

**List of Matters Considered in the Public Consultation but NOT
being put Forward as Proposed Changes with Associated Rationale**

Questions in the Consultation	Rationale
Increase the minimum contribution from 8% to 12%	This was supported by 38.2% of all valid respondents to the consultation as opposed to 51.3% who disagreed; the remainder remaining silent or neutral on the question. This contrasted to the more acceptable option of an increase to 10% as explained Appendix 2.
Remove the Family Premium for <u>all</u> working age claimants	This was supported by 48.7% of all valid respondents to the consultation as opposed to 35.6% who disagreed; the remainder remaining silent or neutral on the question. So whilst more were in favour of this option than against respondents gave a stronger preference for the gradual removal of Family Premium suggested in the option in Appendix 2.
Keep the current CTSS exactly the same	<p>This was supported by 44.9% of all valid respondents to the consultation as opposed to 40.9% who disagreed; the remainder remaining silent or neutral on the question. In many respects this was the most finely balanced of all the opinions obtained.</p> <p>The WRTFG did not consider this a viable option however as there was not a clear majority position and several of the other options (5, 6 and 7 for example) had given clear preference for changes amongst all residents thus creating a clear inconsistency with this view.</p>
Seek to fund the CTSS specifically by a general increase in the Council Tax	This was supported by 17.7% of all valid respondents to the consultation as opposed to 67.4% who disagreed; the remainder remaining silent or neutral on the question. This was the suggestion that respondents most clearly disagreed with. The WRTFG did not consider this a viable option due to the level of general unacceptability – both CTS recipients and general residents alike taking a majority position against this option.
Seek to fund the CTSS specifically by reducing other services	This was supported by 18.6% of all valid respondents to the consultation as opposed to 64% who disagreed; the remainder remaining silent or neutral on the question. So, whilst slightly more acceptable than the previous option respondents were clearly not

APPENDIX 3

	<p>in favour of CTSS being funded at the expense of a loss of service elsewhere.</p> <p>Again, the WRTFG did not consider this a viable option due to the level of general unacceptability – both CTS recipients and general residents alike taking a majority position against this option.</p>
Seek to fund the CTSS specifically by using reserves	<p>This was supported by 24.5% of all valid respondents to the consultation as opposed to 56.8% who disagreed; the remainder remaining silent or neutral on the question. So, whilst more acceptable than the previous two alternate funding options respondents were not in favour of CTSS being funded by the use of reserves. Once again, the WRTFG did not consider this a viable option due to the level of general unacceptability – but did note the difference in view regarding this option in that CTS recipients were more inclined to favour this funding option whilst general residents were strongly opposed.</p>