

West Devon Borough Council - Draft Council Tax Reduction Scheme

1. Page 1

2. Page 2

1. Do you agree with the Proposal 1 to remove the Family Premium for all new working age applicants?						Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes					47.83%	11
2	No					26.09%	6
3	Don't know					26.09%	6
Analysis						answered	23
	Mean:	1.78	Std. Deviation:	0.83	Satisfaction Rate:	39.13	
	Variance:	0.69	Std. Error:	0.17			skipped
							0

3. Page 3

2. If you disagree, what alternative do you propose?			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question		100.00%	5
1	03/08/16 9:15AM ID: 42383867	charge more for second home owners		
2	22/08/16 12:23PM ID: 43070574	why remove it as it helps parents work		
3	23/08/16 9:13AM ID: 43107578	keep the current scheme		
4	02/09/16 10:49PM ID: 43574278	If you remove it only for new claimants then you are being discriminatory in your dealings with your constituents. You must either not implement this action or apply it to existing claimants too, otherwise you may be forced to spend much more than you save by having to defend your discriminatory policies through the Law Lords Courts of appeal. "What is fair for one is fair for all," would accumulate more monies and prevent expensive legal battles and also prevent social unrest between the haves and the cannot gets.		
5	06/09/16 12:56PM ID: 43694356	Each families needs should be assessed on their real needs regardless of age. Whether existing or new claimants, all should be treated the same.		
			answered	5
			skipped	18

4. Page 4

3. Do you agree with the Proposal 2 to reduce the backdating to 1 month?				Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes			68.18%	15
2	No			27.27%	6

3. Do you agree with the Proposal 2 to reduce the backdating to 1 month?						Response Percent	Response Total	
3	Don't know					4.55%	1	
Analysis	Mean:	1.36	Std. Deviation:	0.57	Satisfaction Rate:	18.18	answered	22
	Variance:	0.32	Std. Error:	0.12			skipped	1

5. Page 5

4. If you disagree, what alternative do you propose?			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question		100.00%	4
1	16/07/16 11:41AM ID: 41606098	Leave it as it is		
2	03/08/16 9:15AM ID: 42383867	3 months sounds more practical and fairer to me.		
3	02/09/16 10:49PM ID: 43574278	do not change it. this will only serve too force people who through no fault of their own are already facing extreme poverty. If you corner a wild, desperate beast it will attack you to preserve its own life. Humans are only animals and under severe duress will resort to theft to replace money they need too feed and prevent themselves from dying from Hypothermia that they have given to you under extreme duress. they will also be made Mentally ill and unstable by the stresses you place them under and this will lead to destruction and theft of council property, which will need to be replaced and repaired and will negate any extra monies raised by your proposals.		
4	06/09/16 12:56PM ID: 43694356	Claimants should be assessed on their real need and their circumstances should be taken into account re backdating of claims etc.		
			answered	4
			skipped	19

6. Page 6

5. Do you agree with the Proposal 3 to use a set Minimum Income Floor for self-employed earners after 1 year's self-employment?						Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Yes					69.57%	16	
2	No					26.09%	6	
3	Don't know					4.35%	1	
Analysis	Mean:	1.35	Std. Deviation:	0.56	Satisfaction Rate:	17.39	answered	23
	Variance:	0.31	Std. Error:	0.12			skipped	0

7. Page 7

6. If you disagree, what alternative do you propose?			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question		100.00%	3

6. If you disagree, what alternative do you propose?			Response Percent	Response Total
1	16/07/16 11:41AM ID: 41606098	Base the calculations on a claimants exact income figures, not an assumed one.		
2	02/09/16 10:49PM ID: 43574278	As any competent person is aware the first 2 to 4 years of a startup buissness are the most critical and most people who go on to build their business and become employers will pay themselves less than the monies they would rcieve from JSA during the first 2-3 years. Therefore your stated aim of increasing employment through giving less support through the most critical period of a new business venture's start up phase is severely flawed and will result in the exact opposite result too that which you claim to aspire too.		
3	06/09/16 12:56PM ID: 43694356	Having been self employed for a number of years I know you have no guarantee of income. Actual proof should be used as earnings and ability to pay (nothing should be assumed as to income)		
			answered	3
			skipped	20

8. Page 8

7. Do you agree with the Proposal 4 to reduce the period a person can be absent from Great Britain, and still receive Council Tax Reduction to 4 weeks?					Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Yes	<input type="text"/>			73.91%	17	
2	No	<input type="text"/>			17.39%	4	
3	Don't know	<input type="text"/>			8.70%	2	
Analysis	Mean:	1.35	Std. Deviation:	0.63	Satisfaction Rate:	17.39	
	Variance:	0.4	Std. Error:	0.13			
						answered	23
						skipped	0

9. Page 9

8. If you disagree, what alternative do you propose?			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question		100.00%	3
1	27/07/16 6:04PM ID: 42090130	8 weeks		
2	02/09/16 10:49PM ID: 43574278	You cannot have exceptions because this will be seen as discriminatory. You cannot say that a person can be allowed to be out of the country for four weeks and a the same time say that because they may be gone for longer and that is what you have said "may be" not are going to be. That under those hypothetical conditions they should not receive the first four weeks of benefit that they are legally entitled too. Otherwise you must say that all people must have their benefits stopped on the day they leave the country and reapply on their return using the four week backdated claim system you propose to introduce. Otherwise the regulations would not be legally enforceable and the High court of Appeal will overturn them; granting costs to the appellants.		
3	06/09/16 12:56PM ID: 43694356	If the agreed time of absence from the country is to be reduced it should be the same for all, with exceptions for all if real need of absence can be proved. ie Marriage, visit loved ones, compassion should be shown,		
			answered	3
			skipped	20

10. Page 10

9. Do you agree with the Proposal 5 – To remove the element of Work Related Activity Component for the calculation of the current Scheme for the new Employment and Support Allowance applicants?						Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes					56.52%	13
2	No					30.43%	7
3	Don't know					13.04%	3
Analysis						answered	23
	Mean:	1.57	Std. Deviation:	0.71	Satisfaction Rate:	28.26	
	Variance:	0.51	Std. Error:	0.15			skipped
							0

11. Page 11

10. If you disagree, what alternative do you propose?			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question		100.00%	5
1	15/07/16 2:51PM ID: 41575369	People who have a disability should not be made to suffer with a financial penalty.		
2	03/08/16 9:15AM ID: 42383867	an overall cap would be fairer and clearer for people, that is one that is manageable andless unpredictable		
3	23/08/16 9:13AM ID: 43107578	keep it as it is now		
4	02/09/16 10:49PM ID: 43574278	It is discriminatory, you have described the ESA WRAC component erroneously . What you have described is the descriptor for the ESA Support component. When a person is placed within the WRAC catogary they have the right to appeal and this can take more than a year to accomplish. so under your proposals they would have their CT reduction entitlement reduced and after they where successful in their appeal to be transferred into the support group they would not be able to claim a backdated entitlement to CT reduction from the date that they became entitled to the Support Group ESA benefit namely 12 months prior to the date that the appeal Tribunal overturned the DWP's decision makers erroneous decision which has in turn allowed you to refuse their full entitlement to CT reduction benefit. Or as seen by the public you have stolen around £1000 from one of the most vulnerable members of our society. The backlash of civil disobedience, criminal activities, sheltering and shielding of criminals by respectable members of society, resentment, destruction and theft of property that this course of action will elicit throughout all levels of the public is not worth the short-sighted and ultimately unsuccessful proposals being proposed by yourselves.		
5	06/09/16 12:56PM ID: 43694356	Those who currently receive support and new applicants should be treated the same. Compassion should be shown and real needs met, taking individual circumstances into account.		
			answered	5
			skipped	18

12. Page 12

11. Do you agree with the Proposal 6 – To limit the number of dependant children within the calculation for Council Tax Reduction to a maximum of 2?			Response Percent	Response Total

11. Do you agree with the Proposal 6 – To limit the number of dependant children within the calculation for Council Tax Reduction to a maximum of 2?						Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Yes					65.22%	15	
2	No					34.78%	8	
3	Don't know					0.00%	0	
Analysis	Mean:	1.35	Std. Deviation:	0.48	Satisfaction Rate:	17.39	answered	23
	Variance:	0.23	Std. Error:	0.1			skipped	0

13. Page 13

12. If you disagree, what alternative do you propose?			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question		100.00%	6
1	15/07/16 2:51PM ID: 41575369	No children should be used in the calculations as having children is a personal choice.		
2	03/08/16 9:15AM ID: 42383867	again charge more for 2nd home owners		
3	19/08/16 11:16AM ID: 42992674	Take into account 3. Or more if children are adopted by other family members I. E can you have a special circumstances clause? If a set of children are adopted by someone else with children I feel bad that they'd struggle financially as a result.		
4	22/08/16 12:28PM ID: 43071081	It should be 3 children max		
5	02/09/16 10:49PM ID: 43574278	Penalise your administration staff for not processing information too an acceptable rate of production. The savings you must make can only be sustainably done by making your employees work efficiently if they were working in an industrial environment and moved around at 1 mile per hour as seems to be the maximum speed of locomotion within council offices they would be dismissed for being incapable of performing their assigned work in a reasonable time frame. I witness your staff deliberately wasting time at every opportunity that they get. This is where you are losing money hand over fist by your staff fraudulently accepting wages for work that is not done correctly, efficiently and must be repeated 2 to 3 times because they have deliberately sabotaged themselves.		
6	06/09/16 12:56PM ID: 43694356	People should be assessed on their actual needs and number of dependant children, whether existing or new claimants. There should be no class distinction, they should contribute according to ability to pay the tax.		
			answered	6
			skipped	17

14. Page 14

13. Do you agree with the Proposal 7 – Where someone is already paid Universal Credit (Carers Element) to look after someone with a disability, to remove entitlement to the Severe Disability Premium?				Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes			56.52%	13
2	No			30.43%	7
3	Don't know			13.04%	3

13. Do you agree with the Proposal 7 – Where someone is already paid Universal Credit (Carers Element) to look after someone with a disability, to remove entitlement to the Severe Disability Premium?						Response Percent	Response Total	
Analysis	Mean:	1.57	Std. Deviation:	0.71	Satisfaction Rate:	28.26	answered	23
	Variance:	0.51	Std. Error:	0.15			skipped	0

15. Page 15

14. If you disagree, what alternative do you propose?			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question		100.00%	3
1	23/07/16 5:14PM ID: 41926177	I do not know if your planned changes to the Council Tax reduction scheme will affect me or my wife, however if I have read it correctly why should carers be punished, they save the councils and government a fortune giving 24 hr care to a disabled person, if they where not there to do the caring it would cost the council/government a fortune to do what the carers do, £60 + a week to be on call 24hours a day 7 days a week with no days of for bank holidays etc, etc. If I have read it correctly and this is what you intend to do you should be ashamed of yourselves. the alternative I propose is to sack who ever came up with this extremely mean idea.		
2	19/08/16 7:24PM ID: 43017085	leave it in the calculation		
3	02/09/16 10:49PM ID: 43574278	Are you completely stupid this will stop people from undertaking the role of an unpaid carer or working for a tenth of the minimum wage by being a carer and you will then have to provide the care via agency staff who will cost you hundreds of pounds every week instead of having this provided by basically volunteers for a couple of pounds per week.		
			answered	3
			skipped	20

16. Page 16

15. Do you agree with the Proposal 8 – To remove the additional earnings disregard and apply the standard disregards irrespective of hours worked to those applicants also claiming Universal Credit?						Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Yes	<input type="text"/>				65.22%	15	
2	No	<input type="text"/>				17.39%	4	
3	Don't know	<input type="text"/>				17.39%	4	
Analysis	Mean:	1.52	Std. Deviation:	0.77	Satisfaction Rate:	26.09	answered	23
	Variance:	0.6	Std. Error:	0.16			skipped	0

17. Page 17

16. If you disagree, what alternative do you propose?			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question		100.00%	3

16. If you disagree, what alternative do you propose?			Response Percent	Response Total
1	03/08/16 9:15AM ID: 42383867	find cuts elsewhere		
2	23/08/16 9:13AM ID: 43107578	keep it as it is		
3	02/09/16 10:49PM ID: 43574278	Leave it as it is your proposal will prevent people employed as par time workers from being able to afford to do this work this will force employers to hire full time staff instead of several part time staff. This will cause employers to be forced to pay employers national insurance contributions for their staff and will result in the failure of many businesses and the reduction to your revenue stream by the subsequent reduction in business rates that you receive and the increased applications for council tax reduction from the former employers who will now be unemployed as their business has failed due to increased costs. It is a lose-lose scenario.		
			answered	3
			skipped	20

18. Page 18

17. Our preferred option is to adopt the changes proposed above, which options do you think we should consider?				
	Yes	No	Don't know	Response Total
Introduce the 8 changes proposed	61.9% (13)	33.3% (7)	4.8% (1)	21
Keep the Scheme as it is now	41.2% (7)	52.9% (9)	5.9% (1)	17
Increase the level of Council Tax	26.7% (4)	66.7% (10)	6.7% (1)	15
Find savings from cutting other Council Services	44.4% (8)	50.0% (9)	5.6% (1)	18
Use Council savings	50.0% (8)	43.8% (7)	6.3% (1)	16
Other	45.5% (5)	36.4% (4)	18.2% (2)	11
			answered	23
			skipped	0

If other, please use the space below to tell us what other options you would like us to consider: (5)

1	03/08/16 9:15AM ID: 42383867	charge 2nd home owners more council tax, and empty property owners
2	18/08/16 5:17PM ID: 42967763	Take savings from services used by people on average-higher than average incomes - many of which are barely used by the poor.
3	19/08/16 11:16AM ID: 42992674	Sell services to other councils to generate additional income.
4	02/09/16 10:49PM ID: 43574278	Increase your workforce's efficiency by introducing quality control systems and introducing sliding pay scales based on work completed without errors combined with volume of work produced per day. Work that does not meet very stringent quality standards on any given day will have to be redone the next day, alongside the quota for that day if the employee wishes to retain the level of pay that they have achieved. This is common practice in industry and promotes a culture of self quality control and motivates employees to construct and implement strategies for completing their work to the highest standards whilst simultaneously maintaining the highest standards of quality and finding ways to make themselves be more efficient because the more efficient and quality oriented they

17. Our preferred option is to adopt the changes proposed above, which options do you think we should consider?

	Yes	No	Don't know	Response Total
	are the higher their wage will be. It also motivates their less incentivised work colleagues to become more productive and if any employee cannot meet the standards after a trial period they are dismissed because they are not suitable for the job. Simple job done implement this and you will be able to reduce the council tax rates while improving your service to your employers i.e. the tax payers.			
5	06/09/16 12:56PM ID: 43694356	Assess claimants on their actual needs which they will need to prove and ability to pay and contribute.		

Matrix Charts

17.1. Introduce the 8 changes proposed						Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes					61.9%	13
2	No					33.3%	7
3	Don't know					4.8%	1
Analysis						answered	21
Mean:	1.43	Std. Deviation:	0.58	Satisfaction Rate:	21.43		
Variance:	0.34	Std. Error:	0.13				

17.2. Keep the Scheme as it is now						Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes					41.2%	7
2	No					52.9%	9
3	Don't know					5.9%	1
Analysis						answered	17
Mean:	1.65	Std. Deviation:	0.59	Satisfaction Rate:	32.35		
Variance:	0.35	Std. Error:	0.14				

17.3. Increase the level of Council Tax						Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes					26.7%	4
2	No					66.7%	10
3	Don't know					6.7%	1
Analysis						answered	15
Mean:	1.8	Std. Deviation:	0.54	Satisfaction Rate:	40		
Variance:	0.29	Std. Error:	0.14				

17.4. Find savings from cutting other Council Services						Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes					44.4%	8
2	No					50.0%	9
3	Don't know					5.6%	1
Analysis						answered	18
Mean:	1.61	Std. Deviation:	0.59	Satisfaction Rate:	30.56		
Variance:	0.35	Std. Error:	0.14				

17.5. Use Council savings					Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes				50.0%	8
2	No				43.8%	7
3	Don't know				6.3%	1
Analysis					answered	16
Mean:	1.56	Std. Deviation:	0.61	Satisfaction Rate:		
Variance:	0.37	Std. Error:	0.15			

17.6. Other					Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes				45.5%	5
2	No				36.4%	4
3	Don't know				18.2%	2
Analysis					answered	11
Mean:	1.73	Std. Deviation:	0.75	Satisfaction Rate:		
Variance:	0.56	Std. Error:	0.23			

18. Which is your preferred option? (Choose order of preference ranking from 1 to 6 with 1 being your most preferred option and 6 your least)

Item	Total Score ¹	Overall Rank
Keep the Scheme as it is now	94	1
Introduce the 8 changes proposed	87	2
Use Council savings	73	3
Increase the level of Council Tax	64	4
Find savings from cutting other Council Services	62	5
Other	40	6
	answered	20
	skipped	3

¹ Score is a weighted calculation. Items ranked first are valued higher than the following ranks, the score is a sum of all weighted rank counts.

If other, please use the space below to tell us what other options you would like us to consider. (3)

1	03/08/16 9:15AM ID: 42383867	as above charge 2nd home owners more and empty properties
2	20/08/16 11:30AM ID: 43030419	HAVING CHILDREN IS A LIFESTYLE CHOICE AND THEY SHOULD ONLY COME INTO A FAMILY WHICH CAN PROVIDE FOR THEM. THERE SHOULD BE NO COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION FOR HAVING CHILDREN
3	02/09/16 10:49PM ID: 43574278	As above

19. Page 19

19. If you have any further comments to make regarding the Council Tax Reduction scheme, that you haven't had opportunity to raise elsewhere, please use the space below.

	Response Percent	Response Total

19. If you have any further comments to make regarding the Council Tax Reduction scheme, that you haven't had opportunity to raise elsewhere, please use the space below.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	7
1	16/07/16 11:41AM ID: 41606098	<p>The terminology used in this consultation document is very difficult to understand. It's DWP jargon, which needs clear explanation so lay people can fully understand the proposals and comment on them.</p> <p>I hope this isn't done intentionally to put people off commenting, so the Council's preferred situation can be waved through without public scrutiny.</p>	
2	16/07/16 11:57AM ID: 41606540	<p>I'm sure that this all makes sense to anyone familiar with the benefits system but for others its really not explained well enough to make this consultation effective.</p>	
3	22/07/16 8:18PM ID: 41905279	<p>I have received Council Tax Reduction for the last few years and it has been a life saver, I just can't express my gratitude enough .. I didn't qualify for any benefits and had a part time job of 15 hours a week along with some lodgers rent. No mention is made of any changes to people who do not qualify for Universal Credit etc.. so hopefully there will be no changes for those people ij applying for Council Tax Reduction.</p>	
4	23/07/16 5:14PM ID: 41926177	<p>Reduce the wages and perks councilors receive to what carers receive.</p>	
5	18/08/16 5:17PM ID: 42967763	<p>These proposals are a travesty.</p> <p>The ill-fated and badly-thought-out Universal Credit scheme is NOT something the council ought be trying to emulate.</p> <p>It is not even being rolled out nationally for another five years due to the fact it is failing in the trial areas and already causing extreme hardship to those unfortunates who have already been forced onto it, people already on the lowest economic rung. Why would the council try and emulate a scheme that is still very much in trouble and possibly not even going to see the light of day in the end?</p> <p>The UC has been panned by social scientists, economists, health and social professionals dealing with the vulnerable and jobcentre staff already administering it in the trial areas.</p> <p>It's treatment of the self employed with the minimum income floor is particularly discriminatory, barbaric and ultimately socially corrosive and morally bankrupt. It is expected to be an absolute national shambles if the self-employed are abused in this way. You CANNOT automatically assume a person earns more than they do in order to give them less help, unless you are actually looking to create economic and societal breakdown.</p> <p>The fact is a huge number of small and independent businesses rely on the head person taking less than the minimum wage from time to time - you will be putting people out of work if you make this un-viable by using a mean-spirited income assumption. Self employed people working for less than they should to keep a business going is part of life and used to be seen as admirable not long ago when we were a civilised country - not something people should be punished for - there certainly isn't enough alternative work available for people to take up.</p> <p>As for part-time self-employeds - presumably these despicable proposals mean you won't give them any help? There are so many reasons why many people need to work part time - health, family and personal reasons mainly - the council has no business telling people they must work longer hours or face forced destitution. I would be personally affected by this proposal to the point that from April I would be on the council doorstep demanding emergency housing as I would no longer be able to live where I do and pay the increased council tax. I know dozens in the borough who would be devastated by this proposal.</p> <p>It would appear from these proposals that you have some classic nasty Tories in WDBC who come with pre-instilled prejudice that low-income self employeds are all idlers and shirkers - a common Tory hysteria which has been decidedly disproven by just about every expert demographic and economic analysis undertaken. The Tories hate the poor - we know this as poor people after all these years of them - our real-time incomes have already dropped by up to 50% in cases since the Tories have been back in number 10.</p> <p>It is a well documented national scandal that the poorest have already shouldered the bulk of the austerity cuts. Universal credit threatens them further and now WDBC proposes to twist the knife - are you actually trying to kill us off?</p>	

19. If you have any further comments to make regarding the Council Tax Reduction scheme, that you haven't had opportunity to raise elsewhere, please use the space below.

		Response Percent	Response Total
	<p>Most seriously, I only found out about this consultation by mistake as I tried to pay my (very late) council tax bill. I feel people ought to have been better informed about this proposal by letter - to that effect I am writing a letter to the Tavistock Times - if is not published I shall be putting posters up in town next week to advise those on low incomes that they need to have their say on this - literally nobody I know who would be affected knows about this consultation. Why are the council not making an effort to inform those of us who it will personally affect? It is disgusting behaviour.</p> <p>My council tax bill is late because since the Tories austerity cuts, I no longer qualify for the level of discount I would have received - I receive 50% discount and can only just scrape by paying it off very late - I CANNOT pay more, I WILL NOT pay more. Book a prison place for me if this assault on West Devon's poorer residents goes ahead, because you can't have what I haven't got. Also, get ready to provide me with new housing when I am made homeless as a result of evil 'assumed income' thresholds. Putting me in prison and finding me emergency accomodation is going to be far costlier than giving me the level of help I need, but that's your problem. I know who has the intellectual and moral high ground here and it isn't WDBC.</p>		
6	<p>19/08/16 10:27PM ID: 43021181</p> <p>I do not really understand the subtleties of these changes but I think that simplifying and standardising the approach alongside other benefits makes sense.</p> <p>The one that I am not sure about is if someone leaves the home temporarily. I would assume that the cost of providing services to an empty home is a bit less anyway.</p> <p>I find think though that the approach should be sympathetic to those in hardship. If people are disabled or struggling through no fault of their own then we should support them. That said it should not encourage people to abuse the system.</p>		
7	<p>06/09/16 12:56PM ID: 43694356</p> <p>The Governments and Councils should not be looking at reducing the help available to those in need, be it financial or material.</p> <p>Those that are financially better off should be expected to make a greater contribution for the benefit of those less fortunate even is this means increasing the council tax, or income tax to those who can afford it.</p>		

answered 7

skipped 16

20. Page 20

20. Are you completing this questionnaire as:

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	A resident of West Devon	91.30%	21
2	An organisation (please write the organisation you are representing in box below)	0.00%	0
3	A voluntary/community group (please write the group you are representing in box below)	0.00%	0
4	A business	0.00%	0
5	A Landlord	0.00%	0
6	Other (please specify):	8.70%	2
Analysis	Mean: 1.43 Std. Deviation: 1.41 Satisfaction Rate: 8.7	answered	23
	Variance: 1.98 Std. Error: 0.29	skipped	0

Other (please specify): (2)

1	14/07/16 10:05AM ID: 41505066	non resident
---	--	--------------

20. Are you completing this questionnaire as:			Response Percent	Response Total
2	03/08/16 9:15AM ID: 42383867	resident of south Devon		
If you are representing an organisation or group please write who you are representing (1)				
1	02/09/16 10:49PM ID: 43574278	Your reasoning is severely flawed		

21. Page 21

21. Do you pay your Council tax to West Devon Borough Council					Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes				90.00%	18
2	No				10.00%	2
Analysis	Mean:	1.1	Std. Deviation:	0.3	Satisfaction Rate:	10
	Variance:	0.09	Std. Error:	0.07		
					answered	20
					skipped	3

22. Are you, or someone in your household, getting a Council Tax Reduction at this time?					Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes				19.05%	4
2	No				76.19%	16
3	Don't know/Not sure				4.76%	1
Analysis	Mean:	1.86	Std. Deviation:	0.47	Satisfaction Rate:	42.86
	Variance:	0.22	Std. Error:	0.1		
					answered	21
					skipped	2

23. What is your sex?					Response Percent	Response Total
1	Male				38.10%	8
2	Female				52.38%	11
3	Transgender				0.00%	0
4	Prefer not to say				9.52%	2
5	Other (please specify):				0.00%	0
Analysis	Mean:	1.81	Std. Deviation:	0.85	Satisfaction Rate:	20.24
	Variance:	0.73	Std. Error:	0.19		
					answered	21
					skipped	2
Other (please specify): (0)						
No answers found.						

24. Age						Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Under 18					0.00%	0	
2	18-24	<input type="checkbox"/>				4.76%	1	
3	25-34	<input type="checkbox"/>				9.52%	2	
4	35-44	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			23.81%	5	
5	45-54	<input type="checkbox"/>				4.76%	1	
6	55-64	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			28.57%	6	
7	65-74	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			14.29%	3	
8	75-84					0.00%	0	
9	85+					0.00%	0	
10	Prefer not to say	<input type="checkbox"/>				14.29%	3	
Analysis	Mean:	5.71	Std. Deviation:	2.23	Satisfaction Rate:	52.38	answered	21
	Variance:	4.97	Std. Error:	0.49			skipped	2

25. Disability: Are your day to day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months?						Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>				19.05%	4	
2	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			71.43%	15	
3	Don't know/Not sure					0.00%	0	
4	Prefer not to say	<input type="checkbox"/>				9.52%	2	
Analysis	Mean:	2	Std. Deviation:	0.76	Satisfaction Rate:	33.33	answered	21
	Variance:	0.57	Std. Error:	0.16			skipped	2

26. Are you currently:						Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Single	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			40.00%	8	
2	Sharing a home as part of a couple	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			60.00%	12	
Analysis	Mean:	1.6	Std. Deviation:	0.49	Satisfaction Rate:	60	answered	20
	Variance:	0.24	Std. Error:	0.11			skipped	3

27. How many children?						Response Percent	Response Total
1	None	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			52.38%	11
2	1 to 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			47.62%	10
3	3 to 4					0.00%	0
4	5 or more					0.00%	0

27. How many children?							Response Percent	Response Total
							answered	21
							skipped	2
Analysis	Mean:	1.48	Std. Deviation:	0.5	Satisfaction Rate:	15.87		
	Variance:	0.25	Std. Error:	0.11				

28. Are you a carer?							Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>					4.76%	1
2	No	<input type="checkbox"/>					95.24%	20
Analysis	Mean:	1.95	Std. Deviation:	0.21	Satisfaction Rate:	95.24	answered	21
	Variance:	0.05	Std. Error:	0.05			skipped	2

29. Which of these would best describe your current status							Response Percent	Response Total
1	Employed part-time	<input type="checkbox"/>					10.00%	2
2	Employed full-time	<input type="checkbox"/>					40.00%	8
3	Self employed part-time	<input type="checkbox"/>					15.00%	3
4	Self employed full-time	<input type="checkbox"/>					10.00%	2
5	Unemployed	<input type="checkbox"/>					5.00%	1
6	Permanently sick/disabled	<input type="checkbox"/>					0.00%	0
7	Retired from work	<input type="checkbox"/>					15.00%	3
8	Doing something else	<input type="checkbox"/>					5.00%	1
Analysis	Mean:	3.45	Std. Deviation:	2.13	Satisfaction Rate:	35	answered	20
	Variance:	4.55	Std. Error:	0.48			skipped	3

30. Ethnic Origin: What is your ethnic group?(please select the option that best describes you)							Response Percent	Response Total
1	Asian or Asian British	<input type="checkbox"/>					0.00%	0
2	Black or Black British	<input type="checkbox"/>					5.00%	1
3	Chinese	<input type="checkbox"/>					0.00%	0
4	Gypsy or Traveller	<input type="checkbox"/>					0.00%	0
5	Mixed heritage or multiple ethnic groups	<input type="checkbox"/>					0.00%	0
6	White British	<input type="checkbox"/>					90.00%	18
7	White Other	<input type="checkbox"/>					0.00%	0
8	Other ethnic origin (please describe):	<input type="checkbox"/>					5.00%	1
Analysis	Mean:	5.9	Std. Deviation:	0.99	Satisfaction Rate:	70	answered	20

30. Ethnic Origin: What is your ethnic group?(please select the option that best describes you)			Response Percent	Response Total
Variance: 0.99 Std. Error: 0.22			skipped	3
Other ethnic origin (please describe): (1)				
1	02/09/16 10:49PM ID: 43574278	universal		

22. Page 22