

List of Recommendations for Change and the Supporting Rationale

Recommendations	Rationale
<p>Increase the minimum contribution from 8% to 10%</p>	<p>This was supported by 52.7% of all valid respondents to the consultation as opposed to 35.3% who disagreed; the remainder remaining silent or neutral on the question. There was strong support for this option amongst residents generally and even a level of acceptability proffered amongst those in receipt of CTS. This response contrasts quite starkly to the response to the 12% option, which had a majority against that option and was much more strongly opposed amongst recipients of CTS. Financially the WRTFG considered this presented a potentially affordable option for residents, leaving those in Band C properties (most typical in Rushmoor) facing minimum payments of around £2.54 per week equating to around £132.45 annually as opposed to £1324.52 for a full rate (thus retaining an annual discount of around £1,000).</p>
<p>Remove the Family Premium for <u>new</u> working age claimants</p>	<p>This option was supported by 52% of all valid respondents to the consultation as opposed to 32.3% who disagreed; the remainder remaining silent or neutral on the question. There was strong support for this option amongst residents generally and also a level of acceptability amongst those in receipt of CTS. This response contrasts with the response to the option to remove the Family Premium for all working age claimants which carried less support generally, although was much more strongly opposed amongst recipients of CTS. The WRTFG considered this a viable option, as this would mirror the arrangements from 1st April 2016 for Housing Benefit (HB) applicants (many applicants in Rushmoor access both HB and CTS via a single application process currently). The approach of removing the premium for new claimants only was seen as offering a way of phasing in this change over time.</p>
<p>Reduce the amount of savings from £16,000 to £6,000 before claiming CTS</p>	<p>This option was supported by 63.2% of all valid respondents to the consultation as opposed to 27.9% who disagreed; the remainder remaining silent or neutral on the question. There was a majority in favour of this option amongst residents generally and also amongst those in receipt of CTS (where it was actually the most strongly supported of all the options for change). The WRTFG considered this a viable option as this would affect relatively few people (estimated less than 50), would serve the principle of trying to focus support to “the most vulnerable” which this group seemed</p>

APPENDIX 2

	<p>somewhat at odds with and this change seemed to strongly resonate with residents (receiving strong support and attracting some 179 freeform additional comments - the most of any of the specific proposed changes other than the general % increase proposals).</p>
<p>Limit support at the Band D level for those living in properties banded higher than D</p>	<p>This option was supported by 63.3% of all valid respondents to the consultation as opposed to 21.2% who disagreed; the remainder remaining silent or neutral on the question. There was a majority in favour of this option amongst residents generally and also amongst those in receipt of CTS. The WRTFG considered this a viable option as this would affect relatively few people (estimated less than 50), would still provide a degree of support to those living in the higher banded properties and seemed to strongly resonate with residents (receiving strong support and attracting some 147 freeform additional comments – with a focus on fairness and options to move to smaller properties being common themes).</p>
<p>Reduce the limit of backdated claims to four weeks</p>	<p>This option was supported by 67.5% of all valid respondents to the consultation as opposed to 20.1% who disagreed; the remainder remaining silent or neutral on the question. There was a majority in favour of this option amongst residents generally and also amongst those in receipt of CTS. The WRTFG considered this a viable option as this would mirror the arrangements from 1st April 2016 for Housing Benefit (HB) applicants (many applicants in Rushmoor access both HB and CTS via a single application process currently). Furthermore the change was not considered likely to affect a significant number of people (it would have affected a maximum number of 78 in the previous year). The proposal also seemed to strongly resonate with residents (receiving the strongest support and attracting some 145 freeform additional comments – with a focus on 4 weeks being a reasonable amount of time and some sense that the Council should be able to make provisions for “exceptions”).</p>