full-time care; some carers are employed professionally, often part-time from choice. These different circumstances need different types/levels of care/protection.

The government welfare system - to help people into work and support the most vulnerable. NO THEY DUMP THESE VULNERABLE PEOPLE NO HELP NO ADVICE NO MONEY FACT!! BUT LOOK AFTER EVERYONE ELSE!!

If people are severely handicapped - they need help always.

Council has to be much more precise on the phrase. "Full protection" - see how much.

I agree with this, because what other option do they have very little money?? I think they have put enough money in over the years, they should be exempt from this scheme. I'd like to think my council tax would be helping vulnerable people.

I agree with the scheme but find that not enough is allowed for full time residents and ex worker who were born and bred in this country.

Are they all British citizens?

Low income - no income - we don't get pay rises - we just get threatened about disability payments - lowering the pension and disability rates get rid of bus passes? (we don't have a car)

I think it is absolutely appalling that you are, targeting the elderly and disabled in order to make cuts. Most elderly have worked hard all their lives, and I'm sure would like to continue to do so! Some cannot even afford to heat their houses!! Disabled people would also like to work, but are unable to! So STOP taking away from the most vulnerable, and giving to the work-shy parasites with 4 kids, by 4 different fathers, who can and should be working!!

These people have little control over their income and should therefore be protected.

Depends whether or not the scheme would benefit them.

Any person in need on a low income deserves protection, even if it means the better off (including myself) paying more.

We are living in a wealthy area and should support pensioners on low incomes and disabled people. This is a mark of a civilised and compassionate society and there is no excuse in Great Britain in the 21st century not to carry out this responsibility for those who need some help from those who can afford it.

We must support all vulnerable groups.

A lot of elderly people had low paid jobs early in their lives. Why not give as much help as possible. Uttlesford Council are very good.

Why do pensioners have to pay income tax when they pay well over £500 per month in rent and Council Tax. Apologies, my child has drawn on this.

To make the right decision it would be helpful to know what a low income is.

The mark of a good society is how it cares for the weakest and most vulnerable.

Pensioners and disabled on low incomes are important - probably more important is small children who should NOT be going to school hungry as we are not told some poor children are (going to school) hungry in Uttlesford. There are an awful lot of very wealthy people living in Uttlesford who are mainly excellent - good people.

Provided that the claimants are genuine.

Pensioners, disabled people and carers should always be protected as they are the most in need of any support they can get.

Not sure to say 'yes' which I would do to support disabled and carers. However how do benefits play a part in level of 'income'?

Everybody on a low income needs support, whether they are a pensioner or working age.

See comment at part 2

Everyone with a low income must be given full protection from the implications of this scheme.

Obviously pensioners on a low income must be given full protection but so also do disabled vulnerable people need full protection - something the government and local authorities seem to forget!!

What you are doing is calculated to sow divisiveness in a recent article in the evening standard Clegg, who is partly to blame for this said: - "the generations are not at war with each other" not yet, but thanks to you and your kind things are heading that way. Still, of the two most to blame one has gone to the back benches, the other out of the commons altogether, good, serves them right.

They have enough struggles without having financial hardship too.

The Government then proposes to hitting people financially when they are down. I am happy to live in a caring community with the current councillors.

All people on a low income should be given full protection from the implications of this scheme, not just the old and disabled.

Pensioners on low income should have help with their payments.

Older people who are vulnerable need to receive all the help we can give them. Most of them have worked hard all their lives and frequently did not have an opportunity to save for their old age.

Two questions in one but only one answer option!

After checking they are genuine.

It may help pensioners remain in their own homes for a longer period of time.

The council need to protect the most vulnerable in our community.

Provided that the “lower income” is set at a realistic level and that the figures provided by the individual are correct and represent their total income.

Everyone should pay a share - plenty of people on a “low income” don’t qualify for benefits so won’t be exempted.

It is essential we support vulnerable people and those who care for them.

Only if pensioners/disabled/carers pay 20% tax or less - NOT if pay 40%

We once claimed Council Tax Benefit but made an error in completing the form. The letter sent to us by Uttlesford Council made us almost suicidal and we vowed we would never claim it again even if we were desperate.

I was employed as a caseworker for the Citizens Advice Bureau and still work in the charity sector for a disabled charity - it is important to protect those groups on disability benefits and pensioners. What with the new PIP assessment being 'stricter' than the old DLA system, these claimants are the most needy and vulnerable.

This question is lazily phrased and impossible to answer without prior knowledge of the 'implications of this scheme' which you make no attempt to spell out. However, given that the Government guarantees pensioners a minimum income, and given that pensioners are the fastest-growing group in society, and are often much better off in terms of assets like property than young people, it is no longer realistic to protect every 'low income' pensioner from economic forces. Also, what do you call a 'low income' for a pensioner, disabled person or carer? As I say, the question is so woolly and vague that it defies an accurate response, but in general I disagree that pensioners and other vulnerable groups must or can be totally protected from the impact of LCTS when other sources of State funding such as Universal Credit are designed to make financial allowances for those facing hardship.

It's a no brainer people, low income pensioners cannot afford the price of council tax..... council tax is another way for the government to spend on a jolly up!!!!

In principle there is no issue with this but care needs to be taken not to open the scheme to fraudulent claims

How do all residents know if Uttlesford gives full protection from the implications of this scheme. This is for Uttlesford to set out how they comply. do you comply? what do you mean by full protection? have you made any changes? how have you justified these changes ?

No one should need a top up to their Pensioners as they have had the same chance to add an extra top up to the government pension, they just used their money for holidays and cars etc.

Given that this protection is provided for those in most need, I am strongly in favour of the scheme remaining at least at present levels.

It should protect all people who cannot afford their council tax but it doesn't.

There should be some form of assessment or criteria not all individuals (pensioners or disabled persons) should automatically be eligible for LCTS. For example those that spent rather than saved for their old age. Provided they are genuine

Responses received

Q2 For each 2.5% of increase the LCTS recipient(s) will need to pay, on average, an additional £39 of Council Tax each year. The cost to the council of keeping the rate at 12.5% would be approximately £340,000. For each 2.5% increase the cost of the scheme for Uttlesford District Council would reduce by approximately £5,100.

Should the council keep the rate at 12.5% for a fourth year?

Responses received

15%

Why should Uttlesford be a better place than the rest?

Uttlesford seems to be out of step with everyone else.

Why is Uttlesford again using 12.5% the lowest in Essex should be increased sharply to at least 20%.

There should be a standard 20% for all of Essex.

It is unjustifiably low. We should at least be the average of Essex authorities. 20-25% seems fair.

Uttlesford should increase the figure to 20%.

Raise it to fall in line with the average above over a set period.

I think this should be taken by what are you live in.

There is no logic in having here the lowest rate in Essex. The Uttlesford rate should be 20%, in line with Braintree and Brentwood. But I note that in the most deprived Districts (Castle Point, Thurrock etc.) the rate is in fact higher than in the more affluent Districts.

That is excellent going, but if there are matters that require urgent attention I could well understand it having to be increased, but not into layabouts pockets.

The minimum tax in Uttlesford should be similar to other councils in Essex ie 20%.

Increase the percentage to be similar to other Essex Councils. The average is 22,25%. Its fair use this percentage.

We surely can and should maintain this support.

People are still struggling even with this amount.

Reduce it

Keep it

I do not full understand, but I think the council rate of 12.5% should be kept.

Reduce subsidy to 85%

This should be increased by 2.5% = 15%

It should be raised to 20% in line with the majority of other councils.

15% would not be unreasonable percentage

We can see no reason why Uttlesford should contrive to be so out of line in dispensing taxpayers' money. 50% would not be unreasonable.

The council should also consider reducing the rate as the demand is decreasing.

It does not seem to save much money if the minimum is increased and would probably cost more to chase the payment.

Or lower if possible to 10%

Round up to 15% to bring in line a little more with other Essex councils but I believe 20-3-% is too high!

Why do we need to be the lowest?

I would like the rate to be reduced, if possible, but certainly not increased.

However, you have the finer, global picture of need versus cost. So long as Uttlesford's representatives do what is right for the people of Uttlesford based on clear data rather than any government diktat it should be supported. Elected reps are elected to work for us not central government.

The council needs to explain why Uttlesford is so out of line.

For purely selfish reasons keeping the rate low would be great. However for the good of everybody it should be raised and the money saved spend on other services.

We should be proud to have such a low level.

Disgraceful that should have to pay any council tax.

Uttlesford's rate seems to be disproportionately low.

It would help if you stated how much effect this had on the council tax bill for everyone else - I'd guess it's such a small amount that most people would accept it, but I can't make a proper judgement about this without knowing the impact.

This does seem out of line with other Essex councils and could perhaps be raised.

UDC are way below every other council, so increase at least 2.5% per year until you reach 20%.

To bring it up to an 'in line amount' (20) is too much. The saving of £5,100 is minimal but expecting people to find £39 a year could be difficult for them.

As almost the lowest district in Essex, it would rise by 2.5%.

Don't understand the full implication.

Looking at the table it would appear that Uttlesford could combine its protective core with a small increase - say 2.5% - and still be, in this regard, generous.

Uttlesford is a well-off area so should be charged at least like Harlow.

Try eliminating unnecessary expenses i.e. road works that last and not repair again and again. Buses that run turn of light in council offices not in use

15%

The information provided above provides no basis for offering an objective, reasoned view e.g. what % are of the council's overall budget does £340,000 represent, what do the percentages in other councils mean in absolute terms.

You should come into line with other councils 15-20% seems reasonable.

The rate should be increased to be in line with other local councils - closer to 20%.

It should be in line with other councils.

The council should make it even lower.

Disabled people with - demand - to be treated the same as everyone else - they should pay the same, everyone's circumstances are different and many able-bodied people struggle to find money but do not qualify for benefits.

Increase by 2.5%

The council is to be congratulated on keeping this at a low level.

I suggest that the council explore the possibilities of crowdfunding the extra cost. The wealthy of the district will more than likely be happy to give a donation of an amount they themselves wish to give.

Uttlesford's rate of 12.5% is so far below other councils that it should increase to 15-20% to come into line with several of the other Essex councils.

15%

I think the money individuals will save will be more use to them than it will be to the council (or at least it will be put to better use).

Why not make them fully exempt if they really cannot afford to pay.

Inflation has to be noted.

As a resident lucky enough to be able bodied and, though a pensioner, without responsibilities, I would rather pay more myself than see an increase put onto people who cannot afford it.

The about statistics state 'minimum' not 'maximum'? 12.5% of what? I've said yes because it appears to be least very few people will understand the above. Politics!

We need to protect vulnerable people such as those on low pay. The amount of saving for 2.5% to the council is minimal, but the effect of any increase in amount allowed to individuals on low pay is very significant to them.

A gradual increase is more realistic, and hopefully would mean less likelihood of an eventual sudden large increase.

SUBJECT to my answer/comment on the first page. ("PROVIDED that disabled people and carers are genuinely looked after and have a reasonable quality of life")

Pensioners on low incomes should not have their small incomes decreased in any way.

Those in most need have been hit badly enough in recent years.

Think should be 20%

Uttlesford is a fairly wealthy district. If Uttlesford DC needs more income, it should look at re banding homes in Saffron Walden as these properties are banded far too low!

It should be in line with others ie nearer 20% otherwise others are subsidising LCTS recipients even more.

We should be roughly in line with all other Essex Councils ie 20% (staggered over next 3 years 2.5% rise each year)

You don't inform us on how any extra money would be spent.

Uttlesford D C is admirable in its record for assisting the most vulnerable of its people. Uttlesford is a relatively affluent area and its help in helping the poorer members of our society is commendable.

The above para is highly ambiguous. Is the absolute cost at the current rate £340,000 or does the 12.5% cause the £340,000 if the later, then 2.5% increase would save £68k.

The poor and disabled are in need of additional support resultant welfare "reforms".

I would like to know why UDCs rate is so low compared to areas of Essex with greater structured deprivation. Is it simply greater benevolence or is there more to it?

It would be reasonable to increase the % to 15% or 17.5% IF Uttlesford were planning to spend the money on something useful, not on keeping CT low for people with valuable (top 30% of bands) properties.

The rate could increase to 15% but no higher. Ideally it shouldn't increase at all!

Uttlesford is a pleasant place to live BECAUSE we help our weak and poor. It would be better to help them more not less - I'd make this 10%.

Far too complex to work out!

Up it to 15%!

I believe the council must support vulnerable people and families to the maximum possible in their time of need.

An explanation as to why Uttlesford rate is much lower than the others would have been useful!

If possible.

Since the entire region is being wrecked by endless horrible building, the council is obviously lolling in ever increasing amounts of revenue.

Not a good time to be talking about any kind of increase of payments, but better a 2.5% increase now than a greater increase in the not too distant future.

Council Tax should be lowered so that ALL residents pay the full amount for their property. People have a choice of how to spend their money - council tax or lottery ticket or cigarettes!

It is good that Uttlesford is protecting people on low incomes, rather than just copying what other councils are doing.

What ever the figure shows and are boasted about each year, I always end up paying more!

My feelings are that we are ALL expecting bills to go up - maybe 15% would ease the burden as the council - this chart does NOT show incomes/outgoings relative to each council/individual.

Raise to 15%

I don't think the info provided here is sufficient to conclude it should be increased. I would rather any savings were achieved through better targeting. Subject to assurance that provision is well targeted I would be happy to pay more council tax to support those struggling.

What scheme is at a rate of 12.5%?

Increase to 15% not unreasonable.

Increase to 15%.

15% would still be the lowest.

15% would be more appropriate.

With government cuts and cost of living rising those who pay should pay. It's all about community. Some pensioners and the disabled have high levels of disposable income.

Can't see why we are so far out to other councils?

25%

It should increase to allow for an improvements + expansion of services.

Too low. Match other Essex councils average.

Why should Uttlesford's rate be so much lower than other Essex councils? 20% is more realistic.

Suggest a gradual uplift to 20% more in keeping with other councils. Sadly we are lacking xxx in other essential areas which fall under council responsibility e.g. road repairs.

As a pensioner I would struggle to meet the increase charge of £39.

Uttlesford should be more in line with other councils - is it regarded as an achievement to be lowest?

Don't have a clue.

There is less work availability in Uttlesford compared to the other councils name above. Also, wages appear to be lower.

15% would be acceptable.

But please protect those disabled, and pensioners continuing.

To add 2.5% i.e 15% would be acceptable and avoid a possible massive hike in years to come. Set it at 15% for the next 3 years 17/18 18/19 20/21.

Raise to 15%.

How mean is Uttlesford?

Currently the highest discount in Essex. How long can the discount continue without affecting other services. 2.5% will be a small increase.

Perhaps an increase of 2.5% the 1st year we are way behind other councils.

The benefit to the council of increasing the minimum is very small in relation to the whole budget; the increase would have a far greater impact on the individual recipient.

2.5 increase would still be less than other areas.

The average appears to be around 20% which still represents a significant discount. A 20% figure would be fairer to those of us who pay 100%. Current figure is likely to attract those on benefits to the borough.

It would be reasonable to increase the amount payable, gradually to bring it in line with other councils in Essex.

Should be lower to be in line with other councils in the table above.

3.25 increase p.c.m is reasonable.

15% is still one of the lowest levels in the area.

Uttlesford District Council rate should be comparable to other Essex councils.

25% rate is fair.

The council get enough money from all the council tax they collect as the roads don't get repaired properly and the rubbish collected could do with some changes as well.

If possible.

Bring into line with other councils.

We think the rate should be increased to 15% which is more in line with other local authorities.

If this has to be increase at some time in the future it should be increase very gradually at no more that 2.5% in a year. The burdens on the less well of are difficult enough to manage.

Should not be any increase.

A slight increase would seem appropriate as Uttlesford is at the moment right at the bottom of the list.

As Uttlesford's rate is well below the rest, a slight increase is acceptable and sensible.

It should be risen closer in line with other Essex Regions - the average of slightly below.

I do not fully understand the question.

Increase to 20%

We are a wealthy and privileged area and can afford to look after the less well off.

yes

I am pleased that Uttlesford heads the table for care for our less fortunate neighbours. The aim should be to build on our generosity and lower the rate still further - perhaps to 10% initially.

Increase the rate by 2.5% or 5%

Insufficient if done in this country for the poorest/most vulnerable. Uttlesford is a very prosperous area that can easily afford to support those of modest means.

Increase to 20%

Uttlesford should be brought more in line with the other Essex Councils.

I do not think it is appropriate to keep the rate the same if the benefits that we get from the Council tax are going to stay the same or even reduce because of lack of funds. We need more benefits not less.

Uttlesford should move towards this norm, starting at 15% ASAP.

15%

Three years is quite long enough for a freeze. It has left Uttlesford requiring the lowest % of LCTS. I think it risks attracting more potential beneficiaries to live here.

Amount should be in line with similar councils so not to create a haven for benefit claimants.

A small increase would be acceptable.

Increase it to 15%

I would support an increase to 15%

If UDC keeps this up I hope the CAB gets a bigger building because the courts are going to get busy that means more spending so what GAIN!! More and more in dept!!

Otherwise what would it rise to.

The saving of £340,000 is an insufficient reason to reduce this support. This is no a poor area and UDC finances can not support the additional amount. If cabinet disagrees it should at least not eliminate the payment in 2018/19.

Average income are higher here so the council can provide more support than others do.

A modest 2.5% increase would still be on par with Tendring and the lowest rate.

Why is Uttlesford lower than most in Essex?

Times are hard - especially for pensioner so to increase c.tax makes life even more financially difficult.

Up to 17.5%

I do not understand the question but feel we should limit the outlay, however possible, on LCTS.

Perhaps a 1.5% increase?

People should pay a fair rate for the services they receive like all taxpayers. 25% would be a fairer distribution.

I consider an increase of 5% would be reasonable and still offer a good comparison with other Councils.

15% maybe money saved could help low income families towards school travel costs.

The statement made above appears contradictory when read. The first paragraph implies any increase on 12.5% would increase my council tax. The second paragraph implies it costs the council less if the 12.5% is increased. This implies an increase in my council tax either way.

As my previous response. We do not want to have people living in poverty in a supposedly developed world.

I believe a small increase is justified when comparing to other councils.

Good for Uttlesford - I feel proud to live here.

These are very complex questions and the questions seem to be expressed in a manner that suggests political obfuscation which makes the question even more complex!

Reduce, if possible to 10%. There are more houses and businesses than there ever were. So Council should have a greater input of funds from new housing.

What is the equivalent £ paid - this would be a better comparison than %.

All the new build houses in my area. My question is why is my Council Tax still the same rate.

Yes, keep the rate as it is - people who are already struggling, can't afford another £39/£78/£117/£156, or however much is decided to increase.

There should be no question. Pensioners disabled and carers on low income should be given every help available.

Council should absorb entire cost. This should come before all service except those you must provide by law.

It should increase. There is clearly justifiable scope for a small increase if these figures are to be believed.

Uttlesford contains a relatively high proportion of very prosperous households. We can afford to absorb it to alleviate hardship for households where every single pound really makes a difference to their wellbeing.

Sadly, with the expense of the Town Hall repairs and the many needs of the area I don't think they can.

An increase of 1% (or inflation) would not be unacceptable after 4 years. Assuming benefits % has increased in past 4 years.

Uttlesford totally out of step with other Essex councils, why? Average of others is 23% - needs to be increased to at least 20%.

In America you only get out of the state what you have put in. This should be the same for England. Pay Tax and NI for on yr. receive benefit for one year only!

Rate should be similar to other councils at 25%.

The % applied should be increased in line with other L.A.

Increase to at least 20%

15% will still be the lowest 2016/17 increase less than £1 a week. Unfortunately everyone should contribute in keeping UDC costs down.

Increase to 15%

15% should be affordable.

If you do not bring the rate in line with most other councils there will be a perceived draw to really low income families/individuals to the area.

Uttlesford is clearly out of step with other councils in this area increase to 15% in 17/18 should be considered and 17 1/2% the year after.

Rise to 15%

Increase to 15%

I would support a small increase, of say, 5-7.5% as we seem to be the most generous Council by far.

25% Same as others.

Bring it into line with other councils at say 20%

Uttlesford should follow the average (in percentage terms) of all the other councils in Essex. No reason why Uttlesford residents should be treated differently than anywhere else.

UDC rate should be no longer than the next lowest.

Increase to 15% in-line with Tendring.

12.5% is the lowest rate in Essex. To reduce cost to the Council, an increase to at least 15% should be considered.

It would be reasonable to increase it to a rate comparable with other Essex Councils.

Its much lower than all the other councils in the table. My own opinion is that it should be raised to 20%.

15% would still make UDC the cheapest council.

An increase of a further 7.5% would be a suitable increase bringing a total of 20% in line with most other councils.

We should be similar to other council's.

Increase in line with other Essex Councils

25%

20% is a fairer rate to pay and in line with the majority of other councils.

Increase to 20%

Raise to at least 15%, preferably 20%.

Should be at least 20%

Should be around 23%

Rate should be 20%.

UDC is lagging behind other Essex Councils, and should not be seen to encourage people to move here to take advantage.

Reduce to 10% further savings are important to make in an atmosphere of stringent cuts the programme should always aim to reduce to encourage claimants back to work.

Why is Uttlesford's % so much lower than other Essex Councils?

15% would be appropriate to the area.

20% is equitable.

Increase it by 3%

Increase to 15%

The rate should be raised to the average of 20%.

Standardise across the county at 20%

If taxes are spent to support the most vulnerable and the services are provided then those that are able to pay more should and the lower income families should not.

Bring rate in line with other councils. Uttlesford is the lowest band.

Rate should be the same (or broadly the same) across a county. Next lowest is 15%, most 20+%. Take an average.

If you wish to add a comment, please do so below:

If you wish to add a comment, please do so below:

it should be reduced. UDC should not be considering an increase.

Well done Uttlesford - But my Council Tax is easily my biggest monthly bill (by over 66%), and I have NO street lighting, mains drainage, gas or fibre to the house!

However, if it means the Council having to borrow money and getting into debt to do this then it should be considered.

Comparing it with other councils I would agree to a slight increase maybe 15%. I strongly agree with a contribution for council tax - as all the years working for the CAB when I had to do benefit checks and give general/debt advice, I would ask my clients for their council tax amount and there were only a handful of people in all that time that actually knew!

I believe the rate should rise to at least the Essex average of the other councils quoted in the table, and I would propose 20 per cent as a fairer figure. Council tax is already at such astronomical levels that it is only responsible for Uttlesford to stop being a fairy godmother with our money. It is striking that Uttlesford's current rate of 12.5% is roughly half the going rate elsewhere in Essex and a full two thirds less than Castle Point. Why does Uttlesford feel it must be so extraordinarily generous with council tax subsidies? What would be wrong in bringing the council into line with the rest of the county?

25%

Uttlesford appears to have a very low rate at 12.5%, a gradual increase would be appropriate

It should be raised to be brought into line with other councils

It should be brought up to at least the average of Essex councils.

Not if vulnerable and poor people are affected by your proposed cuts. Not if residents are not fully consulted. If I pay a 1% increase this would amount to £3 a month (a cup of coffee) and might help ensure pot holes are repaired and save me the cost of a new wheel, (not tyre) and might help ensure that public services are not closed. Not enough information is provided in Uttlesford life and other media about the services provided and the cuts. The Council is too keen to talk up their services and they should consult more about the challenges of budgets and raising standards.

It should be more comparable to other areas of Essex (which are generally around 20%)

It is time this was reduced.

in this period of austerity and uncertainty about future incomes all residents should share the burden of LCTS and therefore a small increase should be made

% to increase to 20% matching other areas lowest

The government should scrap the scheme and bring back council tax benefit but they would rather the rich got richer and the rest of us get poorer.

Uttlesford should increase its percentage to the average of other Councils - thus, as I understand it, increasing its available funds for other activities that benefit a wider number of residents and probably some more deserving ones.

I think the rate should equate to the average of other councils rates should be increased in line with inflation.

Still seems low in comparison to other councils.

Uttlesford seems far too generous compared to everywhere else in Essex. Uttlesford should raise the rate to 20% at least.

Uttlesford is making a significantly larger contribution than the other Essex councils, which seems excessive in these financially challenging times

Uttlesford's rate should be more in line with other Essex councils but to achieve this the increase should be introduced gradually over a few years.

Q3 In simple terms, parish and town councils set their budgets by deciding how much money they need to run their services and then dividing that amount by the number of homes in their area.

The LCTS scheme reduces the amount of money the parish will receive as some households will not pay full Council Tax. For the last three years the council has provided grants to parish and town councils to make up the difference. In 2016/17 this cost £154,000. The council proposes to reduce this grant by 50% next year ... It would be up to each parish/town council to decide if they wished to cover the shortfall in grant by increasing their part of the Council Tax.

Do you think the council should:

Continue to pay the full grant / Reduce the grant by 50%

Responses received

Error! Not a valid link.

Stop the support

OR 100%

Any sensible governance would devolve power to the lowest level that can use it, even at the expense of “senior” bureaucracies!

Local Councils can increase their parish share accordingly. Residents can then see exactly where the money is going.

This would make the LCTS scheme more comparable with other Councils.

The people who we use the services should pay for them why is the Council supporting the parishes at all?

The Parish Councils do an important job, Uttlesford should therefore support them fully. Not line their own pockets.

Pay full grant

If percentage increased as above P/councils and T/councils would receive more from these households and D/council full grant would reduce.

The council should find the £154,000 by cutting jobs within the council offices. Too many overpaid and underworked people working for the council. Tax money should be only spent on those who really need it - the poor & needy.

Parish councils should consult before choosing to increase their part of the council tax.

Town and parish councils seem an anachronism and should be abolished. Their work could be done by charitable trusts or volunteers.

Why should helping the poor affect parish/town councils.

It's unfair as some areas will have far more LCT recipients - council should continue to pay full grant.

Increase CT for top 2 bands, increase CT on properties empty for 6 months & on 2nd homes to make up shortfall.

Whilst understanding the external financial and political pressures impacting on the UDC, any reduction will have to be made up from somewhere or standards will drop rendering vulnerable people at even greater risk. I'd like to be assured that pressure is being strongly sent back to centre. You represent us - fight for us.

I'm not convinced that the starting point of councils deciding what they need to run services in the first place is a prudent way to budget, and too subjective on local decision makers.

Items 1-3 seem a reasonable way to assist people on low incomes and for the rest of us to help.

The majority of the funding appears to be allocated to the highest % of hardship/high unemployment areas. I suggest you allocate funding to the greatest need on a 100% basis.

Duplication (or multiplication!) of admin for parish councils would be ridiculous.

? Where does Uttlesford get the money to make up the shortfall?

Surely it makes no difference; we, the rate payers, will end up paying in one form or another.

Or wipe it out! Otherwise why bother? Gt Canfield, Langley, Little Chesterford etc are hardly going to be having parties or doing anything constructive with such small amounts of cash.

Otherwise households like myself will bear the brunt (we pay full council tax). Maybe consider reducing by 25% instead.

If grant is reduced, parish councils will have to raise precept. Parishes have a very tight budget. Don't understand as above.

With the small increase suggested (as above), perhaps the full grant could be maintained - or a much smaller reduction than one half!

This is too hard to call! I will go with the council proposal.

It is a disgrace that SWTC have been allowed year on year to spend taxpayers money at will.

Must be stopped, 50% reduction minimum.

A 50% reduction is huge, like a 50% price increase. With inflation, the base rate of general costs being very low, why would UDC impose a 50% hike in reality?

50% is too large a reduction in one go. Having recently had dealings with Essex CC I am at a loss to see exactly where my council tax goes - certainly doesn't benefit the Uttlesford area.

I cannot answer this question easily because I don't know how the £154,000 grant is funded. 1. If it is from central government then a 50% reduction is clearly going to impact council tax payers. 2. If the £154,000 is funded out of general council tax revenue then it will have little net effect on council tax payers.

Why should others pay for some who have never bothered to consider their future. But there are others who perhaps deserve help because of bad health.

Keep all payments for disabled people.

Same as above but at parish level.

Parish councils should calculate on a rough means tested basis, not per home, but by ref to the home's rateable value.

This is a cost that must be borne by the whole area otherwise parishes with a high % of claimants suffer.

Undecided.

We live in a 'wealthy' area and the parish council should be able to cover this shortfall.

The council should pay the full grant to all parish and town councils. They should not try to pass the cost to individual households via the parish/town councils.

Unfair on areas which have more benefit claimants.

Unsure how parish council would cope.

Why not reduce the grant - but by less than 50%. "Every little helps" (Tesco)

Paying full grant - reduction by 50% is too much in one go.

Again I do not understand the ramifications upon the individual, other than you require individuals to pay more.

Uttlesford is generally a relatively wealthy area. However, there are parishes who will have a higher proportion of those on LCTS. Reducing the grant puts more of a burden on those Parishes so would be unfair.

Communities with higher numbers of reduced payment households are usually the very communities which need a helping hand.

Villages are more dependent on grants than many towns in the north of Essex; I would be happy to reduce the subsidy to towns but maintaining for villages in the Uttlesford.

To reduce the grant would seem to favour wealthier areas with fewer recipients of LCTS at the expense of the less well off.

The Parish and town councils in Uttlesford need more money, not less.

If council don't continue to pay full grant this shortfall should be partially offset by item 2 above (increasing LCTS recipients contribution)

Why does Saffron Walden have the highest grant?

Responsibility should be devolved down to the lowest level of competence - and closer to the voter and tax payer.

Most payments are of smallish amounts in absolute terms and it is not appropriate to reduce them by 50% forcing the councils to increase their CT.

A reduction of 50% is appalling. Up to 10% reduction would be acceptable, as long as no further reduction is made the following year.

Since any shortfall can be covered by increasing the CT, this proposed change would be a costly one.

Uttlesford is a pleasant place to live BECAUSE parishes have adequate funds. Grants should NOT be reduced.

Too complex!

If the cut is made it will mean that P/C and T/C will have to charge resident much more by the precept change NO not a good more don't do it.

We must help people in their time of need if we are to be a civilised society.

Continue to pay the grant until more information has been made public and a full discussion has taken place regarding the practical implications of a shortfall in grant to local parish.

Keep as it was.

This money is invariably wasted on self-indulgent luxuries - well, maybe not invariably! - Like noisy carnivals, playgrounds etc. if people want them, let them pay for them!

Incremental reduction maybe.

It would be helpful to receive more information about what this money can be/is spent on.

Trick questions. If the majority say to reduce the grant then Parish Councils will assume they have been given the green light to raise council tax accordingly rather than spending a small budget wisely.

If the Parish increases their part then the overall yearly bill will increase for everyone not just those on low incomes.

Don't know what the grant was used for so don't know the impact of slashing it.

Public transport should be vastly improved in the area if a reduction in the grant is made at the councils expense.

Too complicated to understand!

There is an irreducible number of people who have genuine difficulty with meeting bills. Some illnesses, and mental health problems are in this, where this is an absolute necessity. This group are not "shirkers".

Isn't this swings and roundabouts? Won't we all end up paying?

I fundamentally disagree that those areas with a greater share of low income households should be penalised.

Scheme is unknown to me!

50% reduction is too big.

The burden of finding the 50% difference should be relieved by the district rather than the parish councils.

Allowing the parish/town council to decide devolves the decision to a more local level.

The proposal makes no difference to residents. It simply shifts the responsibility of making an additional charge to parish/town councils. This would seem irresponsible for the district council to take such a decision and leads to less transparency.

Without clearer explanation/information of expenditure of parish/town councils it is difficult to give an informed answer - more detail required for better consultation.

I think the council should use money they have invested and give the people a better deal altogether.

Reduce by 25%

Should continue to pay the full grant especially the low income, disabled, carer.

I would rather the parish councils receive their full allocation of funds, surely saving £77k is fairly insignificant to Uttlesford District Council.

By reducing the grant by 50%, many people in Great Dunmow and Saffron Walden will be affected, especially in the latter, where living costs are already pretty high. I'm pretty sure that council tax rise or cut in some public services will be needed to cover any shortfall, thus impacting even more people.

Just to reiterate said before, financial support is vital.

Reduce by 25%, following year 35%, following year 45%. To do it in one hit is very hard.

Residents could then elect the parish/town council partly based on candidates' policies on charges to households.

If this results in increases in c/tax which in Clavering is extremely high, many pensioners cannot afford any increase, which has already gone up this year.

We have already seen the implications of cuts to residential areas in the countryside, reducing my village will have serious impact that the parish would have to cover.

I am sure if all the local community chipped in towards the remaining 50% it should be able to manage.

Too expensive and complicated to administer.

Neither. Reduce 50% to 25%.

I am concerned that the towns provide services used by villagers eg tourist information centre in Saffron Walden but are not paying to provide them.

This will just move taxation from UDC to parosh in the same way Nat Gov moved it to UDC. Do you really think the public are not aware.

Increase the number of AFFORDABLE homes for people to purchase so the divided cost goes down, or remains the same. Build more homes closer to Audley End Railway Station.

Parish councils should bear a share of the cost.

Some rural areas need the support of Parish Councils much more, as we are generally forgotten about or ignored by ECC, so we need and deserve the full grants. It would be totally unfair to many regions to reduce these payments.

As above.

Not paying the grant simply shifts the burden. Whats the point of that?

I assume the amount to pay/receive in grant will change with those still requiring support or not. These are isolated figures and individual cases will often no doubt depending in other benefits payable.

Leaving parishes to decide smacks of the medieval! Charity for the poor from the church!
(Parishes are areas disquieted within the purlieu of a church).

Isn't reducing the grant by 50% rather drastic.

Why not reduce the grant by 30%?

Reducing this grant by 50% seems excessive. I would think a reduction of 15% to 25% would be more acceptable.

No I think if Parish Council need help - they should receive help.

Neither. 50% is an unreasonable %age. Suggest 25-30%.

Again why is this the fault of the vulnerable. Maybe if the UDC looked in house at the waste of money by the way this shambolic outfit runs, you will get this money back!

Parish Councils are taking on increasing responsibilities and they support, if kept at the existing rate, is not excessive at £96,000 once again if halved it should be maintained at that level in 2018/19.

Does this matter? Either way it means a small rise in total Council tax, which we think would be ok.

This would be quite a small increase in Parish Tax.

Depending upon location - councils in some areas need to be individually assessed according to needs required of them.

These Parishes and Town Councils will have to prioritise elsewhere, I have to cut back all the time to pay my full Council Tax!

Do not keep building houses in the district as all villages are becoming too large which makes the roads more busy and it would seem the costs keep going up.

Less grant - less money for maintenance works.

Maybe the parish and town councils should be challenged to find ways of making up the shortfall, or/and encouraging more volunteer activity.

To provide the same quality of service they would almost inevitably have to increase their part of the tax which would cost and make the change immediate as the costs would still come from Council tax payers.

Parish Councils do a very good job. Why destroy what's good.

UDC should (by law) give villages the same benefits as towns or make a grant to each village.

A reduction of 25% would be more acceptable.

I would have liked to see the justification for 50%

If this question and Uttlesford's actions here are accurately expressed and if a rather dense person (like me) understands correctly - then Uttlesford is to be commended greatly.

Parish Councils are a waste of time.

They need the support.

Our local parish council is struggling now, to make ends meet - how does UDC expect them to survive if they cut the grant!!

If you reduce it a Tory council (most of them are) will stick the boot into the poor that is Tory nature.

. Either way, most parish/town council money is spent on administration and staffing and the public see little benefit!

Neither! Could the grant be reduced by less than 50%? It would not be unreasonable for Uttlesford minimum Council Tax to be 15%.

Parish Councils need to do their bit in reducing costs.

As Tax payers we cannot continue to carry everybody its time voluntary or compulsory work should be put into place for all benefits. Too many holes in our system for abuse!

If the grant payment is reduced there must be a corresponding reduction in the UDC charge. This is neither an opportunity to spend more or use to offset savings targets. The rate payer should not pay for any change.

50% would hit the larger parishes badly.

Only reduce the grant by 50% if the short fall is covered by the increased income from the Council Tax paid by LCTS recipients being increased.

Parish Councils do not have the staff to monitor the efficiency of the scheme.

It would appear the parish council will be able to maintain their income whatever way is chosen.

Why not reduce it by 25%?

You should increase it by 50% not reduce it Rural Communities receive the least amount out of the council tax we pay. It's about time rural communities received more form this council tax we pay.

It is not the fault of the parish if some households do not pay full council tax.

Reducing the grand by 10% would be acceptable.

Town and Parish Councils already struggle to keep their services going as both district and county pass ever more services (CCTV, toilets, land, speed warnings etc.) on to Parish and Town Councils. 50% reduction is too much too soon. Why not 20% per year? Give councils a chance.

Our council tax is already extortionate.

LCTS recipients should pay more and Council less.

Parish Councils have least access to other funds.

Parish Councils are more in touch with their communities that EC and UDC

Reduce the grant but at a lower percentage i.e. 25% ? - or apply a tier system over 3-5 years.

Without proper justification of the reduction it is impossible to form a judgement, therefore maintain the status quo.

If the district council receives less money it is logical that this loss would be transferred to the parish and town councils.

Why should those who have to pay in an area have to also pay more for those who don't pay? (See also Q1 "Everyone should pay a share - plenty of people on a "low income" don't qualify for benefits so won't be exempted")

How are Parish Councils expected to make up the shortfall? I am not necessarily against a reduction in the grant if councils have a means by which they can raise money to make up the difference if they want to.

If you wish to add a comment, please do so below:

If you wish to add a comment, please do so below:

Where would the money come from if the grant was reduced by 50%.

Some of these areas will have more vulnerable families than others. Is there a way it can be looked at where the Parish and Town councils are not punished in the poorer areas and the ones with a higher volume of social housing? By reducing the grant you are affecting the poorer and more vulnerable in society, and inevitably other public services will be cut .

I applaud any initiative to reduce council tax, whether directly or via local grants. In essence, the current situation means that local taxpayers have to pick up the bill for the council's largesse towards protected groups. I would like to see less largesse and a 50 per cent cut in the grant. I would be totally opposed to the idea that the parish council would then raise its own element of council tax to make up the shortfall.

it would be helpful to know how parishes raise their funds, an immediate 50% cut seems too drastic for parishes to recoup

This is a stupid question. If you pay GDTC 50% what services would they cut and how would this affect me!! We have graffiti in our town now (never before) and it is not getting cleaned up - who is responsible. There is loads of rubbish at the roadside at the entrance to GD who is responsible. There are old cars parked outside the school near Tescos advertising buying old cars, why are they not removed? We don't have any Police patrolling streets and our police station is closed I guess all these things are not the responsibility of Uttlesford? We are hounded with parking fines when we don't have the opportunity of paying when we leave a carpark, we have shops struggling and parking some days is difficult.

A Waste of council tax money

If you pay grants to the parish you are asking people to pay twice, their should only be a Council Tax and a Parish Tax

Reducing the grant would put more people at risk of poverty, ill health and death.

if you don't pay it, the Town Council will simply have to raise more of their own money. When this money was given by Central Government to Councils, it was with the intention that it would be filtered to town and parish councils.

The parish/town has no choice in the number of LCTS recipients it has so should not be penalised, this cost should be carried at council level

Without further information as to the cost per household (in increased council tax) this would entail it is hard to make an informed decision.

This is central government money for parishes so what is the justification for UDC cutting it and pocketing the money??!! Parish councils generally offer their constituents excellent services but on limited budgets,

The District Council has already off loaded to Town and Parish Councils who have had to absorb the cost. The District should not be causing local councils to suffer

With more and more services being devolved to parish councils, it is inappropriate to remove this funding to them. This funding is provided by central government to mitigate against the loss in revenue as a direct result of the change in the council tax scheme.

Q4. As part of central government's benefit reforms, rules are being changed for housing benefit and universal credit (two other types of benefit people can receive). The council is proposing to make the same changes to LCTS. By doing this, the council aims to make the LCTS system easier to understand for claimants as the criteria for all these different benefit schemes will be the same.

The proposals are:

a) Reduce the time a claimant can be absent from the United Kingdom and continue to receive LCTS, from 13 weeks to 4 weeks.

Do you agree?

b) Reduce the period for backdating a claim from 6 months to 1 month.

Do you agree?

c) Removal of the family premium (an additional payment to people with children) for all new working age applicants.

Do you agree?

d) Limit the number of children within the claim to a maximum of two (so even if a claimant has three or more children they will only receive LCTS payment based on having two children).

Do you agree?

e) Remove the severe disability premium (extra money paid to a severely disabled person to assist in employing a carer), if the claimant's carer already receives the carer's element through universal credit.

Do you agree?

f) Remove the work related activity element for new Employment and Support Allowance claimants.

Do you agree?

Responses received

Error! Not a valid link.

People who need this help to get into work must be encouraged to behave in clever smarter ways. Most of these “extra” make the scheme slacker.

The simpler and more uniform welfare support payments are, the better. They are then more easily understood. And welfare support is best provided through a generous NATIONAL scheme rather than through a mixture of national and local support schemes.

(f) Far too many people in the UK, which must include Uttlesford are claiming benefits and at the same time accepting monies via the black economy.

It all needs to be as simple as possible.

Do not use the savings in LCTS to support other services and payments to managers ETC on bonuses.

If you cannot afford to have more than two children, then you should not be receiving support in the first place. I can't afford more than two children.

Agree all

If people cannot afford children they should not have them! Why should I and the other tax payers support their children

a) We can see no reason for any special dispensation at all for those who can afford to travel abroad.

There must be the ability to apply for exceptional circumstances, certainly in cases A & B for example if someone is hurt or injured whilst abroad requiring a hospital stay which means they could not safely return to the UK within a month.

In respect of d) it should be noted that many families not in receipt of benefits limit the number of children to meet their means.

People have to understand, we cannot keep on borrowing money; when interest rates go up to Grt Britain PLC we may run out of money. We then go cap in hand to the “IMF”.

b) Reduce the period to 1 month, unless they is a valid reason why the claim was not submitted earlier. d) Yes, but only for new claimants.

There is no further need to penalise the unfortunate, disabled or children so that taxes for taxpayers & companies are kept artificially low.

I would rather people were involved in productive work - rather than on "activity" which is ill defined.

I disagree with the general trend of the government's welfare benefit proposals.

a) 6 weeks b) 4 months min c) Absolutely not, so Dickensian d) What! & ask them to sell the extra children or maybe just starve them f) What is this - you should have explained Children, the disabled and the unemployed should be supported not bullied.

Sorry I find the above E F difficult to understand. By element i.e carers element does that translate as carers payment?

b) Unless the delay is council caused. c) Depends upon circumstances. d) A complex issue at times - not a yes/no issue. e) As said, this is extra, given because of need as above. Whilst consulting the public is positive the issues raised are often far more personal and complex case by case therefore yes/no answer without case context can appear to give permission for action whereas a different answer would be given with more specific details.

(comment unreadable)

I don't understand f) so cannot say yes or no.

c) and d) With so many blended families, which benefits children in a modernising society, this could seem unfair, and may have the counter effect of families not blending = not so good for children, and more pressure on housing (particularly smaller houses). f) I do not understand the consequence of this - please explain.

I don't understand (f). Claims should be reasonable, but protection for the disabled and for children should be preserved.

This would discriminate against multiple births. I had one child and then had twins. How about those with triplets?

I'm not certain what (f) is, so cannot give opinion.

d) Reduce to 3 or 4 now, & 2 but only with notice being given, or saying people with more than 2 children in the future, i.e. protecting those currently having more than 2. f) Don't understand

what this is.

f) No idea what this means! Jargon.

f) Have no idea what this means...

f) I don't know what the 'work related activity element' means.

I can't answer (f) as I don't know what it means - more detail please!

Don't understand f above.

Insufficient knowledge of detail.

Sorry, I don't understand f) above.

Unable to respond to f) as do not understand exactly what this is!

I haven't answered 'f' as I don't know what the 'work related activity element' is.

I don't understand (F)

a) 8 weeks b) 3 months f) Don't understand the jargon, what is 'work related activity element'?

f) Don't know what this is.

I do not know what f is referring to.

e) Should be very carefully administered to ensure best possible recipient outcome.

Don't understand f) so cannot answer.

d) Having children is a choice, and should not be paid for by the government. Two is fair.

f) I don't know enough about this to comment.

f) I do not know enough about (f) to comment.

No comment. More info please.

b) With provision.

Anything that can be done to prevent people getting money for nothing would be good!

If you are on jobseekers allowance, you shouldn't be entitled to as much compared to those with a disability.

a) If you live abroad it should stop!

I think people get too much money.

Children's needs vary and childcare is extremely expensive, families and severely disabled need more support.

I do believe disabled and vulnerable people should have their benefits protected but those with more than 2 children should not. I think claims should be backdated 3 months not one month.

Disabled people should not have money deducted. There is no way most of them can enhance their finances themselves.

I don't know anything about f) so have no comments.

I cannot answer f, as I am not sure of the definition of work related activity element.

f) Don't know what this is!

f) Don't know what the work related activity element is so no opinion.

I am not quite sure that many of the people reading this form will understand it. Most of it hardly makes sense to me and although I am 83ish and was educated to university entrance standard but went straight into a profession. So I can't see its point and most people will bin it anyway and I admit I was tempted to do just that.

I don't understand Q4 sect f

f) Not sure what this means.

I don't know what (f) above means.

I don't know enough to answer f)

I don't understand question (f) or the implications.

f) What is the work related activity element? Insufficient info to be able to make an informed decision.

Not sure what this means.

I don't know what question f) means.

I cannot answer question f as I do not know what the work related activity element involves.

Reducing the backdating does not seem fair, if people need it they should get it. 100% agreed with reducing the time someone can be absent from UK to 4 weeks.

Do not understand f

What is this?

b) Feel 3 months fairer c) If employment available? e) Feel disabled would find good carers hard to get. f) Would this stop people trying to work not sure what is entailed here.

a) In principle, but no compromise possible? Say 6/8 weeks? b) See above - yes to notion - but why so, apparently, draconian? e) In my experience this is already totally inadequate. f) I don't know enough about this.

(a) Why 13 weeks to 4 weeks too much why not 6-8 weeks. (b) Backdating claim for 6 months seems too much, however to reduce to 4 weeks again too short why not 12 weeks 'happy medium'

Have no idea what (f) means.

It is very important that all disabled people who employ a carer keep the extra money because this money helps them to pay the carer and ensure that they are able to live on their own.

We need to protect the poor and vulnerable in our society.

(f) needs a little clarification for those of us not familiar with benefit structures.

(a) If absence over 4 wks is involuntary eg illness or travel problems then claimant should not be penalised. (d) For new applicants, NO if already have 3. Its only reasonable to limit to two if notice of reasonable period is given that this is coming into force.

Try to encourage all working age people to work rather than rely on state benefits. The severely disabled need all the help they can get.

The rate would be better in the medium, rather than the lowest quartile, so 15-20% is more representative of the other local councils.

The proposal I feel most strongly about is 4a. It is hard to understand the implications of some of these proposals (particularly 4f). It would be helpful to have more information so people in need are not disadvantaged.

Part-time work wages are inadequate and therefore help should be given; resumption of FULL-TIME employment disqualifies individual, especially if young and able. Assistance should be available to really needy. Laziness should not be encouraged to avoid work.

Ill and disabled people should not be hit as they cannot make up the income. These changes should only impact on those on Working Tax Credits.

You must protect severe disabled and the illest - we have to look after people who can't look after themselves.

(b) BUT depends who created the delay. Severe disability requires greater care therefore requiring additional funds - if removed from the disabled individual it takes their feeling of independence.

You need to explain what these benefits refer to any what the typical payments are, for those who have no idea what they're about.

I am not too qualified to comment but it has been my experience that the new universal credit is very difficult and stressful for the disabled person or carer to qualify for and receive. Any support for disabled people is the mark of a civilised society. It is not a gift, it is recognition of inability to earn a living.

1. Ask all these questions, because u won't take any ***** notice, you'll already b made up your minds to put it into your personal SLUSH FUNDS

(f) I presume this mean clients claiming LCTS would not need to actively seeking work, which is why I answered no. If I misunderstood (the question is not clear) please ignore.

Proposals a) and b) are supported on the assumption that there will be on "exceptional circumstances" option.

I understand that Uttlesford DC is an area of high employment and some affluence therefore it can continue to sub those of us who are not so fortunate.

(b) There might be cases where this could impact a genuinely deserving claim. (d) I would prefer a tapered approach - say 50% for a 3rd child, for example. Is this really an effective incentive to have fewer children, or do less fortunate people have more children to compensate for their lot in life, regardless, ie is there evidence to support this as a policy? (e) The disabled are the most deserving of our care and compassion. (f) sorry, I don't know enough to comment.

Reducing financial benefit to the poorest people, which includes people with serve disabilities x on sick pay, is unfair and retrogressive as well as inhumane at a time when public services are being cut back so there is less community support available.

(b) Could reduce to 3 or 4 months, but not 1 month. I can easily imagine a claim could take longer to sort out than just 1 month - backdating should therefore be for up to 3 months. (d) a limit of 2 children is too harsh. I could accept a limit of 4 children. (f) severely disabled and their carers are insufficiently supported already. Their allowances/premiums should NOT be cut.

These changes unfairly affect those who are dependent upon the claimant. Claimants for ESA need current work related skills and providing these keeps that employment door ajar. The above suggested removals will result in solve disadvantaged people falling through the net.

The council should NOT follow the Governments unkind scheme, even though life needs to be simpler for these people (and for all of us).

Carers already receive a low allowance so cannot afford to lose any amount.

We should not impose any burden on those who already struggle, particularly those with children who must be protected and those who find it hard to work for physical and mental reasons.

I feel that it is unwise to limit the payment to as low as 2 children I would say yes to four. We have to realise that a lady may have twins no fault of theirs is it, so think again to allow for this.

I do not approve of any attempt to cut benefit while tax dodgy millionaires and corporations are allowed to get away with not paying their share.

Anyone could find themselves in need in this troubled word lets help make lives better.

While changes in the rules are acceptable the proposed changes are too stringent.

Should be checked for abuse at times say six month (spot).

c. Not always it depends on whether the children are at risk, or being produced simply to claim benefits. Case-by-case judgement? d. Difficult - yes and no! - what about actively supporting the 3rd or 4th child? But again, people abuse the system. So, don't know. e. The carer's element is nowhere near enough. f. Don't understand what this is.

D and e are not always as easily defined to a y/n response. Is there any room for "grey area" assessment!

E. Yes if this is a duplication of money.

The time limits seem harse. I would support 3 month limits for everything for all claimants.

D. In respect of this, I agree to a point but as the average family is 2.4 children perhaps it should be increased to say 3.4 and not penalise families.

a. Good to know that claimants can afford a four week holiday aboard! b. Should not be back dated at all. f. Should be in work.

3 months reasonable backdating period.

I am assisting my son who has mental health issues, and who is supported by CMHT. I would request that when you assess claims you remove mental health from the general 'disabilities' as from experience, they can appeal "good" one day and be incapable another, thus it is very difficult to assess "in general".

Unable to say Yes or No, each case has to be judged on its merit.

My comment is its going to cost me more than last year.

A. I do not understand what the implications would be here. e. I do not understand the implications of this situation.

Don't fully understand f) so unable to give an opinion.

Most seem hard but fair - children should be protected.

D. Limit the number of children to a maximum of 4 children.

There are some Religions where the wife never stops having children - whether they can afford so many children or not. Yes I am sure, lessening the amount of money will make a great difference to the size of the family.

Regarding e and f above - do not have enough knowledge regarding these benefits to make a comment either way.

We feel its easiest to stop all the above for ease of application but each case should be decided as there is always a contry to the rule.

The important thing in relation to these various elements is not to re-introduce the "cliff-edges" and disincentives in the system that universal credit seeks to remove.

I have no idea as to what this scheme refers to.

c) What if they genuinely cannot find employment? This suggests their children could be disadvantaged (???) f) ???

b) Depends on circumstances - compromise 3 months. d) Their choice to have kids. f) Evidence based activity to ensure appropriate benefits are paid to claimants. It is not always achievable to attain jobs these days, however claimant must show intention to work. No evidence - no pay!!

a) I agree should continue to receive 13 weeks. b) Agree backdating 6 months

f) have no idea what work related element for new Employment and Support Allowance claims are to make an informed decision.

Don't know.

I'm against limiting or removing benefit for circumstances which are out of a claimant's control, e.g being disabled, being ill (and therefore may miss the proposed 1-month backdating claim deadline), or any dis-incentive for people into employment. On the contrary, having children or being away from the country for over 4 weeks is more a personal choice and should be at the claimant's own costs.

c) not sure. You have to protect the disabled, pensioners and those who have the lowest income. With disabled even though the carer is paid an allowance the work they do for the person they care for is incredible and without help disabled will be even worse.

b) Why not 3 months? I feel this is a more reasonable timescale.

Disabled residents rarely choose to be disabled. We can plan to have a family, the amount of children we will have. Hopefully we can plan for our retirement - but maybe there needs to be more support with this so funding is on education - planning for retirement.

Suggest that the council tries living on benefit. Very few want to be and for some it wasn't a choice to be placed in this position.

b. This should have some degree of discretion. c. Are we still trying to take children out of poverty. d. I cannot believe you are asking this q. the proposal is outrageous. e. Depends on the circumstances. f. There should have been some explanation of this.

Work related activity is a reasonable requirement for most, but the draconian way in which trivial or unavoidable breaches are used to deprive the most desperate is quite unacceptable.

f. Cannot comment as not enough information provided.

Cannot comment on f) because we do not understand this element.

f. Don't know what this is or implication.

d. Only to encourage drop in number of children eventually per family for the sake of our planet.

I do not know enough about 'F' to comment.

I don't understand the question (F)

Do not understand F

f. Do not understand what this is so I cannot answer the question.

f) I don't know what this means

I'm sorry but I don't understand Question F, no matter.

A Yes no doubt if not here in UK do not get. b. As above why pay for people leaving the country. d. Yes. Why should I pay for them having too many kids. f. Not sure think need to get into work. Totally unfair people having extra kids - living off the state why should they - 4 they have kids at their cost not ours.

I do not understand the effects of f above as no extra info provided.

b) One month is too short. Suggest 3 months. f) Don't understand how this element works.

f) insufficient information in question to make a judgement.

No idea what f means!

E) I think every person is different with severe disabilities, words written are cheap we don't know or understand what these people go through in life so how can anyone comment by reading question E - like the narrow minded GOVNT.

E&F Not really sure of the implication of these 2 statements.

Not in enough info to comment.

I have no idea what is meant for questions E&F - so I can't comment. I am very concerned that the severely disabled should not be worse off.

E) Don't understand the question. F) Don't understand the question.

Let's not make things any more difficult for the severely disabled.

If people wish to have a larger family they should be prepared to pay and take care of them themselves!

D) Most definitely Some disabled people DO NOT even have a carer as they cannot afford one, through now being able to claim for one!! Likewise for carers, who care for elderly/ disabled family members FOR FREE!! Saving councils millions!!

The reduction in the period eligible for back-dating is too severe. People needing help with claims etc may have to wait weeks for the night help. Some have periods when they are unable to deal with things. They should not be penalised.

We must protect all children and vulnerable people.

Why should older people pay tax for other people's children when they had to bring up three children and only got paid for one?

Look! In the immediate post WW2 years the government put the care of children (ie the future) top. Now we are in danger of putting OAP's top (and my wife and I ARE OAPS) wrong emphasis surely - completely wrong!

It is tough enough for many disadvantaged people to manage so cuts are not going to be good and create another cost further down the line and leave them in unfair poverty meanwhile.

a) If taken ill abroad, or other catastrophe of "no fault" it would be unfair. b) As above.

No! Reducing back-dating times, etc, means people will end up losing benefit to which they are fairly entitled, by shortening the time available in which to claim. How this is part of "making the system easier to understand", I don't know!!!

If we only want wealthy people in Uttlesford, we should make all the proposed changes, if we want a variety of people in the area, make none of them but raise significantly the council tax charges in the top two charging bands; I say this as someone in one of those top two bands, who does not want to live in a ghetto peopled only by people like me, and is happy to pay a fair share by raising what I am charged.

Re (d) if a family has more than 2 children those children need support too.

This scheme will just make the gap that's exists now between the "haves and have nots" wider and wider. We live in the 21st century not the 18th century when poverty was rife!!

Each and every one of them is against the person on LCTS.(c) How many over working age have dependent children? (d) Are the Tories prepared to let children starve?

Unnecessarily harsh, with the potential to cause serious hardship. In other parts of the country where similar rules have already been imposed, people have died from lack of food or heating. I hope that Uttlesford is a more civilized and progressive council.

(a) and (b) Claimants are unlikely to be absent from the UK without good reason. It should be allowable for the authorities to question them about such absences but not automatically to add a financial penalty to what may be a family disaster - that would be cruel. (c) and (d) While over population is a major factor is global warming, depriving children of needed help is not going to stop procreation. It is a deplorable, vicious, mean, old testament style proposal. (e) As is the proposed cull of the severe disability payment. The severely disabled have many extra expenses besides employing a carer. (f) People finding it impossible to get full time paid employment need not only financial help but the encouragement and experience occasional work can give (it sometimes leads to full time work too).

Austerity does not work. Why punish the working poor?

(f) Do not know enough about the benefit to comment.

(d) Idealistically yes - morally no. (f) I don't know exactly what you mean by this!!

(d) Idealistically yes - morally no. (f) I don't know exactly what you mean by this!!

All benefit systems need simplification so that it is clearly understood.

LCTS payments should only be available to working age people who have worked in the UK for at least 3 years unless they are disabled or a carer on a low income.

f) Not enough detail given to make an informed decision

f) Not sure

f) I don't understand this question

f) Do not understand this.

f) Do not know what this means.

f) I don't understand F so can't comment

f) not sure what this is.

Avoid double claiming

All these measures will significant impact on the less well-off and more vulnerable parts of our community.

f) Do not know what this question means (hasn't been explained)

c) Don't know; d) Don't know

I have no idea what this is. If it mean people can still claim even if they work on very low income then NO.

All residents should pay toward the services they receive. Those paying higher rates of council tax do not get their bins emptied more often than those paying a lower rate. Typically if you pay more for a service you get a better service. It appears this logic does not apply to council tax. I know that it's not to do with this particular survey but it still needs saying, often and LOUDLY. What about the ridiculous cancellation of free school transport for those living several miles away from both Saffron Walden High School and newport Grammar. Also. Newport Grammar is nearer than Saffron Walden for those living in Chrishall so why claim that Saffron Walden is nearer?

People can choose the number of children they have (if they are educated and fortunate), disabled people do not 'choose' and are unfortunate - so need maximum support. But there do need to be checks - as with every aspect of spending taxpayers money.

I was employed by the CAB as a caseworker for 3 years was funded by a Housing Association (volunteer for 3 yrs too) . I was very pleased to see the new benefit reforms - about time! I always felt on the old system there was too much top up of WTC/CTC though - I very rarely saw any single mother that worked more than 16 hours though! It was the same old thing - if they worked more hours ad-hoc it would mess up their HB and they didn't want to take the risk with an over payment so easier and better for them not to work too much. I do have doubts about HB being paid directly to the claimant - I do believe (along with my ex-colleagues) it is being a bit naive to believe the rent will come first! I do not agree on benefit claimants being allowed to leave the UK for weeks and weeks and not get their benefits stopped/sanctioned - not right ,even for those on Disability benefits.

These changes are sensible and can hardly be called harsh or Draconian when one looks at the colossal size of the benefits bill even after these minor adjustments have been made.

The entire questionnaire is an appalling attempt to cut benefits without explaining to residents and service users of the consequences. It will no doubt be used as a fine example of people voting for the cuts and Uttlesford being able to hold down council tax. This is a truly appalling attempt to push through cuts that could potentially have a devastating affect on individuals and families. There needs to be a sensible discussion on the pros and cons and the consequences of cuts. The questionnaire is far to simple and designed to get the public to support the Conservative party objectives of cuts through the back door as they were caught out last year when the Chancellor had to back track after the House of Commons revolt about such cuts. Sorry not sure if comments completely relevant to this survey! Most people appreciate that the council need to try to reduce the expense of all benefits issued, however for the large majority of people claiming support these payments make a massive difference to their ability to stay afloat. Although you will always get people who take advantage of the system in place there are far more who genuinely feel embarrassed by their circumstances and are very grateful for any help that they receive. I do think that combining the various benefits which I believe is the thinking behind the universal credits (although wasn't sure if the council tax support and housing would eventually be included) would save money, control the amount people are claiming, reduce cost involved in having multiple departments and accounts to monitor and also keep better track on capping claims and identifying fraudulent claims. As a brief example of costs that could perhaps be reduced, if a claimants situation changes new paperwork is issued to reflect these changes, often from more than one department involved, if someones hours vary this could potentially happen monthly and produce vast quantities of paperwork all involving time and expense. If all benefits are produced from a linked account then just one batch of paperwork, if you could look at transferring accounts online and encourage online paperless accounts when people have access, paying a single benefit payment, which would encourage better management of personal finance and responsibility for people who are capable.

Disabled people cannot help being disabled. Family's who have raised disabled people at a detriment to their own lives and enjoyment are entitled to know that their disabled relatives have the funding to ensure their physical, social and emotional welfare is financially supported. These cases must be prioritized over people refusing to work for a salary less than their benefits. People who live apart to obtain social housing and benefits and people who come to our town expecting housing and hangouts.

Stop taking money away from the poorest, most vulnerable people in society.

I agree that claims should not be back dated longer than 1 month but the amount of time to assess a claim needs to be taken in to account so the claim should be backdated to 1 month after the claim submission date and there should be an element of financial support for the period that the claim is being assessed. Whilst I agree that those on benefits should not benefit from having additional children whilst receiving benefits but consideration does need to be given to those who have more than 2 children when hardship hits them.

We must do everything we can to protect the very most vulnerable groups from living in poverty (or below).

Again, without clear information in the form about what the proposals mean it is hard to make an informed decision.

The changes to apply to new claimants only

Disabled people are already suffering - don't make it any harder for them

No individual should receive payments twice

Regarding (c) and(f) we have no opinion because we do not fully understand the implications.

Q5 Further comments made regarding the LCTS scheme

Responses received

Error! Not a valid link.

As long as it works, Great! When it starts to fail, dump it!

Simplicity and equity point clearly to a 20% LCTS rate for Uttlesford, and for aligning the local rules with the new national rules (question 4).

I get the normal reduction on council tax being a person living on my own.

Keep up the good work.

Uttlesford seems to have become very town centric and cutting village services the LCTS saving should only go to support the existing LCTS budgets not as has been obvious in the past to rob peter to pay Paul and increase their own bonuses and payments.

People who are well off, i.e savings, shares, property etc should not get any relief, regardless of employment, income, age, disability.

Pensioners and disabled people no longer able to work deserve all the help get especially if they have paid NI Stamp. Any additional payment is deserved.

No further comments

I do not fully understand what is involved in the LCTS scheme, nor do I understand what the people involve go through.

Thank you for asking my opinion.

It is clear the council has done its best to keep this simple to understand but we feel it would assist if this document/information was submitted to a focus group to evaluate the possibility of further simplification.

Help them that genuinely help themselves (unless of course severely disabled, then they genuinely deserve LCTS)

Not a lot of time between end of consultation and implementation if you suddenly find you are no longer fully protected and have to find extra £ hundreds per year.

It is a scheme to help not penalise people - there are too many Range Rovers, Audis, BMWs around Uttlesford - tax should rise.

Low income single parent families where the parent is working but in low paid work need help & a discount as this payment can amount to 10% of their income!!

I want to see those who are ill or disabled being support - whilst ensuring those who genuinely can work are encouraged so to do.

Look globalisation & automation plus lack of will to deal with bankers/fat cats 'cheating' is reducing part of the UK's pop to 3rd world standards - increased equality improves the lives of all.

Given that Uttlesford has a considerable number of wealthy taxpayers (including myself) it would be unforgiveable to target the disabled, young, and less well-off members of the community.

The cost of this exercise presumably reduces amount that could be paid to those in need - stupid!

4f) should be explained.

It seems the council is required to consult annually. If so, on-line only consultation would be cheaper.

I agree that all council taxpayers should be consulted. However we cannot make informed decisions or comments without further background explanation. Claimants have an advantage in being a part of (and therefore understanding) the system/scheme.

Some your questions not clear.

4f) Not sure what his means; if the work related activity element is unpaid, then clearly no effect on total income, so 'yes' ok.

Whilst not wanting to cause hardship to people, I do not want to pay for shirkers and people who can work, but choose not to. Use the money saved to make people learn English and get a job when they come into the country.

It is time only people who have paid in receive out on all count. One month can only work if people know about it in the first place.

It is very difficult to answer these questions fairly. There are many who deserve help and many who have never worked and have grown used to dependency as their right.

Councillors are elected to make these decisions and justify them to the electorate, consultation is a smoke screen and given the complexity is likely to get very little response or simply an exercise of individual prejudices (rather like Brexit!).

I am a single resident and so enjoy the related discount.

Need to do more to help old age pensioners and disabled people.

In particular item "B" should remain as many elderly pensioners do not fully understand new rules and may not have any family visiting for more than a month.

With the amount of extra homes being built and even more proposed in this area, there should be no question of having to cut funding - just get rid of the overpaid bureaucrats at Chelmsford who are not only incapable of doing their jobs, they refuse to admit their lack of interest and know-it-all attitude means they should not even be employed by the council.

Difficult to understand some of the welfare/benefit terminology and the implications for LCTS. I think we can blame central government for this mess.

Increase council tax (for the higher bands) if necessary to support those in need! Don't penalise the poor.

We must always provide a safety net for the poorest and most vulnerable people in our society.

I recently applied for LCTS as I thought I was on a low income - but gave up on the application as they wanted to know a lot of personal information. I think it would be simpler if you stated the maximum income you can have to receive it. Maybe if it was linked to tax credits it would be easier. Since moving to Clavering from Bishop's Stortford I was shocked that my council tax is more than £40 per month more than East Herts for a property that was £200,000 less than my previous one. I feel that you victimise people with mental health issues - people who have trouble coping with everyday life.

I am fully aware of the difficulties councils have with their budgets, I would be happy for council tax to go up a little, to help with this problem.

Uttlesford is one of the top places to live in the UK. We should assume that the high quality of life we enjoy is shared throughout the community and with those in greatest need.

While there may be a few who 'play' the system, the vast majority of benefit claimants are in that situation through no fault of their own. Taking away benefits only drives them deeper into despair and makes a recovery from their situation more difficult. Poverty also is a drain on our NHS.

. Is there any kind of local loading for people who grew up in Uttlesford (educated, not just born here) or who have lived here for 10 years or more? There should be a local priority for finding assessments and payments.

www.uttlesford.gov.uk/lcts <<http://www.uttlesford.gov.uk/lcts>> does not work!! Note to CEO UDC needs a big shake up it does not comply with the wishes of the people who live in the area.

Enough money has already been taken from poor people. Uttlesford needs to ensure that better off people pay a more realistic proportion of council tax.

I do implore the council to continue is necessary support to prevent the elderly and disabled becoming an underclass, while they deserve a fair life.

I previously knew nothing of this topic. It is hard to offer off the cuff responses. However, I will look out for more information and am very pleased to have had the opportunity to comment.

I think it is more important to support the vulnerable than to fall in line with unfair benefit "reforms".

This is a very expensive part of the country to live ad rents etc are much higher than in other parts of the country outside of London. Please continue to provide support - especially to young families.

Potentially there should be more criteria around the above proposals and the amount of allowance should be based on individual circumstances.

There can be no doubt that many households in Uttlesford could bear a small increase in CT to pay for scheme helping the disadvantaged. Be brave do it.

A caring society taxes the rich and supports the poor. It is pleasant to live in a caring society. The Government's schemes make the country less pleasant to live in. Uttlesford should not follow them.

No Council should penalise those on low incomes or those who are seriously disabled. Nor should families in work this with large families ever lose out. To suggest penalties for these groups is outrageous! Wages remain low for many.

Save elsewhere - environment, leisure activities, lunch clubs.

I pay taxes to help people not so fortunate as myself. I am surrounded by people living in large houses, although mine is more modest. Let's redistribute wealth.

We all don't wish to see money wasted but any one can fall on bad times. Most of the problem is high VAT that everyone has to pay no matter how poor.

I would like the scheme to help people more.

YES IT'S RIDICULOUSLY COMPLICATED!! How many people do you think can understand this form! Pensioners on low income should NOT have to struggle to pay expensive bills.

I'm proud that we care for our 'less able', and those who've come on hard times, humanely. It's a sign of the quality of our local communities.

Increasing poverty and homelessness - which will be the result of these charges - will result in greater cost to UDC as well as impacting most on vulnerable members of our society.

It would be helpful to have more background information in advance of surveys like this (or accompanying it).

If people on benefits spend their money wisely they would be able to pay full council tax.

I don't feel I can comment on other people's benefits.

To all of the above as to 2,3, and 4. Questions totally incomprehensible.

Having regard to the weight which UDC planners gave to our objections to a local planning application, we have decided that it would be a complete waste of time to complete your form.

This survey has been very well designed to confuse everyone. I had never heard or read anything about LCTS until now.

It would be interesting to know the percentage return rate on this "consultation" I would expect it to be low.

We have a severely ill son who is in receipt of council tax rebate. This is an enormous help in the management of his condition - we are very appreciative of this.

Think this form could have been more user friendly - lots of figures but not much explanation as to the consequences of each decision. Surely each case can't be as black and white as you suggest - 4c and d for instance?

I have not answered all questions as I do not understand them not having to apply for help myself. I am one of the fortunate ones at the present time.

I think this consultation could have included more useful contextual information - what % of UC total spend goes on LCTS? Under different scenarios/options presented what would this mean for annual council tax bills? E.g. Q2 if it will cost me £5 to save an LCTS recipient £39 my response will be different than if it cost £1/£10/£20/£40..... (plus I think many of the questions are leading, and potentially motivated)

What is a LCTS Scheme?

Not at this time.

Please don't stop the financial assistance scheme in rent and council tax.

I have never been a position to claim housing benefit - yet unemployed can claim more money than I have earned at times this seems a distorted system.

More information regarding 'LCTS' would be helpful!

We are not all politicians a council employees. Some explanations would not go amiss if you really mean to engage the public, your votes, in this questionnaire.

To easy to generalise but need strong guide rules - people take advantage - ALL WRONG

I was shocked to see on TV the situations of two single people. Once received c£13k pa, the other £17k pa. These are more than a person working 35hrs on minimum rate and paying PAYE, NIC and (possibly) Council Tax. Seems the system is unbalanced. They both had very luxurious lifestyles!

To say I am blown away by this form is a understatement UDC and CC want to look into care companys that are being paid for looking after the elderly. I have the proof to prove they are providing a very poor service maybe you should look into this asap! Save money and also bout the illegal immigrants that gets EVERYTHING FACT!! NOTHING SAID!!!

This questionnaire is not clearly explained. Broadly we oppose reducing the level of support/benefit provided.

I think Uttlesford D.C on the whole do a very good job and fair job.

Why are there so many immigrants allowed into the area, working at low salary which affects the local job seekers.

YES - Get WORKING AGE people into work, and STOP councils giving them an 'easy ride' in life!! Then perhaps the 'benefits' would go to those who NEED it, through no fault of their own!!!! You shouldn't even put elderly/disabled people in the same category as WORK SHY ADULTS! A lot of elderly DO NOT even claim, to what is/should be rightfully theirs!

I think it boils down to the fact that people on low incomes, whether they are in low-paid jobs, pensioners or have a disability, need support to pay council tax. I think it is not unfair for the wealthier residents to pay more.

We have a responsibility to come for those less fortunate or less able than ourselves. If we subscribe to "The Weakest to the Wall" we damage our own humanity and send out a disturbing message to future generations.

The scheme must be seen as fair and policed well to make sure that the most vulnerable get support.

Very difficult to understand and appreciate fully the implications of the questions and the probable long term effect of the proposals. Good questionnaire though just scrub out the political shibboleths.

a) But where do they go??! b) On balance agree - but what is this actually about? c) children must not be punished for the dissolute behaviour of parents. f) But what exactly is "work related activity element" how can anyone respond without knowing this?

Similarly with (d) (e) and (f) - these are cuts, which will affect the most vulnerable. Town Council extremely strongly opposed to any cuts to support scheme payments. 93% of those surveyed in 2015 supported protection of the parish council grant.

Why keep squeezing the poor. They don't have spare money, they need the grants.

What an utter shambles!!

It is difficult to understand why the district councils should absorb the loss of income and not pass onto town/parish councils.

Don't build houses for the sake of getting government grants ! Get grants for infrastructure (roads etc) AND facilities e.g. Schools, surgeries, shops, pubs, Village Halls etc.

It is all too easy to make these proposed changes sound like an agenda against the vulnerable, but the reality is that council tax has risen remorselessly year by year to the point that it is breaking the back of family finances. We cannot keep on making everyone a special case for a rebate, as Uttlesford seems to wish. In our council area, an average family in an average-sized home is now paying around £2,000 a year in council tax out of earned income, much of which goes to fund unaffordable local authority pensions and huge payoffs for failed managers. My own wish would be for the council to do much less, get rid of half its staff, sell off most of its property portfolio and go back to basics: empty the bins, clean the streets and run a few libraries. But so long as the council wishes to regard itself as a taxpayer-funded empire, the bills will just rise and rise. So while I sympathise with the hard-up elderly, the disabled and the carers, I cannot agree that we can continue to make them all special cases. The price of running Uttlesford Council must be shared amongst everybody.

I feel the Council is trying to make out that this is a very amateur consultation but what they really have done is to design a questionnaire to get the result they want without setting out the services they currently provide and the way in which the cuts will be made and the consequences. The government including local government are very poor in accepting their responsibilities for effective communications and reaching out to people who are affected. It can be months or years before a person realises that they could get support and financial help only to find that their claim can only be backdated so far. Cutting claims to a month will help save the Council money but I have first hand experience assisting someone who has lost money because the information provided by one department about what could be claimed did not cover another government department. Use modern technology, develop focus groups and communicate in more effective ways please. less politics and more transparency

We are all had to work hard and save for a pension,cars etc. this often means having no holiday or new cars each year, instead of using money left in a will they go on a spending spree reducing their money in banks just below the limits set.

It is unfair that pensioners are given full protection under the LCTS scheme. Are the Local Authorities putting pressure on the government to remove this anomaly?

Most of the town councils have spending liabilities that they can not get rid of at short notice. They will have no option but to increase council tax. If UDC wishes to bring in these changes to support it should be phased in gradually, with the town councils given a timetable for the changes so that they can prepare for them.

4.2 Questionnaire

Questionnaire forms for the paper and online consultation followed an identical format.



Uttesford Local Council Tax Support Questionnaire (2017/18)

Local Council Tax Support (LCTS) has replaced the national Council Tax Benefit scheme and each year the council must consult on the proposed scheme for the following year.

The results of this consultation will be presented to councillors in the autumn with the final scheme for 2017/18 being agreed in December, to start on 1 April 2017.

The LCTS scheme forms part of a wider reform of the welfare system. The government's aim of the reforms to the welfare system is to help more people into work, while supporting the most vulnerable. Since the start of this scheme in 2013 the number of working age people in receipt of LCTS in Uttesford has dropped by 40% from 1,321 to 789.

The council wants to hear your view on this scheme so please take a few minutes to complete the form.

Click "Next" to see how to complete the survey



Uttesford Local Council Tax Support Questionnaire (2017/18)

3. In simple terms, parish and town councils set their budgets by deciding how much money they need to run their services and then dividing that amount by the number of homes in their area.

The LCTS scheme reduces the amount of money the parish will receive as some households will not pay full Council Tax. For the last three years the council has provided grants to parish and town councils to make up the difference. In 2016/17 this cost £154,000. The council proposes to reduce this grant by 50% next year. It would be up to each parish/town council to decide if they wished to cover the shortfall in grant by increasing their part of the Council Tax.

[Click here to view a table to show how much each parish received in 2016/17 and how much they would have received if the grant had been reduced by 50%.](#) (PDF 87KB opening in new window)

Do you think the council should:

Continue to pay the full grant

Reduce the grant by 50%

If you wish to add a comment, please do so below:



[Back](#) [Reset](#) [Next](#)

Local Council Tax Support Questionnaire

Introduction

Local Council Tax Support (LCTS) has replaced the national Council Tax Benefit scheme and each year the council must consult on the proposed scheme for the following year.

The results of this consultation will be presented to councillors in the autumn with the final scheme for 2017/18 being agreed in December, to start on 1 April 2017.

The LCTS scheme forms part of a wider reform of the welfare system. The government's aim of the reforms to the welfare system is to help more people into work, while supporting the most vulnerable. Since the start of the scheme in 2013 the number of working age people in receipt of LCTS in Uttlesford has dropped by 40% from 1,321 to 789.

The council wants to hear your view on this scheme so please take a few minutes to complete the form and send it back to us in the envelope provided. If your envelope is missing, please contact the council by phone on 01799 510510 or email uconnect@uttlesford.gov.uk

Alternatively you can complete this questionnaire online. Visit www.uttlesford.gov.uk/LCTS

This consultation is anonymous but collated results will be publicly available, including written answers. These will not be attributed to any individual but please do not include any personal or confidential information in your responses.

1. The Government has said pensioners on low income must be given full protection from the implications of this scheme. Uttlesford's current scheme also protects disabled people on a low income and carers on a low income.

Do you agree with this? Yes No

If you wish to add a comment, please do so below:

Please t

2. The table below shows how Uttlesford's rate compares to other Essex councils. The lower the percentage, the less Council Tax an LCTS recipient is required to pay.

	The minimum % Council Tax an LCTS recipient paid in 2014/15	The minimum % Council Tax an LCTS recipient paid in 2015/16	The minimum % Council Tax an LCTS recipient pays in 2016/17
Basildon	25	25	25
Braintree	20	20	20
Brentwood	20	20	20
Castle Point	30	30	30
Chelmsford	23	23	23
Colchester	20	20	20
Epping Forest	20	20	25
Harlow	24	24	26
Maldon	20	20	20
Rochford	20	20	20
Southend-on-Sea	25	25	25
Tendring	15	20	20
Thurrock	25	25	25
Uttlesford	12.5	12.5	12.5

For each 2.5% of increase the LCTS recipient(s) will need to pay, on average, an additional £39 of Council Tax each year. The cost to the council of keeping the rate at 12.5% would be approximately £340,000. For each 2.5% increase the cost of the scheme for Uttlesford District Council would reduce by approximately £5,100.

Should the council keep the rate at 12.5% for a fourth year? Yes No

If you wish to add a comment, please do so below:

3. In simple terms, parish and town councils set their budgets by deciding how much money they need to run their services and then dividing that amount by the number of homes in their area.

The LCTS scheme reduces the amount of money the parish will receive as some households will not pay full Council Tax. For the last three years the council has provided grants to parish and town councils to make up the difference. In 2016/17 this cost £154,000. The council proposes to reduce this grant by 50% next year. The table on the opposite page shows how much each parish received in 2016/17 and how much they would have received if the grant had been reduced by 50%. It would be up to each parish/town council to decide if they wished to cover the shortfall in grant by increasing their part of the Council Tax.

Do you think the council should:

Continue to pay the full grant Reduce the grant by 50%

If you wish to add a comment, please do so below:

Grant Payment (£)					
Parish/Town Council	100%	50%	Parish/Town Council	100%	50%
Arkesden	130	65	Leaden Roding	458	229
Ashdon	658	329	Lindsell	0	0
Aythorpe Roding	48	24	Little Bardfield	190	95
Barnston	1,183	592	Little Canfield	591	295
Berden	248	124	Little Chesterford	48	24
Birchanger	1,016	508	Little Dunmow	698	349
Broxted	769	385	Little Easton	744	372
Chickney	0	0	Little Hallingbury	1,289	644
Chrishall	479	240	Littlebury	919	459
Clavering	503	252	Manuden	236	118
Debden	489	245	Margaret Roding	307	153
Elmdon & Wendens Lofts	357	179	Newport	3,076	1,538
Elsenham	2,650	1,325	Quendon & Rickling	970	485
Farnham	287	144	Radwinter	653	326
Felsted	3,321	1,661	Saffron Walden	56,194	28,097
Flitch Green	618	309	Sampfords, The	384	192
Great Canfield	27	14	Sewards End	144	72
Great Chesterford	2,048	1,024	Stansted	11,503	5,751
Great Dunmow	37,242	18,621	Stebbing	1,553	776
Great Easton & Tilty	798	399	Strethall	0	0
Great Hallingbury	394	197	Takeley	7,038	3,519
Hadstock	356	178	Thaxted	7,642	3,821
Hatfield Broad Oak	1,573	787	Ugley	226	113
Hatfield Heath	1,441	721	Wendens Ambo	310	155
Hempstead	352	176	White Roding	206	103
Henham	744	372	Wicken Bonhunt	87	43
High Easter	213	107	Widdington	384	192
High Roding	0	0	Wimbish	435	217
Langley	74	37			
	58,018	29,009		96,285	48,142
			Total	154,303	77,151

4. As part of central government's benefit reforms, rules are being changed for housing benefit and universal credit (two other types of benefit people can receive). The council is proposing to make the same changes to LCTS. By doing this, the council aims to make the LCTS system easier to understand for claimants and the criteria for all these different benefit schemes will be the same.

The proposals are:

- a) Reduce the time a claimant can be absent from the United Kingdom and continue to receive LCTS, from 6 weeks to 4 weeks.
Do you agree? Yes No
- b) Reduce the period for backdating a claim from 6 months to 1 month.
Do you agree? Yes No
- c) Removal of the family premium (an additional payment to people with children) for all new working applicants.
Do you agree? Yes No

d) Limit the number of children within the claim to a maximum of two (so even if a claimant has three or more children they will only receive LCTS payment based on having two children).

Do you agree? Yes No

e) Remove the severe disability premium (extra money paid to a severely disabled person to assist in employing a carer), if the claimant's carer already receives the carer's element through universal credit.

Do you agree? Yes No

f) Remove the work related activity element for new Employment and Support Allowance claimants.

Do you agree? Yes No

If you wish to add a comment about any of these proposed changes, please do so below:

5 If you have any further comments to make regarding the LCTS scheme please use the space below:

About you

Please enter your postcode here:

Are you in receipt of LCTS? Yes No

If yes, are you in a protected group (pensioner/disabled/carer)? Yes No

Next steps


This consultation will close on 30 September 2016.

The final scheme will be agreed by Uttlesford District Council's Full Council on 8 December 2016. This will be after the proposed scheme and results of the public consultation have been reviewed by the Scrutiny Committee on 22 November and by Cabinet on 30 November. The approved scheme will take effect from 1 April 2017.

Following the decision, the results from the consultation will be available on the Council's website.

4.3 Profiling Geographical distribution – paper survey returns

LCTS Consultation 2016



CB10	CB10	CB10	CB10	CB10	CB10	CB10	CB10
CB10	CB10	CB10 1AG	CB10 1AH	CB10 1AH	CB10 1AJ	CB10 1AJ	CB10 1AQ
CB10 1AT	CB10 1AW	CB10 1AW	CB10 1BD	CB10 1BD	CB10 1BD	CB10 1BD	CB10 1BD
CB10 1BJ	CB10 1BP	CB10 1BT	CB10 1BT	CB10 1BU	CB10 1DB	CB10 1DE	CB10 1DG
CB10 1DG	CB10 1DG	CB10 1DQ	CB10 1DZ	CB10 1DZ	CB10 1EE	CB10 1EJ	CB10 1EJ
CB10 1EJ	CB10 1ER	CB10 1EX	CB10 1JF	CB10 1JF	CB10 1JS	CB10 1JW	CB10 1LN
CB10 1LR	CB10 1LS	CB10 1LW	CB10 1LZ	CB10 1NA	CB10 1NA	CB10 1NB	CB10 1NB
CB10 1NG	CB10 1NW	CB10 1NW	CB10 1NY	CB10 1NY	CB10 1PA	CB10 1PH	CB10 1PH
CB10 1PL	CB10 1PL	CB10 1PT	CB10 1PT	CB10 1PU	CB10 1PX	CB10 1PX	CB10 1PY
CB10 1PZ	CB10 1PZ	CB10 1QA	CB10 1QB	CB10 1QB	CB10 1QB	CB10 1QB	CB10 1QD
CB10 1QD	CB10 1QE	CB10 1QG	CB10 1QG	CB10 1QH	CB10 1QP	CB10 1QQ	CB10 1QR
CB10 1TS	CB10 1TS	CB10 1UX	CB10 1UZ	CB10 1XF	CB10 1XF	CB10 1XG	CB10 2AA
CB10 2AB	CB10 2AB	CB10 2AD	CB10 2AE	CB10 2AH	CB10 2AL	CB10 2AN	CB10 2AN
CB10 2AN	CB10 2AP	CB10 2AP	CB10 2AR	CB10 2AS	CB10 2AS	CB10 2AT	CB10 2AT
CB10 2AX	CB10 2AX	CB10 2AX	CB10 2AX	CB10 2AX	CB10 2AX	CB10 2AZ	CB10 2BA
CB10 2BA	CB10 2BA	CB10 2BA	CB10 2BE	CB10 2BE	CB10 2BN	CB10 2BP	CB10 2BX
CB10 2BY	CB10 2DF	CB10 2DF	CB10 2DF	CB10 2DF	CB10 2DJ	CB10 2DL	CB10 2DN
CB10 2DP	CB10 2DP	CB10 2DR	CB10 2DR	CB10 2DS	CB10 2DS	CB10 2DW	CB10 2EA
CB10 2EA	CB10 2ED	CB10 2ED	CB10 2EE	CB10 2EF	CB10 2EH	CB10 2EQ	CB10 2ET
CB10 2EW	CB10 2GF	CB10 2GQ	CB10 2GQ	CB10 2GQ	CB10 2GT	CB10 2HA	CB10 2HG
CB10 2HG	CB10 2HN	CB10 2HT	CB10 2HW	CB10 2LF	CB10 2LG	CB10 2LR	CB10 2LR
CB10 2LZ	CB10 2NA	CB10 2OQ	CB10 2PA	CB10 2PD	CB10 2PE	CB10 2PR	CB10 2PW
CB10 2QJ	CB10 2QT	CB10 2QW	CB10 2QW	CB10 2QW	CB10 2RG	CB10 2RH	CB10 2RJ
CB10 2RP	CB10 2SE	CB10 2SE	CB10 2SL	CB10 2SR	CB10 2SR	CB10 2SW	CB10 2TE
CB10 2TE	CB10 2TE	CB10 2TH	CB10 2TJ	CB10 2TX	CB10 2TZ	CB10 2TZ	CB10 2UA
CB10 2XA	CB10 2XD	CB10 2XD	CB10 2XE	CB10 2XH	CB10 2XH	CB10 2XJ	CB10 2XJ
CB10 2XR	CB10 2XW	CB10 2XX	CB10 2XX	CB10 2YD	CB10 2YQ	CB10 2YY	CB10 2YY
CB11	CB11	CB11	CB11	CB11	CB11	CB11	CB11
CB11	CB11	CB11	CB11 2LF	CB11 3AA	CB11 3AA	CB11 3AB	CB11 3AD

CB11 3AD	CB11 3AE	CB11 3AE	CB11 3AE	CB11 3AF	CB11 3AG	CB11 3AR	CB11 3BJ
CB11 3BU	CB11 3BU	CB11 3BU	CB11 3BW	CB11 3DA	CB11 3DB	CB11 3DE	CB11 3DE
CB11 3DG	CB11 3DN	CB11 3DN	CB11 3DZ	CB11 3DZ	CB11 3EE	CB11 3EH	CB11 3EH
CB11 3EJ	CB11 3EL	CB11 3EQ	CB11 3ER	CB11 3ER	CB11 3ES	CB11 3EX	CB11 3EY
CB11 3EY	CB11 3EZ	CB11 3FA	CB11 3FA	CB11 3FH	CB11 3GA	CB11 3GA	CB11 3GP
CB11 3GR	CB11 3GZ	CB11 3HF	CB11 3HF	CB11 3HN	CB11 3HY	CB11 3HZ	CB11 3JF
CB11 3JW	CB11 3JW	CB11 3LD	CB11 3LE	CB11 3LG	CB11 3LN	CB11 3LN	CB11 3LN
CB11 3LN	CB11 3LT	CB11 3LW	CB11 3PT	CB11 3PU	CB11 3PU	CB11 3PU	CB11 3PX
CB11 3PZ	CB11 3PZ	CB11 3PZ	CB11 3QB	CB11 3QG	CB11 3QL	CB11 3QR	CB11 3QT
CB11 3QW	CB11 3QW	CB11 3RD	CB11 3RE	CB11 3RF	CB11 3RJ	CB11 3S	CB11 3SA
CB11 3SE	CB11 3SG	CB11 3SH	CB11 3SJ	CB11 3SR	CB11 3TH	CB11 3TJ	CB11 3TW
CB11 3UD	CB11 3UG	CB11 3UG	CB11 3UQ	CB11 3UZ	CB11 3UZ	CB11 3UZ	CB11 3WH
CB11 3WH	CB11 3XJ	CB11 3XJ	CB11 3XQ	CB11 3XQ	CB11 3XW	CB11 3XY	CB11 3YD
CB11 3YQ	CB11 3YQ	CB11 3YQ	CB11 4AA	CB11 4AF	CB11 4AG	CB11 4AH	CB11 4AL
CB11 4AP	CB11 4AW	CB11 4AY	CB11 4AZ	CB11 4BA	CB11 4BD	CB11 4BD	CB11 4BD
CB11 4BE	CB11 4BG	CB11 4BH	CB11 4BH	CB11 4BL	CB11 4BQ	CB11 4BT	CB11 4BU
CB11 4BU	CB11 4BZ	CB11 4BZ	CB11 4DA	CB11 4DB	CB11 4DH	CB11 4DH	CB11 4DJ
CB11 4DL	CB11 4DN	CB11 4DN	CB11 4DR	CB11 4DW	CB11 4DW	CB11 4DX	CB11 4DY
CB11 4EA	CB11 4EX	CB11 4GE	CB11 4GJ	CB11 4GT	CB11 4HB	CB11 4HJ	CB11 4JL
CB11 4JU	CB11 4JX	CB11 4JX	CB11 4JY	CB11 4LN	CB11 4LT	CB11 4LT	CB11 4LT
CB11 4NA	CB11 4PE	CB11 4PE	CB11 4PE	CB11 4PE	CB11 4PE	CB11 4PH	CB11 4PH
CB11 4PQ	CB11 4PU	CB11 4PX	CB11 4QL	CB11 4QL	CB11 4QR	CB11 4QS	CB11 4QT
CB11 4QU	CB11 4QU	CB11 4QU	CB11 4QU	CB11 4QX	CB11 4QY	CB11 4RS	CB11 4RU
CB11 4RU	CB11 4RY	CB11 4SB	CB11 4SB	CB11 4TA	CB11 4TA	CB11 4TA	CB11 4TG
CB11 4TJ	CB11 4TL	CB11 4TL	CB11 4TQ	CB11 4TR	CB11 4TS	CB11 4TS	CB11 4UR
CB11 4UU	CB11 4UU	CB11 4UU	CB11 4XB	CB11 4XB	CB11 4XB	CB11 4XG	CB11 4XG
CB11 4XJ	CB11 5PJ	CB11 JFA	CB21 4PF	CB21 4PH	CB21 4PH	CGQ 1UG	CLAVERING
CM1 4QS	CM1 4QT	CM1 4QW	CM1 4QY	CM1 4QZ	CM10 2HL	CM11 4PZ	CM22
CM22	CM22	CM22	CM22	CM22	CM22	CM22	CM22
CM22	CM22	CM22 1RA	CM22 6	CM22 6AB	CM22 6AE	CM22 6AF	CM22 6AF
CM22 6AG	CM22 6AG	CM22 6AG	CM22 6AL	CM22 6AQ	CM22 6AQ	CM22 6BN	CM22 6BN
CM22 6BN	CM22 6DD	CM22 6DG	CM22 6DH	CM22 6DH	CM22 6DP	CM22 6DQ	CM22 6DS


CM22 6ED	CM22 6EH	CM22 6FG	CM22 6FQ	CM22 6FS	CM22 6HE	CM22 6HT	CM22 6HY
CM22 6JS	CM22 6JS	CM22 6LA	CM22 6LB	CM22 6LD	CM22 6LL	CM22 6LR	CM22 6LT
CM22 6LY	CM22 6LZ	CM22 6MQ	CM22 6NR	CM22 6PE	CM22 6PP	CM22 6PU	CM22 6QA
CM22 6QH	CM22 6QH	CM22 6QJ	CM22 6QS	CM22 6QX	CM22 6QY	CM22 6QZ	CM22 6RA
CM22 6RD	CM22 6RG	CM22 6RG	CM22 6RJ	CM22 6RL	CM22 6RN	CM22 6RN	CM22 6RP
CM22 6RX	CM22 6RX	CM22 6RY	CM22 6SD	CM22 6SH	CM22 6SP	CM22 6SP	CM22 6SR
CM22 6TD	CM22 6TD	CM22 6TG	CM22 6TG	CM22 7AB	CM22 7AB	CM22 7AD	CM22 7AH
CM22 7AH	CM22 7BP	CM22 7BT	CM22 7DD	CM22 7EA	CM22 7EE	CM22 7EH	CM22 7EH
CM22 7EJ	CM22 7EL	CM22 7EP	CM22 7ER	CM22 7ET	CM22 7EU	CM22 7EZ	CM22 7EZ
CM22 7HG	CM22 7HJ	CM22 7HQ	CM22 7HQ	CM22 7HT	CM22 7HU	CM22 7IR	CM22 7JB
CM22 7JB	CM22 7JB	CM22 7JF	CM22 7JF	CM22 7JF	CM22 7JR	CM22 7JR	CM22 7JT
CM22 7JW	CM22 7LL	CM22 7PH	CM22 7PH	CM22 7PH	CM22 7PS	CM22 7PU	CM22 7PY
CM22 7QF	CM22 7QS	CM22 7QS	CM22 7QU	CM22 7QY	CM22 7QY	CM22 7QZ	CM22 7QZ
CM22 7RE	CM22 7RF	CM22 7RF	CM22 7RF	CM22 7RG	CM22 7RH	CM22 7RH	CM22 7RL
CM22 7RL	CM22 7RL	CM22 7RR	CM22 7RZ	CM22 7SF	CM22 7SN	CM22 7TF	CM22 7TP
CM22 7TQ	CM22 7TR	CM22 7TR	CM22 7TY	CM22 7UU	CM23	CM23 1AE	CM23 1AL
CM23 1AX	CM23 1BG	CM23 1DP	CM23 1DR	CM23 1DR	CM23 1HB	CM23 1HD	CM23 1HG
CM23 1HP	CM23 1HS	CM23 1HT	CM23 1HU	CM23 1HZ	CM23 1JR	CM23 1JR	CM23 5FF
CM23 5QA	CM23 5QD	CM23 5QG	CM23 5QG	CM23 5QG	CM23 5QH	CM23 5QJ	CM23 5QL
CM23 5QL	CM23 5QL	CM23 5QL	CM23 5QP	CM23 5QT	CM23 5QT	CM23 8DL	CM24
CM24 8	CM24 8	CM24 8AH	CM24 8AH	CM24 8AR	CM24 8AR	CM24 8AU	CM24 8AX
CM24 8AY	CM24 8BB	CM24 8DA	CM24 8DA	CM24 8DG	CM24 8DG	CM24 8DH	CM24 8DN
CM24 8DS	CM24 8DT	CM24 8EA	CM24 8ED	CM24 8EJ	CM24 8EL	CM24 8ES	CM24 8FE
CM24 8FP	CM24 8FQ	CM24 8FQ	CM24 8FU	CM24 8GD	CM24 8GJ	CM24 8GQ	CM24 8GY
CM24 8HG	CM24 8HG	CM24 8HG	CM24 8HJ	CM24 8HP	CM24 8HW	CM24 8HW	CM24 8JA
CM24 8JA	CM24 8JB	CM24 8JD	CM24 8JD	CM24 8JD	CM24 8JE	CM24 8JS	CM24 8JS
CM24 8JT	CM24 8JW	CM24 8JX	CM24 8LB	CM24 8LD	CM24 8LE	CM24 8NF	CM24 8NJ
CM24 8NL	CM24 8NN	CM24 8NR	CM24 8NT	CM24 8NT	CM24 8PA	CM24 8QA	CM24 8QB
CM24 8RT	CM24 8SH	CM24 8SN	CM24 8SS	CM24 8SS	CM24 8SU	CM24 8TJ	CM24 8TJ
CM24 8TQ	CM24 8UJ	CM24 8UW	CM24 8UX	CM24 8VY	CM3 1HU	CM3 1HY	CM3 1JY
CM3 1QB	CM3 1QG	CM3 1QH	CM6	CM6	CM6	CM6	CM6
CM6	CM6	CM6	CM6 1AA	CM6 1AF	CM6 1AH	CM6 1AS	CM6 1AS

CM6 1BA	CM6 1BH	CM6 1BH	CM6 1BH	CM6 1BK	CM6 1BP	CM6 1BP	CM6 1BP
CM6 1BQ	CM6 1BS	CM6 1BS	CM6 1BS	CM6 1BU	CM6 1BU	CM6 1BU	CM6 1BW
CM6 1BW	CM6 1BX	CM6 1BX	CM6 1BX	CM6 1BY	CM6 1BY	CM6 1BZ	CM6 1DL
CM6 1DN	CM6 1DP	CM6 1DR	CM6 1DS	CM6 1DT	CM6 1DY	CM6 1EA	CM6 1EE
CM6 1EE	CM6 1EL	CM6 1EP	CM6 1EP	CM6 1ER	CM6 1ER	CM6 1ES	CM6 1ES
CM6 1ES	CM6 1EW	CM6 1EZ	CM6 1FB	CM6 1FF	CM6 1FP	CM6 1FR	CM6 1FS
CM6 1FT	CM6 1FW	CM6 1FY	CM6 1GA	CM6 1GA	CM6 1GA	CM6 1GB	CM6 1GB
CM6 1GP	CM6 1HG	CM6 1HG	CM6 1HJ	CM6 1HJ	CM6 1HN	CM6 1HN	CM6 1JP
CM6 1JS	CM6 1JT	CM6 1JU	CM6 1LR	CM6 1LU	CM6 1LY	CM6 1LZ	CM6 1LZ
CM6 1NF	CM6 1NJ	CM6 1NR	CM6 1OD	CM6 1PD	CM6 1PH	CM6 1PJ	CM6 1PL
CM6 1PL	CM6 1PL	CM6 1PT	CM6 1PW	CM6 1PX	CM6 1QA	CM6 1QB	CM6 1QD
CM6 1QD	CM6 1QZ	CM6 1RG	CM6 1RJ	CM6 1RJ	CM6 1RP	CM6 1RS	CM6 1RT
CM6 1RU	CM6 1RY	CM6 1SQ	CM6 1SY	CM6 1TD	CM6 1TD	CM6 1TF	CM6 1TR
CM6 1TR	CM6 1TR	CM6 1TY	CM6 1UD	CM6 1UD	CM6 1UD	CM6 1UG	CM6 1UH
CM6 1UH	CM6 1UL	CM6 1UN	CM6 1UQ	CM6 1US	CM6 1WJ	CM6 1WJ	CM6 1WL
CM6 1WL	CM6 1WP	CM6 1WS	CM6 1WX	CM6 1WZ	CM6 1XA	CM6 1XA	CM6 1XQ
CM6 1XQ	CM6 1XQ	CM6 1XQ	CM6 1XQ	CM6 1XQ	CM6 1XU	CM6 1XW	CM6 1XW
CM6 1XW	CM6 1XW	CM6 1XW	CM6 1XW	CM6 1XW	CM6 1YD	CM6 1YN	CM6 1YT
CM6 1YY	CM6 1ZG	CM6 1ZH	CM6 1ZT	CM6 2AA	CM6 2AA	CM6 2AE	CM6 2AG
CM6 2AG	CM6 2AN	CM6 2AQ	CM6 2AT	CM6 2AT	CM6 2AT	CM6 2AY	CM6 2AY
CM6 2AY	CM6 2BA	CM6 2BH	CM6 2BL	CM6 2BT	CM6 2BU	CM6 2BW	CM6 2DD
CM6 2DD	CM6 2DN	CM6 2DW	CM6 2DX	CM6 2EA	CM6 2EA	CM6 2EJ	CM6 2FH
CM6 2FH	CM6 2FH	CM6 2FL	CM6 2HA	CM6 2HE	CM6 2HR	CM6 2HR	CM6 2HR
CM6 2JB	CM6 2JJ	CM6 2JT	CM6 2JT	CM6 2JX	CM6 2JX	CM6 2JX	CM6 2LD
CM6 2LH	CM6 2LJ	CM6 2LJ	CM6 2LL	CM6 2LP	CM6 2LP	CM6 2LU	CM6 2ND
CM6 2ND	CM6 2NE	CM6 2NJ	CM6 2NN	CM6 2NR	CM6 2NU	CM6 2NX	CM6 2PB
CM6 2PF	CM6 2PQ	CM6 2PX	CM6 2PY	CM6 2PY	CM6 2QD	CM6 2QD	CM6 2QS
CM6 2QS	CM6 2QT	CM6 2QW	CM6 2QW	CM6 2QX	CM6 2QY	CM6 2QY	CM6 2QZ
CM6 2RA	CM6 2RJ	CM6 2RQ	CM6 2SE	CM6 2SE	CM6 2SQ	CM6 3AA	CM6 3AP
CM6 3AR	CM6 3AR	CM6 3AU	CM6 3AX	CM6 3AY	CM6 3AY	CM6 3AZ	CM6 3BD
CM6 3BE	CM6 3BH	CM6 3BQ	CM6 3DF	CM6 3DP	CM6 3DR	CM6 3DT	CM6 3DU
CM6 3DY	CM6 3DY	CM6 3EF	CM6 3EF	CM6 3EG	CM6 3EG	CM6 3EG	CM6 3EG

CM6 3EH	CM6 3EH	CM6 3EJ	CM6 3EP	CM6 3EP	CM6 3ET	CM6 3EZ	CM6 3FL
CM6 3FR	CM6 3FU	CM6 3GB	CM6 3GB	CM6 3GF	CM6 3GL	CM6 3GR	CM6 3HQ
CM6 3HT	CM6 3HX	CM6 3HY	CM6 3JF	CM6 3LA	CM6 3LR	CM6 3LU	CM6 3NA
CM6 3NE	CM6 3NE	CM6 3NG	CM6 3NG	CM6 3NH	CM6 3NJ	CM6 3NN	CM6 3NN
CM6 3NP	CM6 3NP	CM6 3NQ	CM6 3NW	CM6 3NY	CM6 3PP	CM6 3PR	CM6 3PR
CM6 3PR	CM6 3QF	CM6 3QH	CM6 3QL	CM6 3QL	CM6 3QN	CM6 3QN	CM6 3QQ
CM6 3QR	CM6 3QR	CM6 3QS	CM6 3QU	CM6 3QU	CM6 3RA	CM6 3RG	CM6 3RP
CM6 3RW	CM6 3RZ	CM6 3SA	CM6 3SA	CM6 3SA	CM6 3SA	CM6 3SA	CM6 3SA
CM6 3SA	CM6 3SG	CM6 3SG	CM6 3SP	CM6 3SQ	CM6 3ST	CM6 3SU	CM6 3SW
CM6 3SX	CM6 3SX	CM6 3TE	CM6 3TE	CM6 3ZT	CM7 2FE	CM7 4TN	CM7 4TR
CM77 6SP	Hatfield Broad Oak	Saffron Walden	SG8 8QJ	SG8 8QL	SG8 8QN	SG8 8QN	SG8 8QX
SG8 8RB	SG8 8RP						

Geographical distribution – online survey returns

LCTS Consultation 2016



CB10 1BH	CB10 1DQ	CB10 1EY	CB10 1EY	CB10 2AL	CB10 2GF	CB10 2LQ	CB10 2SE
CB10 2XJ	CB101TS	CB102HZ	CB11	CB11 3AR	CB11 3BW	CB11 3ER	CB11 3GP
CB11 3QD	CB11 3QT	CB11 3WH	CB11 4AQ	CB11 4QU	CB110 1AT	CB113AF	CB114DH
CM22 6EL	CM22 6LP	CM22 7DH	CM22 7DL	CM22 7HX	CM227ER	CM23 1AX	CM23 1AX
CM23 1DL	CM24 8AN	CM24 8AX	CM24 8GA	CM24 8JF	CM24 8LQ	CM24 8PB	CM6 1AP
CM6 1AS	CM6 1BS	CM6 1BS	CM6 1DW	CM6 1EP	CM6 1GA	CM6 1HG	CM6 1JE
CM6 1JN	CM6 1JQ	CM6 1LY	CM6 1PH	CM6 1QH	CM6 1QT	CM6 1QW	CM6 1TP
CM6 1XQ	CM6 1XW	CM6 1YQ	CM6 1ZH	CM6 2AB	CM6 2EA	CM6 2ED	CM6 2FJ
CM6 2HQ	CM6 2HR	CM6 2JG	CM6 2LD	CM6 2LJ	CM6 3FZ	CM6 3GL	CM6 3HT
CM6 3JF	CM6 3NA	CM6 3NQ	CM6 3PZ	CM6 3QH	CM6 3TE	CM6 3TT	CM61BH
CM61ED	CM61QU	CM62HQ	CM63DP	CM63EF	CM63GB	CM63JF	