

	% Agree option	% Agree Option	Comments	Recommendation
	Residents	Stakeholders		
<p>Option 1 - Reducing the maximum level of support for working age applicants from 81.5% to 80%</p> <p>£3,500 people £6,500 TWBC £43,500 Preceptors £0.27 average impact</p>	62%	66.7%	<p>The majority of respondents were in favour of option 1, reducing the maximum level of support of working age applicants from 81.5% to 80%.</p> <p>Respondents with a disability were not in favour of option one there is a 21% difference between those with a disability and those without in favour of this option.</p>	Implement – exceptional cases resulting from vulnerability addressed through hardship scheme
<p>Option 2 - Removing the Family Premium for all new working age applicants</p> <p>460 people £11,000 TWBC £72,000 Preceptors £3.49 average impact</p>	47%	60%	<p>Overall, the greatest proportion of respondents (47%), were in favour of removing the family premium for all new working age applicants. However, the graphs below show that there significant variances in support for this option between groups.</p> <p>As a group women were not in favour of option 2.</p>	Implement
<p>Option 3 - Reducing backdating to one month</p> <p>50 people £500 TWBC £2,000 Preceptors £0.92 average impact</p>	77%	60%	<p>The majority of respondents said they were in favour of reducing the backdating of Council Tax Benefit applications to one month with comments referencing the need to take responsibility.</p> <p>The lowest levels of agreement with this option came from respondents with a disability with comments highlighting concerns that assistance may be required or delay unavoidable.</p>	Implement – exceptional cases resulting from vulnerability addressed through hardship scheme.
<p>Option 4 - Using a set income for self-employed earners after one year's self-employment</p>	48%	60%	<p>Comments express concern that does not allow new starters time to grow; self-employed often work longer hours to earn a basic income and national incentives to encourage</p>	Implement – period extended to 18 months.

<p>320 people £22,000 TWBC £147,000 Preceptors £15.35 average impact</p>			entrepreneurship.	
<p>Option 5 - Option 5 Reducing the period for which a person can be absent from Great Britain and still receive Council Tax Reduction to four weeks</p> <p>No data.</p>	78%	80%	Respondents from BME groups had higher levels of agreement with this option, 88%.	Implement
<p>Option 6 - Reducing the capital limit from the existing £16,000 to £6,000</p> <p>46 people £4,000 TWBC £28,000 Preceptors £13.30 average impact</p>	57%	0%	<p>People without a disability were almost 50% more likely to be in favour of this option compared to those with a disability.</p> <p>Comments express concern in relation to inheritance and that this option does not encourage saving. Other comments state if they have the money they should not be claiming benefit.</p>	Implement – savings limit amended to £10,000
<p>Option 7 - To introduce a standard level of non-dependant deduction of £10 for all claimants who have non dependants resident with them.</p> <p>191 people £7,000 TWBC £48,000 Preceptors £5.60 average impact</p>	72%	80%	The majority of respondents were in favour of option 7. That trend was reflected across all groupings.	Implement
<p>Option 8 - To take any Child Maintenance paid to a claimant or partner into account in full in the calculation of Council Tax Reduction</p> <p>202 people £11,500 TWBC £76,500 Preceptors</p>	53%	20%	<p>Comments suggest maintenance is an income and that all income should be considered when calculating benefits. While others suggest that child maintenance is for the child and not the adult and therefore should not be considered as part of the household income.</p> <p>Women also had lower levels of agreement</p>	Implement

£8.36 average impact			with this option compared to men.	
<p>Option 9 - To restrict the maximum level of Council Tax Reduction payable to the equivalent of a Band D charge</p> <p>171 people £9,500 TWBC £63,500 Preceptors £8.11 average impact</p>	57%	60%	<p>There is a 29% difference in levels of agreement between respondents with a disability and those without. The comments suggest there could be a concern about having room for carers and or equipment, with these being reason for requiring a larger property.</p> <p>Note: Council tax band reduction available to disabled residents and disregard (25%) for carers. Subject to qualifying criteria.</p>	Implement
<p>Option 10 - To remove Second Adult Reduction from the scheme</p> <p>21 people £500 TWBC £4,000 Preceptors £4.02 average impact</p>	59%	20%	<p>Overall, 59% of respondents were in favour of option 10. There are three groups where the levels of agreement are significantly lower than their counterparts. 26% of respondents with a disability agreed with this option. Council Tax benefit recipients also had lower levels of agreement at 40% compared to 67% for non-claimants.</p>	Implement
<p>Option 11 - To remove the work related activity component in the calculation of Council Tax Reduction</p> <p>No data</p>	54%	60%	<p>Disabled respondents had the lowest levels of agreement with this option at 34%, and there is an 23% difference in agreement between this group and respondents without a disability.</p>	Implement
<p>Option 12 - To limit to number of dependent children within the calculation for Council Tax Reduction to a maximum of two</p> <p>42 people £3,500 TWBC £18,000 Preceptors £9.88 average impact</p>	71%	60%	<p>The majority of respondents are in favour of option 12 – with high levels of agreement were seen across all groups.</p>	Implement
<p>Option 13 - To introduce a scheme, in addition to Council Tax</p>	79%	100%	<p>The majority of respondents are in favour of option 13 – with high levels of agreement</p>	Implement

*Reduction, to help applicants
suffering exceptional hardship*

No data.

were seen across all groups.