Council Tax Reduction Scheme - Question 2 - ALL COMMENTS

Do you have any concerns with our proposal to use income from second homes to fund the reduced grant from Central Government?

It is just another source of income and should be treated as such

By second homes, I am taking this to mean homes that are occupied part-time by family members only, not homes that are owned and let out to holidaymakers.

In the case of second homes by my understood definition above, I believe their ownership needs to be heavily taxed in order to free up the maximum number of properties that can be occupied full time or if not, are let out for holidays to bring income to the region from tourism.

I do not believe that the council should subsidise people owning two homes for their own use only.

It will seriously affect me personally.

I have a second home which I intend to live in full-time as soon as I can retire.

If they can afford two houses they can afford to support those who can’t afford just one.

Fund to build more houses.

Fund reduced grant from Central Government.

The shortfall has to be made up somehow!

If people can afford second homes they should pay.

Strongly disagree!

Make’s sense.

So they don’t have to get as much grant.

Because if people can afford a second home then they can afford to pay full council tax.

It should come from changes to (c), (d), & (e).

A 10% reduction is not unreasonable as most second home owners use far less of other local?? services

2nd homes are far better than empty properties

If they can afford two home they can afford to pay full tax

The proposal is based on SLDC’s preference of removing the ”2nd home discount” which is deprecated

Anyone who can afford a second home in the Lake District can afford to pay full council tax.

Not all second homes are luxury, some are a necessity.

It appears amazing to me that ”second home owners” should ever have had council tax discounts!

Unfair on empty houses as may be due to valid reasons.

Don’t have any second homes

Those who make least use of services will be asked to pay more. This is not fair / balanced.

To stop the young people from living on the streets

There should be no homes that are not lived in 12 month of year.

An additional charge of 10% should be affordable for people with second homes.

Panellises people with 2nd homes - pay enough already

It seems unfair for second home owners to meet the total shortfall as we do not use the services pd. for by Ccl. Tax

This is punishing an second home owners

Second home owners aren’t necessarily rich they might of inherited it.
Inequitable. 2nd home owners are essential to the local economy but use very few services.

It’s not enough. There should be additional tax charges for second homes up to 50% to encourage owners to let out to local people. Commercial holiday lets have negative effect on overall wealth in the area as these income generally spent outside the area and community’s are unsustainable. Also second homes paying less money due to being rated as business lets should pay a community tax which goes to the parishes to make up for loss of precept.

The funds should come from empty properties instead. You need a penalty tax for not using an empty house.

Homes that remain empty for a long period could be let to homeless families.

Not in the district long enough

Local Government services should be paid by those who use them - LOCALS

One home is quite enough

burden should be shared equally - not just by second home owners

Discounts have previously been reduced by 40% on properties occupied only for a small proportion of the year.

Any increase in costs for benefits should be met by all council Taxpayers.

Council Tax Benefit is currently funded by all payers of tax. SLDC’s proposal is to fund the shortfall by increasing the Council Tax on a small number of home owners in South Lakes, thus departing from the principle of the widest population supporting those on low incomes. There is no sound policy reason given for raising the Council Tax Benefit from the targeted group.

It does not take into account whether or not the second home is let commercially.

Our cottage is basic (though cosy), without central heating / or appliances apart from a tiny fridge / or bath. It has been in the family for 50 years and we love it! But I do feel strongly that there are different categories of second homes.

This is a discriminatory proposal without justification or fairness on a section of society, who contribute positively to the social fund and commerce.

This is another attack on people who pay enough tax

Rise in tax for those who cost least in services. Lazy + rapacious way of avoiding a proper review of properties for Council services

As second home, council services not used on a regular basis

Unfair. Second home owners contribute a lot and take little out.

Seems fair

The empty property should be better used for funding

We spend a lot of money by using local shops + Tradespeople but do not use any services

2nd home owners are not all cash able. And, ability to maintain property may occur as well as local spending capacity.

Your income may be very low, and you have been left a property and cannot sell property. It can take years too sell property at the moment and you may not have enough money to bring it up to letting standard.

If anyone can afford to keep and maintain a second home they can afford full council tax on both properties.

You can only spend so much time either in your main home or 2nd home so discount should be more not stopped.

I do not understand the logic in having no discount on a house where no one is living, yet giving a discount to single occupants.

There is a possibility that people will sell up and move away thus depriving the area of vital income.

 Might help those who are struggling to make ends meet to pay council tax
I would be paying for services that I am not using, when not in receipt.
Proposal not fair.
As long as the monies are not put in the pot to increase Councillors wages.
After the last reduction the council wasted the rise in income + will so again.
Some second homes are _not_ rented to provide income to the owners
Seems a fair system
They contribute but don't use? The facilities.
Only in as much as it is the obvious soft target. There will be a need to consider what's next.
Those wishing to have two (or more) homes should be prepared to pay for the privilege.
Totally unjust
This is another Conservative stealth tax. They waste money & expect us to bail them out.
If you have a second home you no you should pay
Second home owners use NO council services. g. bins, schools, social services etc.
Anyone with second homes should be made to pay more taxes as they can afford to.
It is illogical. Second home users are generally low users of Council Tax services.
Second homes are less burden on council services (less use) and deserve some discount. already reduced from 50% to 10% in recent years
Those who can afford a second home should not get a discount, especially if the income thus gained can help preserve benefits as they stand
Only because it is taking much longer to sell property in todays recession.
The affects of the reduced grant should probably be spread across all house owners.
This is unfair
Already used to subsidise other council tax payers as the level of use of council services is much lower.
It is totally unfair to expect 2nd home owners to fund the shortfall. The burden should be shared.
2nd home owners get very little service from SLDC.
You are hitting an easy target. Other savings possible given will and commitments by LA.
The 10% discount on 2nd homes is a justified a services provided by the council are only?? for limited times
We don't agree that income from second homes should be used to fund the reduced grant.
A second home owner uses SLDC facilities (e.g. waste collection) less than a full time resident, therefore already subsidising.
Just your logic. You have assumed an outcome.
Have no vote in the area, use less services, and relative use of local businesses quite high already.
Fewer demands made on council services.
Why penalise people who spend leisure time + money in the Lake District - they have other option
It costs you less for people with 2nd homes

Easy way out Other spending efficiencies should be sought.

Unable to sell the house & find it? Increasingly? Difficult to maintain properties. Also no services being received for most of time.
Would we be able to afford it
Very impressed, well done
Seems a sensible use of 2nd house income.
See below
Provided the additional revenue is fairly distributed i.e. checks made on those who receive all benefit.
I cannot see how this income could cover the costs of the reduced grant.
The two are not connected.
This is unfair.
Second home owners bring business into economy + have little call on local council run services except for the inadequate refuse disposal system.
Second home owners already subsidise other as they use fewer services.
Second home owners provide vital wealth to the area yet do not use all the local facilities i.e. education.
Because I own a second home and feel I am being unfairly penalised
SLDC has already reduced the discount on second homes by 40%, but 2nd home owners don't generally use the services as much as permanent residents.
We use very few council resources &? For us loss? is unfair
With the exception that 2nd home owners have equal rights - i.e. Voting
Cos - these second homes are making £400 to £500 a month rent or more.
1. You will kill a golden goose
2. It shows a complete lack of imagination
The bias in this survey - it is not a "reduction" scheme.
You should first examine cost saving opportunities stop wasting money on unnecessary road alterations
We agree that the current discount is illogical and have no objection to paying 100% but we would object if it was proposed to increase council tax on 'second homes' above 100% as being unfair.
Will affect A.O.P., they should still have discount. Gov. has said they should not be affected.
Already contribute more than! get from L.A.
If empty - inequitable
You will kill-off tourism and investment into the area. This is not the right time to introduce yet another "stealth" tax.
If second homes were main homes, the cost of council services would increase substantially; your proposal is not fair.
These people do not make heavy use of services.
These people do make heavy use of services.
Do not use services hardly.
Less seconds home in area more homes for locals
If you can afford a second home you should be able to pay full council tax on both houses
If you can afford 2 homes, You can afford 2 council tax bills!
If they can afford 2 homes must pay for both.
People who do not live in the district who have a second home should loose the discount. Those who live and work in the district (e.g. farmers) who rely on the income from a holiday home/second home to survive will be unfairly penalised.
Seems to be fair
This makes sense, So the people on reduced council tax don't have hardship.
Property owners already pay tax on profits made from 2nd homes.

......... As long as it is?? - ??? In some way.

I would like all fund to STAY IN CUMBRIA
Houses should be homes to live in.
See below
Because these owners do not have any democratic rights
Because owners of such properties already pay excessive council tax relative to the demands they make on services
A vendetta against holiday / second homes is totally unnecessary. They provide a livelihood for the tradesmen’s shopkeepers & hoteliers. Remember foot & mouth?
Unfair - funding should be linked to service use
The regional economy on more wealthy residents using local trades and shops / suppliers. This action will cause the loss of such residents.
A modest up lift in second home tax should suffice say 5% additional charge, on the full tax.
We have no concerns at all
Second home owners use less services.
If they can afford 2 homes, they can afford extra 10%
Property sales. Cannot sell even with big reductions.
Second home can afford full tax
I don’t know about these grants.
This would mean second home owners would be paying significantly more @ 2 properties
Perceived that if you can maintain two properties - pay council tax on both
This would be unfair - no use of education
Discriminates against people who genuinely live in second homes and do not let them out for income.
Why not charge current 100% support holders (myself included) at 5% charge this will surely go a small way to help the funding
People generally choose to have second homes. They benefit from services provided for their second home and should factor in the council tax as a necessary cost.
As a second homer owner I feel we already pay enough!
As a second home owner we use far less than 90% of the facilities & already pay more than home no. 1.
Reasons for empty homes are variable but general (e) and (f) sound like a good idea-
Penalising those who have worked to enjoy the Lakes
Seems very unfair when we use so little Council supplied services our waste bins are rarely m/td.
2nd home owners already have taxation without representation at local level. It is not possible to vote for local or national members. This is against all declared UK policy. 2nd home owners use significantly less council resources than full time residents + should therefore continue to have the small discount available.
They already pay for Education/Social Services/etc.
The main source of income for the area is tourism. Why create drastic changes that will deter people from 2nd homes?
2nd home owners help keep this local economy virtually immune from normal economic conditions elsewhere - stop trying to kill the "golden goose"! No tourism = less money for the SLDC & local economy
2nd homes bring wealth to area and don’t use local resources
This area needs tourism. Second home owners bring in cash whilst costing very very little
Second home owners don’t use many of the council services except rubbish collection etc.
As a pensioner - who does not let the property commercially & cannot live at K.L. all the time because of family commitments - I have been penalised enough.
Not everyone who has a second home is rich! Some of us use hard earned retirement funds which are limited.
If you wish to further weaken the housing market - Go ahead
Reduced grant should result in reduced operating costs _not_ increased income
Paying additional sums for a reduced service is immoral.
Need to encourage people into the area and the spending they bring to local businesses.
It seems only fair & there is a shortage of affordable property in the whole country
It may affect my current payments of housing benefit and council tax i.e. reduce the awards.
Others are more in need if services are to be maintained
Because my current housing benefit and council tax benefit may be affected i.e. reduced.
The income should be used sensibly
Second homes require little or no service from L.A so help those who struggle with one home.
If people buy a second home. They should be made to fund all charges themselves.
If you own 2 second homes you can afford it.
But:-
Don’t see why we should have a discount
Those with second homes should be encouraged
This appears to be the fairest option - though no one likes to pay extra money!!
Only fair
Myself & my brother inherited a second home in disrepair and have slowly been trying to renovate /
Improve. We cannot afford to pay 150% on this property.
There are too many second homes standing empty
Often unable to utilize all facilities e.g. refuse collection
C. Tax is a tax on facilities 2nd homes already pay for schools etc. on their 1st Home.
This is being used as a punishment for people who are assumed to be rich because they own 2 homes. Why not charge more council tax on the many houses worth over a million pounds.
I bought my 2nd home to retire in. My husband died & I can’t sell my main home! Would cause severe financial hardship
Second homes should be encouraged as the owners provide a substantial subsidy to council. At least 60% of expenditure (social care & education) is not related to second homes and their owners are therefore subsidising the permanent residents to this extent. As a band C council tax payer I am already contributing nearly £600 a year.
We are often told that there is an acute shortage of housing in most areas, leading to the possibility of using green belt land for new housing.
Is there a moral reason for some people having two homes, while many cannot find one?
Unfair to second home owners
Second-home owners make a much smaller demand on council services
Occasional residents are already paying as if using 90% of services
We have very few benefits & the tax is higher than other parts of the UK.
Second home owners bring income into the whole area providing much needed trade and revenue to local businesses
Service users should pay.
Clearly this would be unfair: all council tax payer could contribute.
Second home owners already contribute more (see below)
Second home little used because of ill health
This is not just our second home but our retirement property and we may lose it if charges are increased.
We, for example, have worked hard and saved for 31 years to buy a small cottage in the Lakes. We pay 2
council taxes and now you want to take the teeny weeny but of discount we get away from us. Also, the
process of buying and renovating a property takes time, without the additional burden of council tax when it
is not in a fit state to live in. The property we bought had been empty for 18 months and up for sale with no
buyers. We have created work for all the trades in the area - plumbers, electricians, builders etc. The
property would still have been rotting now had we not bought it.
Leaseholder of second home in the area.
Second homes bring revenue into the town
In present financial climate not feasible unless minimum amount taken.
Discount is fair given reduced use of council services.
No as they are secondary. Its hard enough for me to run one home never mind two
Second home owners bring a lot of revenue into S.L.D.C areas
It sounds like a plan to increase the tax on second homes.
If people can afford a second home they should be able to pay full council tax / Some people have no home.
Having lived for 13 1/2 Yrs. Next to an empty property, whose weeds tend to swamp our garden I would like
to see some action that _might _ clear up this eyesore!!!
I think its a good way to help the reduced grant
If people have second homes in the area they choose to help the community in which they have chosen to
have 2nd home
10% is not a real benefit
Funding of support for your rate payers should be a community task, not a burden to a small factor.
Why should rate payers subsidise the failure & greed of the bankers who caused the current difficulties
If you can afford second home you should pay the costs
I appreciate why this is being considered but some second home owners are pensioner’s .In particular some
are severely disabled and have made substantial adaptations to their property to enable disabled family
members to be able to have holidays there -holiday’s that\ would not otherwise be possible.
I suggest exempting second home owners who have made adaptations for wheelchairs, roll in showers etc.
from this change. This would not involve large numbers so would be low cost but would be a responsible
thing to do re supporting the severely disabled
Because a second home isn't always a sign of wealth, it might be necessary for employment purposes away
from main home.
Fair approach
Second home users to NOT use local council services. Why should they pay for those who do not work hard
I need my reduction on my second home
The funding will help to keep the council tax down for ratepayers
Fortunately to have second home
Discounts have been reduced from 50% down to 10%. Now wanting to be stopped.
It is difficult at present for people to sell houses, and to stop discounts referred to above could be unfair,
particularly for people moving for employment reasons.
There should be a reduction as the? Call? on council services is significantly less than average
Already paying full tax elsewhere & few facilities used. Empty properties making no contribution to local
economy.
Probably a higher proportion of 2nd homes here than in many other areas.
Businesses and local folk should be protected
We will be paying for services etc. that either don’t exist for us or that are currently unprovided.
Holiday home owners being penalised for placing life savings in property.
2nd home owners use fewer council services
If they can afford a second home they can afford to pay council tax in full...
The council has to receive money from whatever source it can.
As usual, the hard-working middle income earners will pay. Be more efficient - it is possible!
Totally unfair to withdraw current discount and not spread the savings required across the groups.
Need to ensure that the revenue / spend in local businesses by second home owners is not damaged by
removing incentive of council tax discount. 10% is fair.
See below
Totally impossible to put in place. Extra paper work + time to gain hardly anything. Nightmare to implement
+ people would cheat the system. Houses would be empty due to increase needed to facilitate on rental
properties.
People with second homes don’t use all the council services in education but regularly spend money in the
area
Many are let as holiday homes bringing revenue to the area & jobs, also 2nd home owners have hammered
previously from 50% deduction to 10%!
It's opportunistic and unfair
Most efficient and fair
If they can afford second homes they should pay the full council tax on their property.
We think it is unfair.
Contribution at 90% significantly outweighs low consumption of services: Not equitable.
Call on services is less, as not resident every day.
2nd home owners use less of the services than full time residents.
Taxation without representation has always been wrong and is unfair
Existing income ok proposed increase worry as 2nd home owners already pay 90% tax & bring money into
area but don’t put much expense onto council
We have a 'second home' in Bowness we use it ourselves but contribute to the economy as we rent it out.
People / our customers have commented they will? Return? + It is far superior to the B+B’s in the area.
Letter attached addressed to Councillor Evans. Passed on.
The degree / amount of services which the council have to provide for second homes is far below the
current charge of 90% levied.
This money has to come from somewhere.
Any income should be used as the council deems suitable.
See below - It’s fair that those who can pay a bit more to support those who can’t
Because there are people who live in a lot worst building buildings than some people.
unfair
Be more efficient
I pay more than enough in taxes
I am 65yrs old living alone at my normal address and pay less council tax than on my second home which was discounted by 25% a few years ago
Seems very sensible
Income from second home owners should benefit the community generally
What are the alternatives?
People ought to be allowed holiday homes, it means they will be spending money here instead of abroad
Already pay the tax elsewhere; contribute to local businesses when present, it’s your easy solution.
To be honest I think this is more complicated
It is the central government reduced grant which should be stopped!
I have several rental properties and when tenants move on and the property is empty for short periods I will be heavily penalised.
People with a second home are already paying Council Tax as full? Elsewhere? And do not use the services offered in both.
As below
Second home owners already contribute on a net basis more than non second home owners.
Help keep present standards or improved to schools houses etc.
Most are holiday lets that they make money on
2nd home owners contribute large amounts to the local economy, by supporting business/shops/services.
If people can afford a second home this should not be a problem.
If certain people can afford second homes, they should not have the benefit of a reduction in Council Tax
If its there by all means use it right.
Penalising the minority for government changes
Individuals are already taxed far too much.
10% is not a consideration for 2nd home owners.
This is part of my pension. Already taxed
I do not use medical or education services
This proposal will solve many issues, not just council tax.
Does this mean tax on income from second homes in addition to income tax?
It’s a fair cop guv and i’ll come quietly BUT I would warn against creating a HATE category, which could be the target for future exactions when the government’s next attack comes.
Should pay full rate
If we had to pay full tax it would take half of our pension.
Whilst it is useful to hold the empty properties proposals in reserve to fund any further cuts demanded by government, some of these proposals if implemented now, could well be used to improve and reinstate local services.

The ridiculous closure of public toilets has deprived both residents and visitors of the most essential of all facilities. This has lead to the expense of the proposed legislation on public urination and defecation. Surely you ought to have foreseen the consequences. What is a person to do, in Kendal for instance, after the shop facilities have closed?

I am concerned that the money will just go into the pot and used for anything. If this proposal is accepted it should be, if at all possible, ring fenced to reduce the council tax burden of all local residents. This could help all the young first time buyers to remain where they were born and grew up.

Second homes boost the economy by attracting tourists to the area.

Will reduce number of second home owners who spend & support the local area

Funding of the reduced grant should be from further efficiency and by dealing with the abuses of the Benefit system.

All councils need to reduce expenditure

See below.

Second homes generate considerable income in area

Second home owners invest a lot of income into the local economy.

Anybody who can afford the second home can afford to pay extra cost.

One sector only is covering the whole cost.

Because our second home is a designated holiday home, thus we do not have the opportunity to occupy it full-time and make use of all that SLDC provides. By using our second home frequently we spend money in the local area supporting local trades persons and businesses without drawing significantly on publicly provided services. Friends and family also use the property so are introduced to an area that they have all found enchanting. We love our second home and feel part of our local community where it is located, helping out neighbouring pensioners with shopping, gardening, house maintenance etc. Removing the discount seems punitive and petty where our home, because of the holiday home designation, is not depriving a local of a permanent home.

Our property is a second home and you have already reduced the discount from 50% to 10%.

Already pay tax on the income.

Lake district heavily depends on tourism - you need to support.

Second home owners are an easy target + a convenient excuse for not making tough decisions. Furthermore, empty properties + their owners make no contribution unlike second home owners who do!

Second homes have 10% disc only used 2-3 days per week not benefitting from 100% of charges on usage 2nd home owners do not avail themselves of all services & therefore should receive a discount e.g. education but do not contribute greatly to the economy thus helping to sustain the tourism industry don’t kill one of the geese that lay the golden eggs!

Already making large contribution but reduced use of Council Services.

Second homes do not make large demands on local facilities, but do contribute to the local economy

All luxuries come at a price.

As a second home owner having inherited the property from my parents, we use very limited services provided by the council. The main council expenditure (77%) is on Education and Social Care, none of which we use. We are therefore already subsidising these services and we also inflate the local economy by spending locally when in the Lake District.
I believe a tax on residents of a property other than the main two occupants, i.e. working relatives - sons, daughters, lodgers etc. would be a fairer system and enable the council to fulfil their increased funding gap requirements without affecting others less able to pay the full council tax.

At the same time such people would be paying their fair share of the facilities they currently enjoy free of charge, but which the council are at the moment forced to provide for them.

I wish only to comment on the proposal on the proposal to abolish 10% Council Tax discount for second homes. Naturally, the proposal is likely to be popular as it will affect only a small number of people who have no political clout given that they generally vote elsewhere, and are widely regarded as well able to afford it (though in fact many second-home owners are intending to re-locate full-time within a few years of buying a second property. They are not necessarily super-wealthy). A few further points:

1) second home owners make considerably less use of the services which are covered by the C Tax;
2) they pay almost double the amount of just a few years ago, following successive cuts in the discount;
3) they generate visitors and spending in an area very dependent on tourism. (I personally have a stream of regular visitors who would not otherwise come to Cumbria except very occasionally, who spend money in restaurants, shops and on all kinds of local services).

The tone of local public "debate" on second home ownership (comments by politicians and community "leaders", as well as a steady stream of comment, often biased, in the local press) is entirely anti-second homes. But this is short-sighted. Although, Cumbria is very dependent on visitors it often seems to be completely contemptuous of them. The proposed increase in C Tax will be one more example of this.

THE MONIES WILL BE USED TO HELP THE LOW INCOME PEOPLE, THEY CANNOT AFFORD TO PAY OUT ANY EXTRA COSTS.

You should look at cutting council costs before hitting services

Second homes should be treated like first homes.

Seems a sensible solution

Use alternatives - e.g. increase SLDC efficiency by 10% per year; more charging/pricing solutions

It follows that those with resources to maintain 2nd home, would more comfortably bear unavoidable burdens from reduced Government grant.

This is an unfair levy on people who love the area and wish to spend time & money there

Because it will affect me & I pay full council tax same as everyone else.

SOAKING THE "RICH"

What if a second home DOESN'T produce an income?

NOT SATISFIED WITH THE REASON YOU GIVE

This would represent an unfair additional cost on people who make very little use of council services

If by 2nd homes you do not include homes currently up for sale.

I think they make enough money to fund it.

Second home owners are 'light users' of local government services i.e. already subsidising others.

2nd homes form long term investments for responsible citizens, do not penalise savers.

use government money not owners

A higher priority should be to bring empty homes into the housing stock.

Lakeland depends upon tourism. You are killing the "Golden Goose" instead of spending the egg wisely.

Way should someone who pays full Council Tax elsewhere have to pay 100% rates on 2nd home.

Fair enough

It will penalise yet further those who don’t make great demands of the services provided by the Council: result: less investment, visitors & much needed income for the area.
Feel that it is wrong that one section should shoulder burden 2nd home owners bring a lot of income via tourists to the area.

Don't Know

Unfair on people who work in area

Bought as family holiday home 28 y/rs ago ?? CT when our children leave school ???. In Leeds may in future sell home and this will then be main residence.

It makes financial sense.

Any shortfall should be borne by all homes

Don’t trust SLDC to use effectively

You already make me pay for services I don’t use - water / drains / bins / police / library - why should I pay even more. I pay full tax & council tax at home too!

Second homes bring added revenue to the community from tourism.

The home owners are in theory more affluent, therefore they can pay more.

Second home owners provide a steady income which otherwise wouldn’t be there

*Not sure*

More info would be required before making a decision on this question

Second homes help boost the economy of the area due to visitors - so not fair to penalize something positive for the area

Second home owners bring significant spending power to the area & use v. limited council resources

Second home owners provide much support to local tradespeople and through council tax but make little use of council services

N/A

Seems fair

Because not all second homes are rented. Purely family or sole persons use.

Everyone should pay the tax

Discount should cease for second homes

Too inconsistent

Not receiving full benefits, going for easy option.

Second home owners bring money into the local economy - why should they be penalised?

A second home produces expenses to the owner & no income. so this question needs explanation

It is unfair - discriminatory and unbalanced

A convenient scape goat policy which not been thought through

But, see below...

Second home does not provide income - moved out of necessity due to ill health + death of husband + still trying to sell due to state of economy

Robin Hood has the same opinion

If you have a second home you can afford to pay full

Central Government should not have reduced the grant but in the circumstances this is a reasonable proposal

At my age every little helps

A second home occupier does not fully use Council services.
I bought the house at time understanding that a discount was available.
Too easy to continue to use a small (relatively) number of people to solve a problem not of their making for political reasons.

People with second home add significantly to economy of area
Who will control the amount the council charges the home owners. Loose 10% discount what next?
The owners of second homes use very few of the SLDC services that they have to pay for.
Seems only fair.

Empty homes and holiday homes, are contributing to the destruction of community life. It is only right that they should be charged for their adverse effect by contributing to support of the less well off.
Surely, SLDC should be continuing to encourage people with 2nd homes, as it supports tourism, retail etc.
This is just a simplistic solution & the council is taking advantage of the fashionable idea of “bashing” 2nd home owners. Why are they so vindictive?
The reduction is intended to make your ??? ???
We are a housing association in providing housing for needy people. We need to minimise liability for our tenants.
Second home owners use council services to a much lesser degree, so should have some discount.
2 homes means usually more income from lettings
No added value, already paying towards parking, not using all the amenities provided
Those trying to sell their homes in present climate are being penalised. Also object to funding families to have children they cannot afford.
Properties for sale should be distinguished from those empty and not for sale.
The reduced grant from central government should be funded by reducing costs as intended by government.
Income should be funded from options c/d/e/f who are ??? C. Tax.
Should only apply to 2nd homes above valuation band ‘C’
Owners of second homes generally do not require as much use of council resources as ?? full time residents
Tax those who rent out second homes instead of those who use it (and therefore council amenities) sparingly for themselves only.
Second home owners spend locally and support the S.L economy whereas empty properties creates a negative effect. Therefore the 50% discount for empty properties should be reduced.
It’s unfair
Social Fairness
I think it should be hypothecated to affordable housing.
Second homes support local economies
Why should we fund central government
Second home owners already subsidise the council, i.e. tax they pay greatly exceeds benefits they use.
Funding reduced grants from a single source is likely to prove impossibly large for that group.
We consider that any increase should come from empty homes.
If people can afford a second home and push locals out they should pay full council tax.
Income from people staying in the county in 2nd homes could diminish if people decide to sell
Used second homes bring money + investment into the area.
Most second homes place minimal demands on local services & contribute to local economy
False economy u will never stop 2nd homes & we should not be penalised by red budgets
Second home owners use very few local facilities & get little benefit from their council tax.
Second home-owners maintain properties, generate tourist income but use far fewer council-funded resources.

It is likely to be counterproductive

If a legitimate expense of the licensing license for If you only do 20 mile a week you still pay full car
Second home owners help generate income amongst local businesses, so should not be automatically penalised.
You could end up with people selling their second homes en masse
It will assist the home ?owners? Who need ?supporting?.

We get nothing for the Council Tax we pay, not even refuse collection.
We are a second home owner and are therefore already paying 100% on first home
The amount we pay more than covers the costs of the services we use.

As long as benefits are better targeted

Empty homes may be empty due to low market activity - not always neglected. Holiday homes add to local incomes; using / employing trades
Second homes use less services.

No taxation without representation. We don not use schools, doctors why pay 100%
We already pay council tax in full on our primary residence.

Second home owners are able to enjoy all the benefits whenever they wish so should pay accordingly.
Concern that less visitors come to lake & impact upon local businesses - should be allowing and promoting visitors 100%at budget / overturning of Lake.

This won’t answer all your funding issues SLDC must stop promoting second home owners as evil social pariahs: Look at Alston to see what happens without their input.

Second home cost the council less to manage overall.

I have no vote and no voice, This is a primitive and indiscriminate tax. It’s case of allocation spares the local authority of the need to examine other expenditure and expense accounts.

Reduction in grant should be funded by loss reductions not increases in tax. This is our understanding of the measures being taken by the government.

All homes should pay the same.

Setting a precedent

Some of us are in the county as we are working here part of the time. Second home owners contribute more than a fair proportion of costs given that they do not receive the benefits of many services.

I feel 10% discount should be continued.

I think it will drive people away from area. Currently we help support the local economy which would be affected..

Its not a second home owners fault!

If someone can afford a second home they can afford the full tax.

You are overloading the burden for people who use your facilities the least.

Second home owners help bring extra income ? ??? To the area and probably consume less services. Discount is very small.

Have holiday home.
If someone can afford a 2nd home then they should pay full council tax.

I am not likely to approve of something which increases the amount I pay especially with the level of services I use.

We don not use all the facilities e.g. schools which we pay for elsewhere.

Any change to the present system should be based upon a ‘root & branch’ appraisal of all the council’s Income & Expenditure.

You will deter tourism / wealthy people whose disposable income generates employment within S.Lakeland.

Reduces local government income & allows more central government control.

Sounds a sensible way to do things.

As a second home owner I believe that already my council tax contributes to this funding as many of the services funded by council tax are not available in my area.

This house is in almost constant use and is therefore good for the local community + economy.

Discrimination against second home owners.

People well off enough to have two homes can afford to pay.

Will cost me money

Removal of waste at 10% discount is too harsh

The lakes are heavily dependant on tourists and tourism. Second homers are a key element of this. In bad summers whilst non-second homers choose to stay away (similarly recession), those with second homes have already committed to the area, & continue to visit supporting the local shops pubs etc.

Property should not be left empty when people are homeless

Owning a second home is an option. It creates problems in the housing market and forces young people out of the area. I am amazed that this subsidy for the affluent has existed so long. There is no good reason for it to continue. I would be in favour of a council tax surcharge for second homes.

I think the second home discount has always been wrong and very unfair on full time residents,

Many second homes have been holiday let for many years making a complete travesty of the discount.

Seems the most fair solution. There is no real justification for a discount on second homes. It is also far preferable to increasing council tax for everybody else.

Support is for people who need it and by definition anyone who owns a second home does not need it. And anything that encourages empty housing stock to be put back on the market is to be desired.

Houses that are Left unoccupied for a period of time prevents people that want to live in the area and pay their

If you can afford a second home then you should pay council tax in full.

It is unreasonable that those who can afford a second home should be subsidized by those who are in far more difficult circumstances.

Landlords should also be eligible for more tax if properties are empty. At any time unless it is / was their main residence.

Tourism is a big income generator in LD

Grossly unfair to those who have improved property that would not have otherwise been improved. Often now pensioners!

Second home owners already pay taxes.

If anyone has a second home, why should that be subsidised.

A wider range of cut backs should have been given consideration.

We help many clients resident in South Lakeland who are vulnerable and on a low income, and they would
be harmed by a reduction in Council Tax benefit. The owners of second homes are by definition better off than the average and a 10% increase in Council Tax will not impact on them in the way it would on the poorest.

My upstairs is rated as a 2nd home.

The reduced grant from central government should be borne equitably by all council tax payers. It should not be unfairly lumped onto a minority group.

Every property has it's own value.

2nd home owners use far fewer services funded by local govt than full-time occupants. When I can no longer afford to keep my 2nd home it will be one of many empty homes up for sale with no buyers available.

Council Tax Reduction Scheme

Q2   Reasons for concerns with Council’s proposal to use income from second homes to fund the reduced grant from Central Government

1 Inequity of Full Council Tax Charge on 'Second Home Owners’

To reflect the fact that 'second home owners’ do not require or utilize the range of Council services that local residents require was always reflected in the discount allowed on Council Tax. Prior to 2004 this discount was set at 50% however since then the Council has reduced this to 10%.

Council Tax is levied to fund the budget requirement of the constituent Councils’ however ‘second home owners’ without any discount on Council tax would pay a greatly disproportionate amount relative to the services they receive or indeed are even eligible to receive. For example, Cumbria CC Council Tax requirement is approximately 74% of the Total Council Tax Requirement and of this some 70% is in respect of the Education and Social Care Budgets neither of which services will ever be drawn on by ‘second home owners’. This, when added to the majority of District and Parish Council services which are similarly not drawn on, demonstrates the inequity of no discount being allowed to ‘second home owners’.

‘Second home owners’ pay full Council Tax in their area of main residence and rightly so because all the Council services are available to them whether or not they are drawn on; but to be expected to have to pay full Council Tax for a second home where very little of the services are drawn on is inequitable and unjust.

2 Other options are not even being considered

Referring to the document ‘Have your say on our Council Tax Reduction Scheme’.

The Consultation process appears to be an exercise in ‘going through the motions of consultation’. The Council has already stated that the proposal to ‘Remove the Council Tax discount for second homes (currently 10%) is already the preferred option’.

There is a category entitled ‘Also under consideration’ however these are immediately discounted for consideration because ‘These are not main proposals as they are not needed if our main proposal is accepted but they are considered options in the future’ Somewhat proves the point that this is a foregone conclusion and something of a fait accompli.

There is even a category ‘Not under consideration’; the reasons given for not considering these, whilst extremely laudable, are still not a valid reason for not considering them. The vast majority of Councils up and down the country are, in this extremely difficult financial climate, having to make tough budgetary decisions and, if my own local Council is anything to go by, are indeed considering those sort of options that SLDC has classified under ‘Not under consideration’.

It is clear that an easy option has been taken to fill the funding gap by targeting the already unfairly small discount given to ‘second home owners’ without giving due consideration to other options.

3 Penalizing ‘second home owners’ to the exclusion of all other classes of owners

Only ‘second home owners’ are affected by this proposal. As has already been shown they already pay disproportionately higher levels of Council tax relative to the services which they utilise or indeed are eligible to utilize. Furthermore, population wise they are a considerable minority so the few are considerably subsidising the majority. The said majority are not being asked to bear any of the burden. This situation is surely unreasonable, inequitable and unjust; particularly so when considering that ‘second home owners’ are disenfranchised and have no elected representatives to represent their interests.

4 ‘Second home owners’ are an integral part of the community

Speaking for myself I have owned a ‘second home’ in the Lake District for some considerable years now and consider it to be an important part of my family’s life. I love the area and visit as often as I can and thus contribute to the local economy without being a demand on the local government resources. Without a
home there I would not visit the area anywhere near as often, to the detriment in some small way of the local economy. Over the years however, the financial burden of owning a second home has increased, particularly the reduction of council tax relief from 50% to 10% and there will come a stage when it is, sadly, not viable. I purport that if this happens to a great number of ‘second home owners’ and they move away then I would suggest this would be severely detrimental to the local economy and far outweigh any benefits gained in freeing up some housing.

Perhaps the Council don’t appreciate the value ‘second home owners’ bring to the local economy or may even not want them; certainly by targeting them in this proposal it does perhaps beg the question of whether there is an ‘agenda’ against ‘second home owners’

Economic burden should be shared by all
The Prime Minister, Deputy Prime Minister, Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Leader of the Opposition have all said, at various times, that in these fraught economic times ‘we are all in this together’ and the burdens must be shared equitably. This is a view shared by all political parties. I strongly suggest that the current proposal to ‘Remove the Council Tax Discount for second homes (currently 10%)’ and putting all the burden on a relatively small group is not acting within the spirit espoused by all political parties. Additionally at a local level Councillors have a duty to consider fairness across the board for all Council tax payers whether enfranchised or not.

The current proposal takes the easy option to target an unrepresented small group with the full financial cost in order to subsidise the majority without due consideration of other options to spread the burden. This cannot be just or equitable.

Other empty property holders should pay. Second home owners bring income to the lakes.

The additional income from the changes should be used for the benefit of all by reducing Council Tax. The proposal to use it to negate HMG strategy on housing is wrong. Those receiving CTB are not the only poor in South Lakeland. Time to face the reality that as well as the ‘deserving poor’ many on CTB are the feckless who for generations have been quite happy to live on state hand-outs.

As I pay council tax & use my 2nd home 7 to 8 times a year, 10% discount is helpful.

Second homes - not let out for financial gain - use fewer resources over the year but in many cases provide extra income for the local areas via trades people, retail outlets etc.

Occupied "second homes" being revenued Empty homes don't therefore illogical and unsupportable to tax one and not the other.

2nd homes imply 2 lots of council tax which in this recession becomes difficult.

You can only use one home at a time.

If people can afford two homes they should pay double council tax at the full rate.

We spend a lot locally and use very few services.

People with 2nd homes in the Lakes which are empty should support the local community in some way.

There are too many second homes.

Nor agree or disagree

Cost increase for second home owners.

Have supported SLDC for many years.

It is only fair

Second homes may only be used slightly more than empty homes which receive 100% discount - this is not fair.

It seems fair that 2nd homes subsidise locals

You are looking at one group for the responsibility - Also this is a leading question - replace 'concerns' with 'comments'

If they have second homes, They should be able to fund their council tax amount like everyone else.

There are many reasons why people have second homes. Generally council facilities are used less.
Only if second home is empty property waiting to be sold.

We have a second home in Kendal. It had been on the market for some considerable time before we bought it. The previous owner was able to buy another house in Kendal to be near to relatives. Since buying the house we have undertaken renovations previously not possible for the original occupier. We used local builders for all our property improvements. We use local shops every time that we come up to Kendal and support local services. We do not rent out the property to anybody, therefore all of our activities involve the regular use by ourselves and our family of local shops and businesses, even though we make little use of Council Services. We believe the 10% discount is reasonable - if it is removed we will have to make savings by bringing our own food and provisions, and shopping around more widely to find cheaper suppliers and tradesmen - to the detriment of local businesses. We believe it is better to target empty homes which should be brought into use and thereby generate spending in the local community.

All institutions and councils should consider wastage of Council funds and ?council? Bonuses to top earners. Second homes are used by people who bring a lot of income into the local authority area & they should not be penalised more than anyone else.

2nd home owners use less council services

Good idea if you can afford 2 homes you should pay.

They should pay full amount.

You are assuming 1. This government will allow this & 2. 2nd home owners honesty & integrity.

Added financial burden for pensioners such as ourselves

It is assumed that second home owners are not in need of this discount. especially if an income is derived from the property

However - all sections should pay - not just 2nd homers we bring you a _lot of money_ - _a lot._

Why penalise those who do spend time in second homes, but apply discounts to empty ones?

2nd home owners have already suffered a 9x increase from 10% only to 10% reduction but not been able to pass this on to holiday makers due to the economic recession. Tourism and accommodation that is affordable is ESSENTIAL for the Lake District. 2nd homes produce less waste and cost the Council less to service and bring in valuable tourism for the rest of the region and should not be penalised further, to the detriment of the Lake District

My employment is in ?mkr? City - unable to find employment in ?? - Therefore having to commute. I do not use council facilities during the week.

Some people struggle to have one home, let alone a second one

You don't seemed to have taken into consideration those who have a second maybe trying to renovate it so that it can be rented out. If funds were reduced, then the house will be empty for longer.

Second 'home' bought as investment towards retirement income and to reduce dependence on state.

Private pension did not deliver. Value of property ?less? than that in 2007

Too many holiday & empty properties

As a second home owner I have no problem paying full rates. It's fair.

See below

Second home owners use shops, restaurants cinema i.e. they support tourism & pay cleaners & agents & gardeners

Second home owners bring value to the local economy. Empty homes bring no value at all and even reduce value!

we contribute enormously to the local economy and should not be penalised

I don't agree with stopping the 2nd home discount

2nd home owners contribute to the economy
Not fair - when there we utilize services but when not, we don’t. We are not there more than 90% of the time.

Once again, those who have made disproportionate financial contribution to ‘society’ are punished again

Already contribute but do not receive many of the services supplied by council and have no vote on the councils expenditure

Some second homes are simply too small for full time, permanent occupation

In paying for services used there seems to be no justification for charging 2nd home owners more than single occupancy tenants

As a second home owner, I make hardly any use of local govt./council services (schools, doctors, refuse collection etc.)

Should be in addition & total be used for benefit of a +b above

We do not use all the amenities but do support the local economy when in residence.

See comments below

Present 2nd home for sale, even reduced price, stuck in a situation where cant afford everyday bills.

Those responsible for the woes should pay.

As we do not live in the property all year round we do not utilise the facilities the council tax covers fully and therefore should not pay full amount.

See Q3 - The proposal is the best of those being considered but we still have concerns.

Second home owner is paying more into the community only receiving 10% discount now + are less of a burden on the services provided.

If People have worked hard all their lives + have managed to buy a holiday cottage in beautiful Lakeland they should not be penalised.

Very unfair.

Agree if passed by the council. (Also see Q3 for comment)

Reduction of tourism income - refund could come from business council tax associated with tourism
- pubs/eateries
- gift shops etc. i.e. shops which are not for local community.

Owners who leave properties empty or not-maintained should be penalised more.

Second home owners use council services much less than first home ones.

Second home owners have more money than me

If you can afford a 2nd house then council tax should be paid in full, this goes with property.

On the channels that you are attacking only one element of the rating pictures finances

Probably, owners able to afford the cost.

Mend the bloody roads!

Give incentive to get them occupied

Its an easy option, make your council more efficient

Second home owners provide valuable income to towns in the area. Also temp. migration of people should be encouraged to hopefully bring business re-location

As a second home owner I do not need the full services of the council and I do not get them

Completely different issue.

we have had the property for almost 40yrs and regularly come + spend money in Kendal

Second home owners are being penalised yet they make a positive contribution to the economy.
Why penalise those who support the area & bring revenue
Money collected will not affect services
Central Govt are passing the buck on to the minority.
We are co-executors of our mother’s estate. We _do not_ wish it as a second home. It has been for sale and empty for 18 months.
Do not understand
People who have a second home must have a good income. And they must be able to afford the maintenance and up keep of two homes. People struggle with one. and local people cant get a home in villages
The reduced grant is covered by efficiency measures!
Should pay full council tax
Central Government should be better organised
There are other and more appropriate options available to the council.
This is only fair. It is immoral for people to own two homes.
This is a sheer political malevolence. The Lake District gains an enormous amount from second home residents who bring vast amounts of money into the region. They may seem to be an easy target but this attitude needs to stop. They already pay 90% of full tax yet use a far smaller proportion of services so already disproportionately contribute to the local coffers. It is empty homes which should be targeted, not those which are occupied, albeit not all the time, but whose occupants do contribute to the local economy. And if the avowed intention is actually to raise council tax by the minimum amount possible then that is achieved by a small overall rise. But the best way is to target the empty homes which are not contributing in any way. I respectfully suggest that you stop demonising the holiday home owners who actually contribute to the local economy and who already pay far more than their fair share of council tax.
A distinction should be made between second home owners who receive an income or profit from their second homes and those who don’t.
We already pay a large amount of money when compared to the very low level of use of services.
The government is abolishing all benefits + bringing in one benefit called the universal benefit. This one benefit should cover peoples living expenses + bills. I don’t believe we should have a reduction scheme
People with second homes should pay full Council tax on them
Second homes use far less of the services - education / social services etc.
? " Most vulnerable " What criteria will be used?
The onus on second home owners is disproportionate. The burden of funding the grant should be spread more fairly.
Too many 2nd homes - not enough for locals.
The money as to come from somewhere.
Do not agree with your proposal as above.

See letter attached. To Summarise
Not using all the services, the consultation is biased you are only targeting second home owners. A pensioner on a fixed income, The home was inherited by his brother trying to sell it.
In 1995 I converted our family home into 3 flats, at my own expense / labour & with no Grant. Letting 2 of the flats means we are self reliant make no monitory call on anyone. The flats provide SLDC with 3 contributions to the community charges when a flat is unoccupied significant stress is placed on our finances having to pay the community charge on an empty flat is difficult. With this summers disruption of Arnside prom. 1 flat has remained unoccupied for 3 months(so far) an extension of the 6 month allowance would of be appreciated. Our TOTAL income (2 persons) is under £25k.
Second home owner.
Unfair to second home owners who do not benefit from many services i.e. schooling, libraries etc. enjoyed by local residents.
With the shortage of homes today, I feel people should be rewarded for empty homes.
Owners will be forced to sell their properties so creating a glut on the market.
The main home is priority! A 2nd home is a luxury!
Tax rates for wealthy are too low.
Will deter holiday homes and tourism 1st primary home pay 100% tax - used reduced services.
Should be agreed.
As a second home owner, I feel it is right that I should lose my 10% discount to help those more vulnerable, as long as it is properly targeted to those who really need it.
Penalisation for tax payers
It is unfair, second home owners are less of a burden on the council.
Second home owners don't use the facilities that the council tax pays for. Should remain at 10% discount.
If you have a second home, you should be in a position to pay council tax
2nd homeowners spend a lot of additional money in South Lakeland when visiting. If you lose the 10% discount money will sell up + leave
You have no idea of the circumstances of the owners & their ability to pay
Just another money grabbing exercise by you and government
Owners of second homes don't need benefits.
We pay numerous taxes to central government - who should distribute centrally collected tax fairly - Scotland gain to much.
SLDC could save £300,000 p.a. by stopping payment to _councillors_! They serve a civic duty... Ask any of them if 'they do it for the money' and they all say 'no' (especially when canvassing before an election!)
_None_ of them _need_ this money! Then sack 20% of surplus staff in Lowther St. & similar! Don't pick on people who can't sell a house or are renovating a house or have to live away for work etc.
Second home owners help the economy
We both receive a small discount for out rates which we hope can continue
Second home owners contribute!
Don’t really understand the form
Because people on low pensions need all help
Ease burden on others
Don’t know
IT AFFECTS ME
A fairer system!
Second home owners do not use all the services supplied by the council or at least only for part of the year and to tax those the same as the permanent home owners is not justified. They also bring much needed revenue into the economy both from themselves and those that use their cottages. I am aware that there is a feeling against second home owners but the Lakes is a prime tourist area and if you want to attract the visitors who spend money then a small 10% reduction isn’t a great deal to grant in their favour. You have already reduced it from 50% in the past (which is understandable and I didn't object to that).

By all means increase the taxes on homes that are left vacant for 2 years or more (or even 6m -2 yrs.) as a deterrent to owners. Those are the people you need to tax extra (with exceptions such as under probate etc.). I understand the need for the council to make up this shortfall but it should not be at the second home owners expense just because it is easiest to implement and is the amount approx. that the SLDC needs.

If it helps locals
If the owners can afford two homes make them pay for it.
I use both properties regularly as I have close associations with South Lakes having lived & loved her for 36yrs
10% is a small discount. 2nd homes make little demand on council services.
The council will do what they think is right. They know what to do they will play fair.
People with second homes also use local services.
People who can afford to own a second home can afford more to help those who are in a less privileged position.
Born in Kendal 1915 & lived at least all of my life in the country - S. Lakeland & ???? Uncertain about 2nd homes.
If one can afford a second home, one can afford to pay full council tax.
No concern, because a person with a second house could try to sell that property if facing financial hardship.
Any income that will benefit everybody is welcome
10% is a minimal amount it all helps! We do not financially gain from our property i.e. it is not rented.
2nd home owners do not receive all facilities of local residents but spend money in the area.
Try looking at your internal costs
It is not fair to use this reason alone, also 2nd homes are not able to benefit or use the full facilities of an only home.
Further taxing those who invest in the Lake District.
Because I can't find work in the lake district!
There are enough homes instead of being used standing empty by the local people.
People with a 2nd home should get no discount
The tax should reflect the costs incurred by ? Associated with the property. The costs are much lower for second homes for education, social services refuse disposal & living because second homes have less occupation then first homes.
Second home owners regularly spend money in the south Lakeland and employ local tradesmen, discouraging second home owners will ultimately cause decline in the local economy.
Individuals are already taxed to the hilt, improve the way in which the council is run. Second homes and unoccupied properties do not require the amount of council services as a full time resident hence some form of discount should apply.
See attached letter but briefly, Owned second home 23 years spent thousands locally i.e. building work, gardening work, shopping, caravans etc. If we have 10% disc removed fine but cannot be expected to pay more.
I need my second home for my work location.

This discount enables me to afford this home until I can move back to the lakes.

If they weren't holiday homes they would be empty and not income producing.

1. Potential loss of 2nd home owners could reduce trade brought into the Lake District.
2. Could be seen as an easy means of reducing the shortfall and reduce the incentive to use alternative methods.

2nd home owners DO contribute to the local economy when in residence.

Reduced overall income for shops and general income generated by tourism.

Second home owners - as we are - make a valuable contribution to the local economy and community.

Only use some council services (e.g. Refuse / roads / lighting)

Not occupied all year

We are almost 70 and had regarded this property as our long term bolt hole. We would have financial difficulties. We cannot sell out main home for domestic reasons

We do not use all services e.g. Schools etc. we already pay full council tax on our main home.

Second home owners provide valuable income both as tourists and as low users of other council services...

Tourism / leisure a major Lakes industry. Owners already provide a substantial subvention to SLDC - days of killing the 'goose that lays...' in a time of austerity.

This is the 'easy' option, penalisng a group of people who have no vote to select councillors. People with 'second' homes do not cost the council as much as those living in the area full time.

Will deter investment from 2nd home owners into area

2nd home owners do not live here, let their C tax help us

I love my holiday home in the Lake District, and I am on fixed pension income, now a window.

We already pay for more than our share of this tax.

Makes sense

This will put severe hardship upon myself I may be forced to sell property

Unfair that you already pay full council tax at main residence & only receive a 10% reduction for second home, despite rarely using facilities in area. Will discourage second home ownership in SLakes area + further damage local business + tourism in the area.

Second home owners do not require the public expense that local residents need.

The Council would be better served by challenging Govt. Policy than effectively penalising local residents.

See Q3

It might encourage to support second homes

By removing any second home discount, some of these 2nd homes might be put up for sale so allowing other to purchase 1st home

It seems fair

Small properties will be less attractive to buyers to come to the Lakes.

(Larger properties will make no difference)

I have a second home in the Lake District

Second home owners already subsidise other council tax payers

Victimisation of second home owners!

Properties ?may? remain empty

Such properties will not be occupied 100% of time so will acquire less than 100% of services. Discount
already very low
Second home owners under utilize council services and therefore already subsidise others
Visitors big help to local economy.
Home owners should support the community
Second home owners use very few council services - Me are net contributors.
Passing the burden of funding your deficit to just one part of your community is not democratic.
It would be unfair. Recently raised from 50% discount. We only use a small proportion of services.
Need as much income as possible from people who don’t live here permanently
 Owners of second homes do not make as much use of the services provided by the council as those who live there full time. Also second home owners bring income to the area and hence support local businesses, etc. each time they come to the area. Without this income the local businesses may well struggle and hence overall income to the council would reduce rather than increase. Any increase in council tax will just mean less money going into the local economy.
We use the house app 10 days a month. We always eat out at local restaurants and do most of
Second homes that rent bring money into the economy empty homes do not. No second homes = much less tourism.
It is confusing two quite distinct benefits. Each should be viewed independently.
We only use the flat 8 weeks per year
Inequality works both ways.
Better to save money directly
2nd home owners do not receive the same council services as full time residents but support local services + communities
S. Lakeland already benefits financially from high number of 2nd homes where less council resources used (relative to paying 90% of full council tax)
Shortage of Rentable or Purchasable Housing
It is an injustice: Second home owners make few demands on local government services.
This amounts to paying twice for the same service
Good Idea
Reduce other areas. Stop blaming failure of council to balance budgets on second home owners.
If people can afford second homes, they can easily afford to pay council tax in full or more.
Seems eminently sensible.
Discriminates against second home owners
Use the funds to support local facilities
My concern is with any increase rather than ?? The tax is used.
People with second homes are obviously well off and can afford for it to be used towards those of us who are not well off.
Because 2nd home owners are not using council facilities for a full year. I am not holiday let.
You should be making internal savings.
Second homes are an important source of tourism revenue for the area; it seems wrong to penalise them.
May be used to fund things I disagree with?
Rich folk already pay more than their fair share.
Second home owners pay fully for education / health / refuse etc. without using such services a great deal
It is a "no-win" situation.
Central Gov. should not reduce grant.
Both my wife and I are pensioners and as stated, The proposed change will not affect us. However, I wish to state the following:-

No Taxation without representation
The council provides very little service to people with a second home for an enormous cost even with 10% discount.
Taxation without representation an easy target without justification, alternatives not being considered in detail.
The council should manage without it!
Plenty of people DO NOT pay council tax even ???? Have they live in -!!? Everyone should pay it -!
You admit to targeting a minority to shoulder this burden rather than spreading the load over the greatest number of people isn’t that unfair?
Bereavement (see below)
As a second home owner we get very little benefit from the C.T. we pay; But do benefit the local economy by spending in the area.
Second homes are reducing the housing stock for people needing a first home and also pushing up the price of housing.
Ownership of a second home (in UK or overseas) indicates the availability of funds that are not needed to pay for reasonable living costs whereas the ownership of one home does not necessarily indicate an easy ability to pay one’s costs of living. In today’s attitude of taking and never giving it is about time that those who have considerably more (funds to buy and maintain a second home) than most people have (possibly struggling to fund one home, owned or rented) should recognise the inequity of the existing situation and paying more tax should be seen as their contribution to levelling out some of the inequitable differences that cause resentment in those incapable of bettering their own situation.
Whilst I can see the logic, there does seem to be an anomalous situation whereby the single occupant of a property, who uses the council services 365 days a year, gets a 25% reduction in their council tax whereas a second home owner, who will use the services far less frequently, will pay 100% of the council tax!
Don’t no
Second homes are killing village life as it’s been known for decades.
No one should be treat different
Fairest of the options suggested
Don’t know.
Our occupation of 6-8 weeks/year mean that we use far less of the services than the 90% we pay for.
Not all second homes are the same
Great idea
Many second home owners are pensioners and cannot afford to pay more; also unfair as do not use services.
If I own property I should contribute to local services - This is only fair.
Second homes pay 90% CT and spend a lot of money in South Lakes whilst only using a fraction of facilities.
Not sure
Too punitive for people in Lakeland with second homes there :There are many: Do you want to drive them away?
You shouldn’t remove the existing 10% reduction for second homes.
Why should people who have been sensible with money, not got into debt, saved & invested in property instead of a pension be paying this shortfall??

It sounds like a workable plan. Unfortunately I don’t know what pitfalls there can be or what the consequences might be.

Tax the rich not the poor. Well done!

Taxed enough, have to pay 40% if home sold

Second home owners rent their properties.

If people want a second home they should pay for it

The increase in income will even not come close to making up the shortfall in CG grant..

It is a vicious punitive attack on supposedly wealthy people when in fact this is very often not the case...most are diligent savers.

We have had a policy of spending with local shops and trades people ,not large nationals, in order to increase the prosperity of local business people. The increase in Council Tax will have to be found through savings...bringing food with us and going to supermarkets for cheapest prices. Remember it was local people who sold us our property.

People well off enough to have two homes can afford to pay. 

Those that can afford 2nd homes can afford to help those who have either no home or have difficulties with getting their own home or health requirements.

Each case is different - a general proposal would be wrong

Too many second homes in one area + local people cannot afford to buy or live here.

I am contributing to the local economy and do not believe I should be penalised because I don’t live there permanently. Don’t forget that without tourism the lakes economy would suffer and residents would suffer. Some people don’t get what you are asking.

If you can own two homes you need to pay

Your preferred proposal is to increase tax on those people who, mostly, do not have a local voting voice.

Difficulty collecting any rates from long term empty property where there owner is unknown/dead?

Seems a fair way of doing things.

They have the power to reduce grant don’t help them.

2nd home owners bring considerable spending to the area helping employment in the region.

People with second homes should be charged 100% - its stopping local people buying

I can only afford 1 rented house!

Amounts to 100% payment at two places, whilst benefitting whilst at one or other, but not both.

Second home owners bring economic benefits to the local economy whilst not using many services provided by local government.

Unfair on owners

Second homes typically draw less services than main homes hence it is a fair discount.

If they are able to afford a second home the money should help with any shortfall

Council should use a variety of measures to achieve cost savings, not simply target second home owners only.

Some owners are trying to sell their second homes & maybe empty for that reason.

Those who have, must pay more

Many second homes are already owned by residents in the area. In current economic circumstances income from rentals is down with fewer visitors to the area. Costs are increasing and cannot be passed on to
customers. The viability of many homes available to rent by visitors is marginal; a further increase in costs will remove many homes from holiday lettings and have a major impact on the tourist income to the area.

Owners not using facilities all the time i.e. litter collection libraries etc.

Second homes are in general purchased by people who can afford to pay the full council tax charge.

10% discount is little compound to reduced use of services it is a direct tax on 2nd homes small % increase to council tax will never make efficiencies.

Too simplistic to use an easy target

Because second homes boost local economy through tourism.

I would be concerned, the current slow market for house sales is not the fault of the owner.

Provided the council tax benefit remain unchanged.

However being a second home owner I know that we & other visitors spend a lot of money in the area when we visit / Stay.

1, it is politically easy - 2nd home property + no vote.
2, Already subsidies happy to - but means if 2nd home then lived in ??? But no extra tax.

We plough thousands each year into the area as second home owners but use hardly any amenities.

We do not have any other services. Only bin etc. emptied once a fortnight.

Money should be left with second home owners.

Second home is used for family holidays that we couldn’t afford in hotels or abroad

Being used to cover poor money management and waste.

Because as the house is not used / rented permanently council service e.g. refuse are not used every week so saving for council.

But I do believe that measures should be also introduced to reduce the number of properties empty for more than 6 months

Use monies where needed

Sec on: home owners tend to bring a lot of “city” money back not the rural economy, they employee cleaners, gardeners and other locals and tend to spend more on activities and eating out than locals.

Second home owners are a net positive contributor to the economy and should not be. Penalised for central government actions - the end result will be less money and less jobs in the local economy

Due to the current economic climate some people could be penalised as they are unable to sell their property.

Second homes in S.Lakeland put an undue burden on other local council tax payers.

The fund will be diverted some where else!

I would prefer to see it spent on the communities and on buying up empty homes and converting large empty homes into several smaller homes in order to reduce the need to build houses on greenfield land and

I would prefer Council tax benefit (or it’s new equivalent) to only be available to the disabled/pensioners (although their benefits should be means tested) and others who genuinely cannot pay - People who work hard but still cannot afford to pay because their wages are too low should be eligible for a discount but people who are of working age but choose not to / refuse to work should not be entitled to benefits.

I think it is right that there is a budget to support Council Tax it should be allocated to those most in need, not used to support those who can afford a 2nd home. It is also necessary to take whatever possible action to reduce the number of empty homes in South Lakeland at a time when there are so many people struggling to find a home.

Those with second or empty homes are a drain on the community at large and should not be subsidised in any way

In fact there ought to be a penalty rate for second homes.
If someone wishes to purchase a second home they should budget accordingly to maintain that home and council tax is part of occupying a home. It will not make anyone homeless if they can’t afford it (which is unlikely) and in these austere times we must protect our most vulnerable families and this is the fairest way to do that.

Second homes blight our community. Owners of second homes should pay a premium to compensate for this. Steps should be taken to avoid owners flipping their permanent residence to shop for lower council tax. Stop moaning and do a proper job. If you stop giving your revenue away to festivals, minority interests in the arts, firework displays etc. we could all have a reduction and our essential services restored. You can’t have my e-mail address then you can’t publicise it - what a scandal!

Owners of second homes can well afford to support local services.

Second home owners can, and do, contribute to the local economy. The tag ‘second home’ is often taken to mean a luxury or holiday home. It could well be an inherited home, a home which is used for more than holidays but is actually shared 50/50 with another address. Several ‘second home’ owners are known to have eventually settled in this area (on retirement or because of other circumstances) so their second home has become their permanent home. Penalising second home owners in such a draconian way will discourage such developments.

I have a son who is serving in HM forces and based in Germany, he this year spent 6 months on active service in Libya and has now been told he is to spent 6 months of 2013 in Afghanistan. Although he considers his main home to be the house he owns in Kendal, SLDC regard it is a second home even though he actually spends a great deal of his service life in war zones. He needs a house in Kendal because when he leaves HM Forces in 6 years time he will need somewhere to live and because he works, is married and pays taxes he is unlikely to qualify for local authority housing.

Many of these properties are used as holiday lets bringing valuable income into the area and offering employment to local unemployed. The tourists using this facility spend millions Es of extra income in South Lakeland thus preserving jobs and keeping locals off benefits. The marginal saving produced by this measure could seriously backfire and increase benefit payments and reduce local retailers turnover it is likely that. More 2nd homeowners sell up and move out of the area. Cumbria Tourism are already worried about the downturn in the tourism business and this proposal could aggravate the situation. Most of these properties are not occupied several weeks of the year thereby saving on Council costs (bin collection, schools, medical facilities, library, many other benefits like unemployment/work seekers allowances, childcare, public transport etc. etc.)

How do you reconcile the 25% reduction in rates for full time single occupancy when full rates are proposed for part occupancy? It seems like a contradiction!

What will happen in the following financial year if Central Gov. reduces its contribution?

Since second home owners can afford to own two dwellings, they should not benefit from a discount which reduces revenues for the South Lakeland community.

The demand for second homes has a detrimental effect on the availability of homes for those working locally. Second home owners do not contribute as much to the local economy as full time residents would. Consequently, I do not see why second homes should be subsidised with a discount.

Second home owners should not pay for cut backs

Second homes are a luxury for the wealthy - and local council tax payers on low wages should not be subsidising this.

Second homes use up housing supply that local people need.

It is a great idea that second homes should fund the reduced grant from Central Government.

Second homes are a luxury item, they significantly reduce the supply of housing and increase the cost of housing in the area for people who live and work in the area.
You give _no_ rationale as to why these discounts should be removed other than they help you fill a funding gap. These discounts are in place because they reflect usage of your services. It feels like victimisation of a minority who will not have enough support to fight this. The extra funding should be shared by all council tax payers.

Second home owner!

We pay 90% at the moment, but do not get 90% of the services, as we are only there 30% of the year.

Not affected by 2nd home plan

You can’t have it both ways. If you fully charge second home owners, you have to provide them with a full service.

*Q4 empty home: “from time to time”*

You may deter potential second home owners / buyers.

Cumbria relies on these properties to support tourism & incomes to ?our? Business - reduce spending is what is necessary as for every other council ?tax? approach prolongs your inefficiency

All properties should pay full Council Tax.

Where else will you get the money

One home is enough!

2nd home users use few services + already support home council services at main home.

This picking on one group of people only.

If people can afford a second home, the can afford to pay more tax

If people can afford 2nd homes - they can afford council tax & additional payments - if their 2nd home is empty the probably won't be paying electric / water bills / pone lines etc. -> it's time they paid.

Many people are trying to sell their homes & you will create more revenue not more affordable housing

Cannot afford bills as they are getting more into debt, unable to sell property

Second home owners do not use the services to the same extent (as they pay elsewhere). Why should they pay for education (for example) twice?

If they have 2 homes, they should dig deep and help you out.

It is dishonest to charge full price for a half price service

Second home owners price locals out

To own a second home is made by choice

Second homes are often holiday lets generating income for local economy / boosting tourism

You should reduce spending & accrue more efficiency

I don't believe in second homes

The extra cost would eat into my pension.

Those paying x2 council tax contribute a great deal to the national purse, and may have very little in the way of "services" on the second home.

Q1(B) Should only apply to 2nd homes above valuation band " C "

It's unfair on second home owners.

We have a second home but are willing to pay 100% (Not more!)

Not too happy to pay more for services that are not as they could easily be.....

Unfair. Also if council tax benefit is stopped won't these people just receive additional income from other benefits.

I recognise the need to balance books and economise, but there is the '???' of a witch hunt about these
proposals.

Further increases in grant.

I have a second home in Windermere and pay full Council Tax at home. I accept this as a necessary charge. However to pay even more for my second home in the Lakes is disgraceful. I already pay a huge amount and feel the I am being penalised even more. When I and my family and friends visit the Lakes we spend money therefore generating the economy in your area. It will only mean that you will put tourists and myself off from visiting your area. Surely you generate enough money from having people visit. You may even lose your second home incomes all together if people like myself have to sell up because we can't afford the bills!

While it seems best way forward - it does seem a bit unfair on those who make few demands on Council services

The proposal is not ' Fair ' the burden of raising extra revenue should be spread across empty properties.

Stop penalising second home owners.

The current 10% discount is a good enough carrot to identify which are the second homes. A surcharge will be a disincentive to such property owners to "fess up" and I am sure many savvy owners will find a route out of additional charging. This could backfire on you.

Second home owners make substantially less call on council services for which a 10% discount is the minimum recognition.

The second home could be that persons income - or it could be just paying for it's self via the rent - They shouldn't be have to help fund the Government Grant.

*Q4 I get a little help with my Council Tax not much but it helps.*

Some 2nd homes such as ours were 1st homes originally and because of the beauty of the area - were kept and we support local - tradesmen and shops

Many 2nd home owners are retired on ?? incomes

Impossible to answer!

Each household should pay council tax in correlation with svs. used

Council tax support helps people to stay in their homes.

The proposal involves taxing property owners who have no say in the imposition of the tax

This proposal is manifestly unfair to second home owners - who do not use council services when they are at their main homes

Because they got 2 homes they can afford to pay

You know what you are doing. I’m sure your right.

Money does not come from thin air!

Second home owners should not be penalised they can provide tourism and enjoyment facilities may do not use resources of council.

Let HM treasury do their own dirty work.

Second home owners have worked very hard over the years and have already paid enough in various taxes.

Second homes are not letting as well in the last few years and this will result in the housing market being flooded with second homes which are not selling either

These people provide visitors who support the local economy they shop locally & support local events they already pay full council taxes in their home areas.

No sense of fairness. Second home owners must utilise services less.

But I do feel you have a large payroll bill.
I have seen no figures. Does the full income derived from eliminating the 10% discount equal to the amount required for Council Tax support?

Taxation by any other name

I have a second home in Cumbria, I don’t want to find where Gov. has reduced grant - I pay my taxes. I am a second home owner and I see no reason why I should get a discount.

Services have to be financed

South lakes depends largely on tourism - you may well do significant damage to the local economy.

Second home owners contribute fully to the local economy using shops, cafes, sports facilities - they are very useful.

Second home owners do not get fell benefits from council at present despite paying 90% into funds.

If people can afford 2 or more properties, they are probably ?renting? Out some of them, 1 or more.

I understand the reduction has to be found from somewhere

Make less use of SLDC services.

They can afford 2nd home can afford tax.

I do not quiet see why the burden should fall on second home owners, when in fact, we use LESS of the Community facilities then any other group, particularly those who do not let the property.

Income from second homes over and above the needed for their services should go to fund affordable housing.

It is common sense

Second home owners use few council services in particular high cost services such as education & social services and therefore already subsidise the council’s spending

The burden of this extra cost should fall on a wider population _and_ on SLDC to improve efficiency still more. It’s too easy just to pass the problem to your customers, to pay.

I am a pensioner and any move of this nature would contribute to financial pressure.

If homes are for profit they should help

2nd home owners bring additional revenue in and don’t use services as much as full time residents.

Income used from 2nd home should be fore improving surrounding area _not_ for Central Government

The people that pay the most are penalised most full facilities not used , Misconception they can afford to pay more.

This is taxation without representation.

We have had our second home for many years. We are now elderly and I am disabled and this is the only possible holiday break for us. We do _not_ let this property

You have to find money from somewhere, We trust that you look at all options.

Stated 'no'. In addition would rather one or more of the other options also be considered as an alternative to putting up council tax payments for taxpayers.

No taxation without representation.

If 10% discount removed concerns would be 'no representation'. What proposals do you have for controlling landlords/rents ?on? Housing benefit?

Other proposals are more likely to stimulate the local economy as vacant property does nothing.

Empty properties are not contributing, second homes are.

Empty homes are often an indication of financial stress (e.g. reflecting costs of repairs) not if available funds.

It is unfair that the cost of the new policy falls on one group of people.
Most people are tax payers & already pay tax on any income
Any funding shortfall should be met by increasing council tax on properties in the highest bands
Second home owners have invested money instead of saving a pension and will be unfairly penalised.
Anyone who is lucky to have two homes should be made to pay the full amount if not more.
It should be based on specific cases. Although our home is a second home we now spend 4/5 days a week there.
A good method of reducing the impact of reduced grant from government
Second home owners should pay 50% more if they can afford 2nd homes they can afford to pay this amount. As most of these rent them out ad do not pay any TAXES
If you can afford to buy a second home should be able to afford full council tax.
If the second home was a second family it shouldn’t be an issue
If can afford 2nd home should pay council tax
If they have enough Capital to own 2 houses They have to pay 2 C taxes.
Second homes will become a source of _mass_ revenue for council
If afford 2nd home can afford tax
The current 10% discount for second homes is modest but fair. Second home owners use far fewer council facilities.
Good idea
Everyone who has a house should pay tax, whether they live in it or not.
They can afford to pay
Money from our area should stay in area
You may severely penalise people who are not able to afford their 2nd home and are not able to dispose of it
If people can afford a second home should pay for the privilege.
However second homes that are busy holiday lets constitute to their local economy, so shouldn’t be penalised, but also shouldn’t get a discount
It may deter people from having 2nd homes in Cumbria. These people bring in a lot of income.
Reduction of wages, increase of all other utility bills - Council reductions affecting far too many people within work ??
1/ 2nd home owners are effectively disenfranchised - and as a matter of principle there should be no tax without a vote
2/ All council tax payers should share evenly with the "burden"
3/ 2nd home owners neither have access to, nor ability to use the range of services that they pay for.
Unfair / biased 2nd homes don't take many benefits e.g. schooling.
We take very little from SLDC e.g. little waste for disposal no school children etc. etc.
I personally lose out!
I think this is fair.
1)Unfair
2)Short-sighted
3)Will hit Cumbria’s main industry very hard.
4) If a person can afford a second home they can afford the council tax.
This will put greater demands on your budgets.
Second homes do not require the level of service as a first home, therefore why should it fund them. Owners of second homes will have rights to local resident status.

It would be unfair to take yet more money from a group of people who make virtually no demands on council services, particularly education & social work - the largest items of council expenditure, it is a principle of taxation that it should be redistributive, but there are many rich people in Cumbria who do not have 2nd homes. A fairer way would be to increase the tax on all higher value properties.

If they have a second home, they usually have a good income, plus profit from renting out.

It will discourage 2nd homes & therefore tourism income.

This is the fairest way to fund reduced overheads???

It should help reduce locals council tax.

Unfair

You should be able to separate "holiday" homes from "working" homes

A second home is a luxury - if it can be afforded, then so can the extra tax.

Second homes should not be subsidised by government rebate

To replace the shortfall in council income should be shared equally by all.

Seems a fair thing to do.

You are penalising the very households who already bring significant levels of income to the area.

We feel we pay sufficient council tax on our 2nd home as we do not use any of your services.

Sometimes second homes cannot be sold so are empty through no fault of owner.

Economic input from occupied second homes already add more than average income to local communities.

Our property in Longsleddale was bought 50 years ago.

It is not the function of Council Tax to redistribute wealth. The proposal is a miss-use of Council Tax.

Because I disagree with stopping 10% discount

Seems a very sensible proposal

I think it is the best course of action and protects vulnerable groups, if anything they should be charged more for the effect they have on the area of inflating house prices as well as meaning these houses are no longer available for local people.

This is too easy a solution. The council needs to look at all it's expenditure and income.

It is obvious second home owners have sufficient funds for this.

Some 2nd homes are left unoccupied for 49 wks. Of the year.

This proposal opposes government effort to reduce the UK's unsustainable benefits system + the Uk's deficit.

I do not own a second home in South Lakeland or an empty home.

None.

I think 90% is fair considering lack / limited use of council facilities.

Will effect small business & tourist trade.

I am a 2nd home owner

I think this is an eminently sensible way to proceed. Second home ownership is a big problem in South Lakeland, artificially inflating the rental costs for many of the most vulnerable in our society. I feel this is a step in the right direction in terms of beginning to redress the balance.

Second home owners subsidise others enough already.
This becomes a subsidiary tax because we have a retirement home.

If you can afford second home then should be able to afford to pay council tax. Shouldn't be allowed it in first place.

It should be kept at the level it is now

Second homes provide very little demand on council facilities so the income derived has to be used somewhere.

See comments below.

We already pay 100% tax on one property. By paying 90% of the tax on our 2nd home we feel that is enough!

We are already paying more than enough council tax to quantify any benefits we receive.

The presence of second home owners in South Lakeland results in significant financial benefits to the area.

This would discriminate against one sector of society and could only be done once.

It is unfair.

Gov. will also receive top ?? Tax if 2nd home is sold.

We all have to make sacrifices and people enjoying council tax benefits should be no different.

Unfair

People with second homes should pay full Council tax on them

Don't understand how it works

There maybe a shortfall? Where will the money come from then?

It should have been full payment always.

If you can afford 2 homes you can pay full.

By scraping all discounts for 2nd homes it may force developers + landlords to bring more homes into use. Far to many 2nd home owners benefit from large discounts and continue to leave the property empty. By making more property available it would enable young people to stay in the community. It would also keep house prices down.

Will reduce income coming into the area.

No because if people can afford a second home they can afford full amount. They have already put cost of housing up for local people so should compensate that.

Anyone with two homes should pay full tax on both

N/A ?C not sure?

Money should be used to build more social housing

Should have been considered much earlier.

Because second home owners do not use many of the council funded facilities. They should not be singled out to take the " HIT " It should be spread more fairly across more council tax payers. By higher charges for all if necessary.

It helps to keep tax down.

Our second home is in Oxenholme our real home is in Sweden, we pay high taxes there and the U.K.

There should be no direct correlation

I only have one home.

There should be a change of discount from 10% to 5%. The discount for properties empty for over 6 months + up to 2 years should be reduced to 25%.

Efficiencies can be made but this extra money may allow inefficiencies to continue.

I have agreed to the cancellation of the 10% disc. However did worry about the local people who do rent
these homes as finances often prevent them from buying their own home.
Second homes do not cost the council the same level in services!
I already pay 90% of the full cost but get 0% of the benefits - it is already disproportionally high -
Tax has been paid on money to buy the property.
It is very unfair. (against natural justice)
These homes use less facilities and services but are used. 10% is however a small discount and I do not
object to paying more. I object strongly to being stigmatised and picked out for worse treatment.
But I do not agree that it should be solely funded by second home owners
The tourist industry is vital to the Lakes economy + second homes earn more than they cost to the council
2nd home owners do not use council services as much.
Seems rather simplistic - will it make a significant difference?
Have small holiday flat occupied for maximum of 10 weeks per year therefore use services provided for only
short time.
Spending needs to be reduced, second homes bring employment and income to sldc
I can see no justification for this proposal.
People with second homes do not generally use a great deal of the services for which they are charged
council tax.
Second homes are a luxury we cannot afford and should pay at least the same as an ordinary householder.
1/Some people have moved to another home and are having difficulty selling this home because of slow
market.
2/Holiday homes are second homes and the holiday lettings market brings holiday makers into the area and
much needed spending.
The problem posed by second homes and the loss of resulting income is a major issue for communities like
the Langdales where villages such as Elterwater have their feeling of community life pulled out of them by
the large % of second homes which are in the majority..
You should use this income to reduce parking prices in Cumbria so we can attract tourists and increase
income, as well as improving social care for the elderly
Good Idea!
Just another super tax
Generally the owners of these properties can afford to leave them empty until housing market improves,
Therefore increasing the selling price.
Second homes are a luxury, not a necessity
If they can afford second homes they can afford to pay full tax
2nd home owners probably have economical resources to help with the shortfall.
Second home owners do not damage the community on the whole.
Tourists bring money into the area - cottages to let encourage tourists
It is the fairest way to raise revenue.
Detrimental to the economic wealth of the region
Local councils can easily waste money when they should be using it for more important issues.
As a pensioner who was originally local it seems an easy way to address a problem.
10% discount is not a large discount - although a fair percentage 2nd home occupants use the services far
less than permanent residents
I am 80 years old
Avoids SLDC having to make fundamental changes to services that may be required
It does not seem that long ago that the discount on these properties was reduced from 50% to 90% which was a large increase in the costs of having a second home.
We receive absolutely no benefits from this government because we have worried and saved all our lives - why should we pay for those that have not.
Could changes have an impact on the local economy?
Second home occupancy brings valuable spending to local businesses.
We only use the property less than 25% annually and should not have to pay for services we do not use 100% of the time.
If people can afford a second home they can afford to pay full council tax or more - second homes tend to be the smaller properties which should mainly be for first time buyers.
We pay enough to the council.
Second home owners already pay more than the services they use and are a soft target
Second home owners make substantially less use of all services provided by Council than fulltime owners
Second home owners already pay a high price for their limited use of Council Services.
It's only fair as these people can afford to pay more.
I think this is only fair.
Service in Rural areas already at a minimum. By definition 2nd home users do not use full service available.
" we are all in this together "
Why penalise people who support your local economy?
Pay enough
All homes avail themselves of S.L.D.C services.
Those who have - should pay.
Does not seem reasonable as services not used.
Unfair!
We will never use welfare services / education / and very light refuse collection, but have to contribute.
Only a few years ago the discount was 50% second home owners pay a lot to the local economy.
People with second homes do not consume the local services at the same rate as full time residents so are already paying too much
Unfair when second home users use less council services i.e. I only use bins.
2nd homes don’t use education facilities
2nd home owners being valuable revenue to the area YET DO NOT USE council services like social.
Should be affordable for owners - Keeps things simple
The tax for the ??? Services already too high.
See below
Second home owners already put much more in than they take.
I consider my contribution from my second home is sufficient.
I’m biased as I don’t have one
Concerned the second home owners may find a way around this, which will be of detriment to the area. Also some second home owners may find loopholes, this should be properly thought out and doubled checked before implementing.
It should be limited to pensioners only and then my answer is No?
A second home is a luxury and luxuries have to be paid for.
Second home owners use relatively few council services and pay disproportionately high rate for those services they do use
Increasing the tax burden yet again is unfair to those that neither benefit from or ?would? use the public services
You should not use a minority to fill the hole although I have 'v' agree.
Excuse for government to cut further
Second home owners contribute to the local economy, those with empty homes do not.
My tick is for the reason's only, that people who are not well off should not pay council tax at all.
It another name for government cuts in spending in the local council sector.
Because I can't find work in the lake district!
If 2nd home is in frequent use then 10% discount should apply.
Unable to sell property (empty) for over three years due to current market made impossible by our banking greed.
Second home owners bring revenue to the area. To push them out will mean areas like Arnside will wither on the vine.
It has to come from somewhere.
Second home owners should be in a better financial position to help others who aren't.
People with second homes in the Lakes must be using - on an annual basis - significantly less than 50% of the services provided by the Council; therefore if anything they should in equity be entitled to a discount greater than 10%. The proposal is unfair and unreasonable. It's an easy populist ploy. The council should look to ways to reduce its costs, improve its efficiency and probably cut some of those services which are neither value for money nor a value to the community.
They are lucky to have this
Knot right
*Q4 Because it's currently being renovated*
There are too many young people who can't afford to get onto the housing ladder in the first place because of people buying flats as second homes.
We have a second home but we think this is fair
You will dissuade visitors with a high marginal propensity to spend from buying property and visiting the area.
The two are unaffected so therefore should not be conflated.
For properties who's owners keep them in good condition 90% C.T. I think we pay enough as we are paying full tax at our other home.
Second home owners do not use services
It is not for local government to tax people who already contribute by way of income tax
Providing the 2nd home tax does not increase
Cumbria already suffers from poor quality services. Compared with a council such as Bolton e.g. leisure
We do not use the full council services, nor have a vote on councillors, but pay 90% tax!
See below
Second homes cost the council far less in services & benefits. It is morally fair to allow a discount.
Indifferent
Object to supplementing others.

discriminatory

If people can afford second homes they should help low income households

Second homes bring little benefit to the area.

We consider that the deficit should be funded by an increase in Council Tax for all who pay, rather than those second home owners who receive less services, but actually contribute a proportionately larger amount, even with the discount. It is difficult to believe that the increased revenue for Cumbria will cover the total deficit of £560,000. What is going to happen in future years - probably the burden will fall on Council Tax payers in any event. We would be interested to know what action SLDC are taking to reduce their own expenditure to assist with the shortfall?

We would have no dispute if it was used to provide social housing.

By removing the 10% council tax discount for none empty second homes may cause more harm than good as the owners of these second homes, who do not gain an income by letting these second homes to holiday makers, may decide that the properties are too expensive to run and sell, reducing this council tax income. Those who use their second homes to let to holiday makes will more than likely put their prices up which will probably reduce the number of visitors to the area which will have a knock-on effect on the local economy.

Second home owners should not be targeted they already pay (90%) other areas charge 50%

Many empty homes are for sale in a stagnant housing market in which sale of a property may take literally years.

People rich enough to pay for it should have to pay.

If they have second homes they can afford to pay the full price

If a person owns a second home there must be a presumption that, such a person, can afford to pay full rates.

2nd home owners cost the SLDC very little (because they are mainly holiday homes) but contribute to SLDC costs.

Seems a fair way to share the pain.

If you can afford a 2nd home you can afford the tax.

Services are not used as much because they are not occupied full time 10% is not a large discount and it brings people to the area.

The government has stated that pensioners must not be affected by the changes (quote - SLDC)

Many second home owners are pensioners (and not rich !!)

Any shortfall should be made up through greater efficiencies.

Second home users should pay less as we don’t use the towns facilities anywhere near as much as residents do. Also we are also paying full tax on our main residence. So we are effectively paying twice! As we can’t be in two places at once.

Second home owners are not fully utilising services they pay for. Therefore should not be charged more.

As we are only in residence for part of the year it is logical and fair that we pay a discounted rate.

I/we think there are much better ways to find the income to fill the gap than this way.

It seems fair.

I think this is a very good idea!

Second home owners bring £ into the area.

Do not cost the council anything. No schools, police, or privileges. Only rubbish removed

An area dependent on tourism is pretty shortlisted if it sees attacking tourism as a good strategy.
Tourism is critical to our area.
I'm surprised you are calling this a council tax reduction scheme; if implemented it would increase mine. I pay 90% of the full council tax but only use your services for about 40% of the year
Do not feel the 10% will make much difference.
Worried about rises in council Tax
perfectly fair
Many people on benefits will be unable to find any extra income to fund this additional payment. For many people these properties are not second ‘homes’ but buildings purchased to earn an income when they are sold.
Why should this 'business' decision be subsidised?
Empty homes are a problem, they contribute nothing. Second homes are a great source of income already, owners use few local services (schools, hospitals etc.) but do spend money locally.
Council tax should be a charge for the services the council provides. Second home owners do not require the same level of services as permanent residents. The place for redistributive tax is the national taxation system.
As a second home I spend 50% of my time in s lakes & support the economy & community wholeheartedly. I think it is grossly unfair to expect people like me to make up the shortfall in council tax revenue resulting from these changes. The current discount also reflects the reduced usage of SLDC facilities by second home owners. A much fairer approach would be to take a firmer stance on council tax evasion & to concentrate on local efficiency savings.
If you can afford a second home you should pay council tax
If this increases the 2nd home payments
The council tax is already high relative to the use of the property and the benefits we obtain from Council Services. Any reduction of discounts is in effect an increase to us and is unfair as these are obviously to be used to prop up existing benefits currently enjoyed by some. Perhaps these benefits should be reduced in the light of current economics. We are both pensioners and are already facing effective cuts in pension value and this just represents another way to penalise the aged.
don’t see it as a cash cow
unfair/discrimination
The cuts are there for a reason. You as a council need to learn how to spend less i.e. shop around for better deals on the services you pay for.
the charge for 2nd homes should be increased
They can afford it, and if they can't then the homes can go back to local people, though this will depend on the price they charge when trying to sell!
I feel you are penalising those who by no fault of their own cannot work and live in Ambleside. I live elsewhere and would like to live full time in Ambleside but unfortunately the type of work I perform means I can only live at the weekend in Ambleside and when I have holidays. I pay tax elsewhere so pay twice and yet I can only consume one set of services so you get a great deal from me and my family. We have a greater disposable income and spend as much as others and invite people to our home. I would seriously need to think about turning the home into a holiday home business with minimum rents which would result in less council tax to you and less spend
See Q4
This proposal affects people who have worked, saved and invested. It is clearly the option which the council feels will have the least negative publicity and the easiest option. It fails to address the fact that we can longer afford the benefit system in its current form and avoids overhauling the benefit system which is what is required. The hard working people in this country are fed up with paying for people who are not prepared
to find work and rely on the benefits system instead. The council needs to provide a more modern robust proposal taking into account the current economic situation and the fact that able bodied individuals should not be encouraged financially with the payment of benefits not to work.

People with second homes can afford to pay Council Tax and should make more of a contribution to the area than they already do.

1/ second home owners have no vote locally, therefore disenfranchised. This is fundamentally wrong. Local councillors who will vote for this measure will at a stroke painlessly hand over the burden of these central government cuts to those who are unable to use their democratic leverage to oust them.

2/ this burden should be equally distributed to all council tax payers fairly or the council should find cost saving measures elsewhere

Second home owners are supporters of the local economy and this is a further step that will drive them away. I also believe you should be looking at ways to further reduce council spending and this is not being considered. The stated reason for not reviewing council spending is totally unacceptable. I ran a business of £1.2bn turnover and as with any business faced constant budget challenges. The issue is never how many people are affected but how to do more for less whilst maintaining services. I also have objected to the under six month unoccupied reduction because in this economic environment people selling houses for example of a relative that is deceased will not sell quickly and it is unfair to penalise their estate.

Income from second homes is income from those who only gain partial benefit from Council services. The current discount, which is the minimum possible, takes account of this. A reduction in one form of grant available to local authorities does not justify the discriminatory action of increasing sums payable by those who use the services least. It may be a convenient accounting exercise but has no basis in fairness.

Second home owners unless they have a rental income should not have to pay an additional fee. More often they already pay elsewhere for their main home.

For example, our flat is used solely for our own use and as such is occupied for perhaps 10 weeks of the year. It therefore utilises very little of the local facilities in comparison to a fully occupied home.

The benefit to local business from second home owners far outweighs the cost of a 10% reduction.
Second home owners are also a boost to off-season tourism.
Second home owners are seldom, if ever, in residence for 90% of the year so already over-pay for the services taken up by them.

2nd homes buying should be stopped
Second home owners should pay for their own Council Tax
These properties give 90% of income but use very little of councils resources
Second home owners bring significant monies into local economy and discouraging outsiders will be detrimental.

Our family are all in the South of England. And we have a home here for them to stay.
Holiday homes generate lower costs to the council than permanently occupied homes.
Any shortfall should be met by levying council tax rates on all properties.
Owners of second homes should pay 100% council tax.
If they can afford a second home they are already pushing prices up for local residents so should pay full tax.

Why not cut your costs??
2nd homes are the lifeblood of the Lakes tourist industry.

Unfair
A blatant tax increase on a group which receives very little service for amount paid and who do not have voting rights in SLDC area.
The second home discount is a modest 10% - less than it was formerly and is about right.
It’s a second home which we don’t rent out.
Never agreed to loss of houses in the area
Second home owners are often vilified & no account taken of economic benefit to district
If there are empty un-used homes being given 100% & 50% surely diff could be made up here.
By ??? Do you mean the 10%?
People owning 2 or more homes should pay full rates
As we only use our second home for less than 20% of the time we already pay a lot more pro rata.
' Second homes ' when there is a national housing shortage are a luxury - also you can generate income by using it as a ' holiday let ' when you are not using it yourself.
second home owners by definition do not benefit from facilities provided
A sensible financial policy, the only loss is the identification of second homes.
I don't believe the proposal should be adopted, but if it is, this is the best use of the income.
The amount of council tax that I pay greatly exceeds any benefits.
Second home owners already pay more than enough, and make little use of council services.
I work in this community - it is not a facility purely for leisure or status as with many.
It depends what you spend it on.
My second home belongs to me - I pay the C. Tax although house is in my children’s’ name. I’m 73 pensioner
2nd home owners use less facilities.
Once again tax payers foot the bill for the scroungers.
We live in an apartment in a large house in Ambleside, there are ten apartments and each contributes substantially to the wealth of the area by way of spending in shops, restaurants etc. We are pensioners and go to the apartment at least once a month. If the house was unoccupied or just one owner the income to the council and area would be substantially reduced.
I am a 2nd home owner + put much into the local economy.
No concerns as empty houses damage other houses
Second homes used solely by owners + not for commercial rent use a fraction of the amenities of a permanent resident.
IT IS UNFAIR
Most people are grateful to own a home never mind two.
Not if the income is used for the disability groups.
Any one with second homes can afford it.
Unfair to target second home owners, particularly as they have no rights to appeal as cannot vote in local or general election for local MP. Very unfair system, I currently pay about £150 for each bin collection as this is the only service I use. Second home owners will never use the education or social care services. In terms of income + expenditure, council already does very well from 2nd home owners. How can you have a system where you give 25% discount to single people on basis they use less services + expect 2nd home owners who use hardly any services to pay 100%. Tourism is an essential part of Cumbria’s economy - this will not help. If as a consequence of this, people decide to sell or pay Business Rates (I let house out commercially for more week ) this act could backfire & total revenue fall.
Yes, deeply unfair. What happened to "user pays" methodology?
They already have somewhere to live.
I feel that to tax people that have empty homes that are on the market is unfair. But people with holiday homes should pay full council tax.
Proposals not clear enough - see notes
Second homes bring revenue to our area. They use local shops, restaurants etc. and I do not believe we should be expecting them to pay more.

Although your proposal is attractively simple and easy to implement, it is unfair to single out 2nd home owners.

Only right concessions should go to people with genuine low income in our district.

Because we are fed up of subsidising other peoples’ incomes

You assume that 2nd home owners are a cost to your benefit.

Because they have got to much money

If they can afford 2 homes full tax should be paid.

I use the second home regularly & support the local economy & would suffer for the hardship

Penalizing one sector to subsidise another sector

Discriminates against those who receive limited benefit from council resources, but invest capital, income and provide employment within the area.

Seems fair

Is it really going to generate the money needed to cover reduction in Gov. grant?

What happens when the number of second homes reduces below being a help.

2nd home owners bring business to the area with little cost to the Council Tax pot.

It’s discriminatory + the owners by definition use less council services than residents

Unfairness.

Good Thinking

If like me you can afford a second home you can afford to help others

Most second homes in the Lakes generate income through letting

In some areas, this may cause people to leave their second home.

Because I use your facilities less than 40% of year.

I feel that in general anybody with 2 homes doesn’t need one of them.

The charge should be lower as fewer services used.

If the property is empty it gets no benefit from the Council so why should it pay

If you can afford 2 homes, you are rich.

Second home owners contribute significantly to the local economy without putting increased strain on the council services. Most are on holiday and make good use of local business including restaurants and shops to enhance their positive contribution to the community.

As a second home owner we already pay South Lakeland 90% council tax.

" Second Homes " are often holiday lets. Do you wish to damage this market?

Second home owners are not using your services as often / as much

Top paid council workers could lower their wage to help in the reductions of others.

One group paying for services.

Second home owners will have less to spend in local shops.

Second home owners do not use expensive services re: social care.

Council Tax is high enough.

Council Tax Discounts on second homes is not necessary. People who can afford a second home can afford at least the full council tax appropriate. There could be a case for an additional charge of say 150%.

I own a 2nd home in the Lake-District and do not get my share of council service at present.
The current level of 90% exceeds services taken, hence currently funding other council activities
It is unfair to second home owners
Second home owners do not avail themselves of all council service - Particularly education.
I pay 90% of Council Tax for my second home, yet use few Council Services. If people on benefits cannot afford their Council Tax then they should move to somewhere more affordable
No concerns as 2nd home owners use the facilities and services offered by the Council and have the option of letting out their properties to other such users when they are not in residence themselves.
The owners of second homes often bring money into the area
Simple economics - SLDC economy is based on agriculture and tourism. Remaining discount is a dis - incentive for second homes and they bring into SLDC area.
Second homes use less council recourses.
Turkeys don't vote for Christmas.
With the extra VAT charged on rentals it is hard to cover costs. We need tourism and the rental properties.
Second home owners already pay 90% tax but do not make use of many services e.g. education, social services.
People with 2nd homes should be made to pay the full amount - maybe it would encourage them to rent out or sell!
Second home owners contribute greatly to south lakes economy.
Second homes are used as holiday homes. Empty homes are not used at all.
?Raise? Money generated by discouraging properties remaining empty for more than 2 years. Don't penalise second home owners
Totally unfair
Ridiculous - 2nd home owners use virtually none of the services.
I don't no
*Q1 Not much bloody choice*
People went in 2nd homes to provide and recover given the shocking attack on the pensions industry by labour + how the power government.
Too many 2nd homes in this area & not enough affordable property for young locals.
Only income we can generate in my business comes from 2nd home owners, we must not alienate them
They have the same amenities
I have second home
It makes sense to use income from 2nd homes
Assuming you mean by " Income " council tax which problems arise from second homes being fully taken.
I am a pensioner (nearly 82) and pensioners are support to not be affected by the changes. I do not derive any income by letting my humble second home, but use it to allow me to continue my research on Cumbrian history to which I have been able to make a considerable contribution over the past 35 years - all without financial reward !
The original reason for reduction in council tax is still valid. The discount already reduced to 10% this in my view is fair.
I have a small second home.
The extra cost to myself.
2nd homes owners (in properties) bring in revenue to SLDC.
You should not assume that all 2nd home owners are wealthy I'm a pensioner on fixed income.
We use our 2nd home for at least 6 months of year. When we are not here we don’t use any council facilities e.g. bins etc.

Second home owners are paying towards the local services - usually in a different area from home 1.

The concept of Council Tax is to fund the very expensive services that Local Government provide to people who live in properties. Properties that are empty do not incur costs significant costs that are born by Local Government. As a matter of simple fairness empty properties should not incur significant Council Tax. It is rarely the case that empty properties are owned by ‘rich’ people - more commonly they are properties awaiting sale, or used as holiday lets - and hence bringing income into the area without the costs of child support, education etc. that arises from ‘full time occupation’.

The reduction in grant means that Council Tax Benefits should be reduced to people of working age who in most cases can work part-time. We simply cannot afford to support the massively expanded numbers of healthy and fit people who are able to work, at least some of the time.

It is pointless holding a consultation when the Council has clearly ‘made its mind up’ - with the wrong decision!

You should not penalise second home owners who already spend a lot in South Lakes but only use half the facilities / utilities.

Every little helps.

Loss of valuable income to the area from those who come to the area regularly to use their second home.

We gain very little in reward for an extremely large payment already.

Many second home owners put a lot into their local communities and, in some instances go on to become residents. Not all are necessarily hugely wealthy and able to pay 2 lots of council tax. Second homes are less of a “waste” than empty properties and yet the level of exemption is very much lower for these already.

Most second homes will be rented out.

I don’t believe that is fair.

This does not however recognise where 30% occupation : 70% occupation occurs.

I don’t understand this.

I'm not totally against 2nd homes but not on housing estate etc. when people are on the waiting list.

Those second home owners who presently pay 90% Council Tax do support the local economy by spending money on food, other household items, carpets, capital goods, etc. in local shops, transport, water, electricity, gas, petrol and diesel, and local tradesmen for maintenance of their properties, both inside and outside, etc. Although they pay 90% of the Council Tax, they are likely to make demands on substantially less than 90% of the facilities that are provided through the Council Tax.

Conversely, anyone who owns an empty property is not supporting the local economy to the same extent. When no one lives in an empty property there is no associated spend on supporting local shops, buses, taxis, tradesmen, etc. Yet the Council Tax discounts given to empty properties range between 100% to 50%. Surely it makes better sense that the Council Tax on a property that has been empty for more than 6 months should receive no Council Tax discount so as to encourage arrangements to be made by the owner to get the property rented, sold or kept so that it has to pay either 100% or 90% Council Tax. If it is rented or sold it will no longer be empty; it will be inhabited by people who will support the local economy, shops, transport, etc., and the SLDC would receive either 100% or 90% Council Tax instead of giving either a 100% or 50% discount.

We suggest that second home owners continue to pay 90%, whilst empty properties that do not help support the local economy should be charged the full Council Tax (or more if they have been empty for more than 2 years).

Those of us who don’t make a profit from our second homes would like better local services

We contribute 90% of the charge for services we access only 10% of the time. We _actually_ fund services for residents.

This is subsidising council tax for everyone else by taking from those that use fewer services. 10% discount
does not reflect the actual service usage.

If you have two homes, you can afford two council taxes.

Those second home owners who presently pay 90% Council Tax do support the local economy by spending money on food, other household items, carpets, capital goods, etc. in local shops, transport, water, electricity, gas, petrol and diesel, and local tradesmen for maintenance of their properties, both inside and outside, etc. Although they pay 90% of the Council Tax, they are likely to make demands on substantially less than 90% of the facilities that are provided through the Council Tax.

Conversely, anyone who owns an empty property is not supporting the local economy to the same extent. When no one lives in an empty property there is no associated spend on supporting local shops, buses, taxis, tradesmen, etc. Yet the Council Tax discounts given to empty properties range between 100% to 50%. Surely it makes better sense that the Council Tax on a property that has been empty for more than 6 months should receive no Council Tax discount so as to encourage arrangements to be made by the owner to get the property rented, sold or kept so that it has to pay either 100% or 90% Council Tax. If it is rented or sold it will no longer be empty; it will be inhabited by people who will support the local economy, shops, transport, etc., and the SLDC would receive either 100% or 90% Council Tax instead of giving either a 100% or 50% discount.

We suggest that second home owners continue to pay 90%, whilst empty properties that do not help support the local economy should be charged the full Council Tax (or more if they have been empty for more than 2 years).

This scheme discriminates against second home owners who do not use the property for business reasons (businesses will not be affected by this)

Second homes rented out as holiday lets encourage tourism & boost local economy.

This is an easy option funded by ALARGE section of the community - who does not have a voice. Next year :-

% loading on second homes?

This is my only home I do not let it but circumstances make me reside in Preston 2 weeks in every month where I rent the property.

Unfair to second home owners

As a pensioner on a fixed income. I find it most unfair to subsidise the ever increasing BENEFIT CULTURE.

But people may have no choice but to move, & may need financial assistance i.e. a discount.

As a second home owner I pay full council tax in one area + 90% in another. I clearly do not use all council services fully in both + should not pay fully for both.

2nd home owners do not fully use council services so 10% discount is fair.

not sure doesn’t affect us no second home

Second home owners do not use the facilities provide by the council for the same percentage as full time residents who should pay for the facilities they use(provided to them).

Second homes (excluding let properties) use less services and bring money into the local economy (e.g. building trade)

This income should be used to buy / build houses for locals(Not foreigners) on the waiting list.

Tourism is critical to the area

Second home owners bring revenue into the area and use few of the council funded services. Removing the 10% discount is therefore biased against a minority who do not create a cost burden in the first instance.

I have a second home for work reasons only - not pleasure if the cost becomes prohibitive I will move from Cumbria.

We have already taken a 40% increase to pay for benefits + services that we do not receive

This would be my main home except I rent property

As a second home owner, I spend about 8 days per month in the Lakes. ?? I pay 90% CT. If this is suggesting that I pay more, then yes I have concerns
Extra burden for pensioners

Need to target also property unoccupied for extended periods adjacent home to mine has been empty for over 2 years

2nd home owners currently contribute _90%_ toward service and only use - _10-20%_

Broadest backs must take more burden

We do already, as second home owners, in a well-used family-occupied '2nd' home, pay considerable rates but use almost no resources from the Council. I agree with the principle that the better off should pay more - but we're not better off. We have an inherited shared home which we love and use. There are a lot of much better off people who just rent houses out for profit.

second home owners use local services less and therefore are less costly to fund

It is fair and decent.

People work hard to make an income and pay government tax as a result

Second home owners do not use as many facilities - e.g. refuse disposal.

The idea of generating income from a property is to funnel the costs associated with that property / occupants. If a property is empty or is a second home then by default not as much financial burden is placed upon the local authority and therefore the revenue generated from that property should reflect this. I occupy my property less than 10% of the year but spend twice the annual national level of disposable income in the area which helps business and generates jobs. If the council choose to help the less well off ALL council taxes should rise to pay for this not just the group that spend the most locally from all tenanted properties.

As a second home owner. I would like to see this encouraged as the income this brings to Cumbria is significant

People with second homes use very little of the local utilities i.e. police, libraries, health care etc.

None use of services by 2nd home owners already provides funding

I'm a second home owner and spend a fortune both business & private in your community

Second home owners often bring benefit to the tourist trade by allowing friends + family to use the home.

c/d/e/ &f above should be used to fund the deficit.

People who can afford second homes are in a position to provide monies for council funds. Out of the rents they charge for re-letting.

Add additional pressures on those that have holiday properties reduce income to south Lakeland if they use the properties and add to economy should not be penalised

This countries in a mess. No one seems to know what they doing.

Second home owners bring money into the Cumbria economy and do not take much from, for example, schools, hospitals, so it does not seem fair

Penalising 2nd home owners is the easy option rather than SLDC economising on its expenditure as other non-tourist authorities have to do

This is prejudicing 2nd home owners.

Because this allows SLDC to avoid making savings by improvement of efficiency & elimination of waste in the management of it's organisation.

see below

My only slight concern is that there will be a slight downward pressure on house prices as a result which may make the value of my home which is by far my biggest asset reduce.

Second home owners seem to have more money than those who need help.

I get a council tax rebate which in all honesty I rely on due to the fact I can only work 16hrs due to the lack of childcare in my village. And the fact that my income has not changed over the last 31/2 yrs. - the economy
has risen so has rent and council tax
As a second home who does not rent out how can you differ between the two.
I am not clear that I understand what you mean by this as you already have a second home income that you are using even with a 10% increase, it won't be enough to close the gap.
All services provided by council not used throughout the years
The more you find by doing this, the less the government will give
Ban discounts to all second home owners
Government takes too much for bureaucracy
Homes are empty for up to 6 months
Totally unreasonable
Homes and second homes should be treated the same way
I would be penalised
Only disagree if it means stopping the discount
Owners will feel threatened and alienated and move away
The discount level was grossly reduced to 10% by the last government
This is not clear
Second home owners already pay appropriately high costs for limited services
Because I know you will be wise and put them to good use
I have no problem with removing the 10% discount from second home owners who live in that second home for part of the year and leave the property vacant for the rest of the time on the grounds that they can probably afford to pay 100% council tax on the second home. I however rely on rental income from a second property and removal of tax discounts for periods when the property is vacant would be a senior financial blow to me and others like me who work very hard running a business and paying taxes including full council tax on our principal residence.
I am a second home owner. I use only occasionally and contribute to the local economy when I am in SLDC.
Q1(b) seems sensible and probably the least painful