

Appendix 2 - Summary of responses from key stakeholders and preceptors

Question	Law Centre	Labour Group	County	GCC Comment
<p>Do you agree that a minimum payment should be introduced and all residents should contribute something towards their Council Tax?</p>	<p>Not supported with additional comment that small values can be unaffordable</p>	<p>We would oppose the introduction of contributions towards Council Tax for the poorest residents of the City, for example those in receipt of means-tested benefits who are often living in poverty. We are aware that the Supreme Court has recently found, in another context, that means-tested benefit levels such as income support “are not generally designed to provide a surplus above subsistence needs for the family” and the introduction of a minimum payment for the very poorest residents will cause serious hardship, whatever level they are set at. We are reminded of the disaster of the Poll Tax with the same</p>	<p>Supported with recognition that 100% support are no longer feasible and several other local councils in Gloucestershire have already reduced levels of support</p>	<p>In light of increasing financial pressure the cost of maintaining a 100% scheme will place undue pressure on council finances</p>

		principle of minimum payments for all		
If a minimum payment was introduced how much do you think the minimum payment should be?	As low as possible	If despite our answer above a decision is taken to introduce a minimum payment then it should be at the lowest possible rate	Happy to support the decision of GCC	10% minimum would be the lowest value to make the change viable to implement
If a minimum payment was introduced do you think it should be introduced over two years with part of the minimum payment withheld until 2021/22?	A phased approach would be supported if a minimum payment was to be introduced	Yes – anything which eases the burden on hard-pressed residents should be considered	Not to stagger the introduction	At 10% it would not be cost effective to stagger the introduction of a minimum payment
Do you think any of the following groups should be protected from having to pay any Council Tax and remain eligible for up to 100% support?	Protection should be considered to households with young children, disability or caring responsibilities	Yes, we agree that the groups listed should be protected, together with any other vulnerable classes of resident	No preference to apply any protection	This would add complexity to the administration of the claim  EQIA does not show a disproportionate impact on households with these characteristics. Mitigation can be applied in different ways

<p>Do you agree that a minimum income change level should be introduced for households who receive Universal Credit?</p>	<p>Fear that some households may lose out high levels of support</p>	<p>We would have concerns about this, although we appreciate that the alternative of adjusting benefit every time income changes is very costly for the authority. However, we question why the very poorest in the community should have to accept that they could be out of pocket when this would not be acceptable to others on a higher income, for example in a calculation as to how much tax an individual is due to pay</p>	<p>Agree with proposal</p>	<p>It is true there are likely to be winners and losers in adopting this approach.</p> <p>The maximum loss per month could equate to approximately £30 if the level is set at £60 for UC changes</p> <p>Evidence for other councils that a £100 tolerance level is reducing the number of changes by 50%</p>
<p>If a minimum income change level is introduced what amount do you think it should be set at?</p>	<p>As low as possible</p>	<p>Any minimum income change level should be set as low as possible, given that by definition these proposals are going to affect the poorest residents of the City</p>	<p>No preference and will support the decision of the council</p>	

<p>Do you think the council should use information passed to it by the DWP to determine awards of LCTS without the requirement for a separate claim form to be completed where the communication from the DWP contains all of the required information to determine whether an award should be made?</p>	<p>Agree with proposal</p>	<p>Agree with proposal</p>	<p>Agree with proposal</p>	
<p>Do you agree that the same applicable amount should be used in the assessment of LCTS whenever a household has had a determination of a claim for Universal Credit?</p>	<p>Agree with proposal</p>	<p>We think this is probably acceptable</p>	<p>Agree with proposal</p>	
<p>Do you agree the council should not use data provided by the DWP in the assessment of LCTS where evidence is held which indicates that information is incorrect or there is a</p>	<p>Agree with this proposal</p>	<p>We are not sure about this. Certainly, any decision to follow this procedure should be made as transparent as possible and residents affected have a clear</p>	<p>Agree with proposal</p>	

<p>suspicion of fraudulent activity?</p>		<p>explanation as to what has happened and why, and given the opportunity to respond and query the evidence relied on</p>		
<p>Do you agree that all non-dependant adults should be considered as part of the household for purposes of calculating a non-dependant deduction?</p>	<p>Unsure. Fear that households will be disadvantaged by this change</p>	<p>We would need further information on the effect of this proposal as it is unclear to us what the effect might be</p>	<p>Agree with proposal</p>	<p>The level of deduction would equate to approximately one-seventh of the rent charge for a single room in a shared property</p> <p>Households letting rooms in their own homes would continue to be better off from doing so and have incomes above the minimum income</p>
<p>Do you agree that the level of non-dependant deduction applied should be calculated on the level of earnings and not be affected by the number of hours worked for working age LCTS claims?</p>	<p>Agree that level of deductions should be based on the wages received not the hours worked</p>	<p>Agree with proposal</p>	<p>Agree with proposal</p>	

<p>Do you agree that the level of non-dependant deduction applied should be calculated on the level of earnings and not be affected by the number of hours worked for pension age LCTS claims?</p>	<p>Agree with proposal</p>	<p>Agree with proposal</p>	<p>Agree with proposal</p>	<p>This proposal to make the level of non-dependant deductions more generous for pensioners has been withdrawn – it is not considered appropriate at this time to add further protection to this group when reducing levels of support elsewhere.</p>
<p>Do you agree that the level of non-dependant deduction should be changed to the amounts in the table above?</p>	<p>No believe they should remain the same.  This view is based on the inability of some householders to collect the money from the non-dependant</p>	<p>We have concerns about this and would like further explanation and examples, as it will obviously make some residents worse off than they are now</p>	<p>Agree with proposal to simplify the scheme</p>	<p>This proposal has been amended in line with consultation comments</p>
<p>Do you agree that Second Adult Rebate should be removed from the scheme?</p>	<p>Unsure. Some households do rely on this support</p>	<p>Yes probably – it doesn't seem that this is widely used</p>	<p>Agree with proposal</p>	<p>If the liable tax payer receives a low income they will be eligible for support through the LCTS scheme.</p>
<p>Do you agree that Extended Payment Periods should be removed from the scheme?</p>	<p>Agree with proposal</p>	<p>Agree with proposal</p>	<p>Agree with proposal</p>	<p>This proposal was not supported in the main consultation therefore we have withdrawn this proposal</p>