

Key findings report

Council tax premium proposal



February 2016.

Report by Sue Glenn, Corporate Consultation and Engagement Officer

Background:

A sample of the Citizens Panel were sent either a postal survey (500) or an online survey (200) with background information about a proposal to introduce a Council Tax premium on certain types of properties.

The 700 panel members were asked to read the background information about the proposal and provide their views on key questions by Monday 8th February 2016 so these could be shared with the Cabinet and inform their and the Full Council's discussions and decision around the proposal.

The proposal:

The Housing (Wales) Act 2014 gives local authorities discretionary powers to charge an additional amount of council tax from 1st April 2017 (a premium) on both long-term empty homes and dwellings occupied periodically (second homes/holiday homes).

The introduction of a premium supports council policy of bringing as many empty and periodically occupied properties as possible back into full occupation. Currently no discount is granted to empty properties or properties that are periodically occupied. Reducing the number of such properties within communities increases the availability of housing stock and delivers economic benefits to local communities.

The response rate:

211 responses were received by the closing date. 41 of the 200 panel members who received an email and link to the online survey responded and 161 of the 500 who were sent a postal survey did so. This gives a total response rate of 30%. This is quite typical of the normal response rates from the panel and also for postal type surveys on the whole.

Around a dozen or so surveys were returned or bounced back via email from panel members who had either moved home or changed their email provider without notifying the council.

Panel profile and response:

The panel is a self-selecting group of residents who have volunteered to be involved and consulted by the council on a variety of topics from dog fouling to domestic abuse. The panel is predominantly made up of an older demographic but can act as a control group offering an independent and impartial view on matters affecting key stakeholders.

From the 211 responses received 106 were from men and 92 from women. 13 panellists chose not to specify their gender. 109 panellists who responded were aged 65+ years, 88 were aged 45 – 64 years and 12 were aged under 45 years. One person owned a property that was currently empty and seven respondents owned properties that were periodically let.

Key Findings:

Empty Property Premium

- 79% of panel members were in support of a premium being introduced on long term empty properties. A fifth were not in favour. (21%)
- 145 comments were given around why panel members supported such a proposal. (See Appendix A)
- 37 comments were given around why panel members didn't support the proposal. (See Appendix B)
- 70% felt the amount of premium should vary dependent on the length of time a property had been empty.
- 81% felt introducing such a premium could act as an incentive and help motivate owners of long term empty properties to either rent or sell the property.

Periodically Occupied Homes Premium

- 71% of panellists were in favour of a premium being introduced on periodically occupied homes e.g. holiday homes and second homes. 29% were not in favour of this proposal.
- 126 comments were given around why panel members supported this proposal. (See Appendix C)
- 58 panel members gave reasons why they didn't support the proposal. (See Appendix D)
- 63% felt that introducing such a premium could act as an incentive for owners to bring their second property back into use as someone's main residence.

Additional Insights

- The top five answers when panellists were asked where any revenue gained via introducing this premium should be spent were:
 - Supporting owners of empty properties to bring them back into use
 - Providing more affordable housing
 - Schools/education
 - Tackling homelessness
 - Social care for adults

Question by question analysis.

Q1a. Do you support the proposal to introduce a premium on long term empty properties?

6 panellists chose not to answer this question.

Answer	Number	Percentage
Yes	162	79%
No	43	21%
Total	205	100%

Q1ai. Please give your reasons for supporting the proposal?

Of the 162 respondents who answered yes, 145 gave a reason why they supported the proposal. These were predominantly around people feeling that there were areas in the county where people couldn't afford housing and that by getting empty properties back into use this would improve the availability of affordable homes. There were also comments about people who could afford two properties contributing more to the economy.

Some examples of the comments given are as follows:

"I live in Presteigne where there are many young people who cannot find houses to buy and some have moved into Herefordshire where the Council's attitude to allowing development is more realistic. The empty properties in Llandrindod will not be occupied now that the Housing associations have built so much."

"In the area in which I live there are many longer-term empty properties which could serve housing needs rather than new-builds a quota for which is imposed on local councils. The new-builds (often executive and not affordable for a vast majority) are then granted permission but the only people to benefit are the developers."

"There is a shortage of affordable housing both to rent and buy in our part of Powys. Having long term empty properties just exacerbates this problem."

"Increase revenue for P.C.C."

"To avoid vandalism, to maximise on council revenue to ensure owners use properties which would add value to local communities either by occupancy, sale or rent."

"Unless there is a good reason for the property to be disused they should pay the premium. Families need to be housed at all costs. It is difficult to buy or even rent property. Bring as many as possible back for use."

"This will increase revenue for PCC. It may make more housing available locally. Occupied dwellings improve the appearance and atmosphere of a locality."

"Properties empty for extended periods attract vandalism, squatters, fly typing etc. and reduce the number available for sale or rent."

Please see Appendix A for the full list of comments. Any personal details have been removed for confidentiality reasons.

Q1aii. Please give your reasons for not supporting the proposal?

Of the 43 panel members who answered 'no', 37 provided a reason why they felt they couldn't support the proposal.

The main reasons given were around the fairness of charging people who may have worked hard to own a second property or inherited it and couldn't afford to renovate it quickly enough to avoid a premium.

Some examples of the reasons given for not supporting the proposals are given as follows:

"I have had a property empty myself, doing renovations slowly when I can afford to do it and still waiting for solicitors to sort out my mother's estate, things are never clear cut. Things can take a lot longer than 12 months."

"Penalises people who may have a good reason for not occupying a home of use it as a second home."

"It is none of the Council's business whether or not a property is occupied, provided the full rate of Council tax is paid. This whole business diverts attention away from the true issue. Successive governments and Councils have failed to build enough COUNCIL HOUSES (I'm not talking about 'affordable' homes built by developers)."

"Why should they pay more when they are not receiving any services - they in fact, should pay less? Empty properties should pay a reduced Council tax."

"Probate delays. Planning delays. Planning blight. Insurance claim delay."

A full list of the comments given is in Appendix B.

Q1b. One reason the council wishes to introduce the premium alongside income generation is to try and ensure some of the current 1600 empty homes become lived in rather than remain empty. Do you think charging a premium will help or hinder this plan?

8 panellists chose not to answer this question.

Answer	Number	Percentage
Help	164	81%
Hinder	35	17%
Don't know	4	2%
Total	203	100%

Q1c. Should the amount of premium vary/be staggered depending on the length of time a property has been empty?

19 panellists chose not to answer this question.

Answer	Number	Percentage
Yes	135	70%
No	57	30%
Total	192	100%

Q2a. Do you support the proposal to introduce a premium on homes that are periodically occupied? (I.e. second homes/holiday homes)

Answer	Number	Percentage
Yes	146	71%
No	61	29%
Total	207	100%

Q2ai. Please give your reasons for supporting the proposal?

126 people gave reasons supporting the second proposal. The main reasons were again around fairness and people being in a position to own more than one property contributing more. There were also comments about people who own second homes stopping young people being able to buy a home locally.

Some of these are listed below. Please refer to Appendix C for the full listing.

“Again, it would provide a new income stream from those people who are using their properties for other than residential reasons and who are likely to be wealthier, and who will have the means to recover the additional premium by increasing their rents.”

“Holiday homes take away potential homes for local people.”

“When younger, frequently people struggle to provide homes for their families, often in areas where they have lived possibly all their lives and with fast rising rent levels in some cities being quoted for such as Bristol, any arguably reasonable proposals are worthy of consideration.”

“People that can afford a second home should pay more I don't think it should apply to holiday homes let as a business.”

“If you can afford another property you can afford to pay a premium! As a holiday home - enjoying the views etc. nice roads, parks, it has to be paid for.”

“Absolutely it should be 100% as the owners do not contribute to our community and are taking housing for local people and pushing house prices up.”

“Help to the Council Exchequer - especially if staggered over 4 years i.e. 25%, 50%, 75% then 100%.”

“Owners are making a profit from letting (e.g. holidays periodically).”

“These type of properties should be paying the same as any resident in Powys paying Council tax. Holiday homes are a business to some.”

Q2aii. Please give your reasons for not supporting the proposal?

58 panel members were not in favour of the proposal. Key reasons were around the fact that people felt a premium was not fair when people owning second homes already paid more tax and may have worked hard to afford one. There was also a fear that it could affect tourism in the county.

Some of the comments are listed below. The full list is available as Appendix D.

“This will penalise these people who have worked / saved up to buy a second home. More effort should be made to tackle benefit fraud which is rife in Powys.”

"Discourage holiday lets which will impact tourism, especially if many holiday lets decide to pack it in. After all it is seasonal business and they would be penalised for something they have no or little control over!"

"I think having a second/ holiday home in this area is a positive and not a negative on the whole. I doubt that the kind of homes people buy for holidays are competing with, for instance, first time buyers, though it's probably the case that the demand does exert some upward pressure on the housing market. I know of a number of cases of people who came here for holidays, perhaps owning a house and at some point come and settle here, so I am not sure that penalising 2nd home owners would not be counterproductive."

"As an owner of a holiday cottage - I have already spent substantial revenue in achieving the relevant standards set by WTB. The fact that the property is let brings revenue into Powys through tourism. I object strongly to this possible premium. It's hard enough to make any profit at all now."

"SECOND HOMES: undecided. HOLIDAY HOMES (for rental) NO. The owners pay (or should pay) tax on their rental income anyway."

"Much better a 2nd home/holiday home than an empty property. If Powys charge a premium and other areas do not this will tend to discourage people from buying a holiday home in Powys - to our detriment? Could then adversely affect property prices which are already very depressed."

"If a property is being used then I don't think it puts it in the same category as properties being empty for long periods."

Q2b. Do you think the premium would act as an incentive for owners to bring their property back into use as someone's main residence?

Answer	Number	Percentage
Yes	98	63%
No	58	37%
Total	156	100%

Q3. Any money raised through a council tax premium is not ring-fenced. This means the council is free to spend the money in any way it sees. Where do you think any income should be spent?

10 suggestions were listed for respondents to choose from and an option for alternative ideas also provided.

The five receiving the most support were as follows:

- Supporting owners of empty homes to help bring them back into use
- Providing more affordable housing
- Schools / Education
- Tackling homelessness
- Social Care - adults

If respondents didn't wish to rank the suggestions given they were asked to give their own suggestions. 48 panel members gave their ideas. Please see Appendix E for the full list.

Q4. Please provide any final comments below about the proposal.

97 panel members choose to give final comments around the proposal. These were on the whole very similar to those already expressed and haven't been included as an appendix. They are available on request.

Q5. Profile questions:

Gender	Number
Male	106
Female	92
Total	198

13 respondents chose not to answer this question.

Age	Number
Under 45	12
45 – 64 years	88
65+ years	109
Total	209

2 respondents chose not to answer this question.

Property Type	Number
Owner of an empty property	1
Owner of a periodically let property	7
Total	8

Appendices

	Appendix A – Comments from panel members who support the proposal to introduce a premium on empty properties.
1	To encourage properties to come back into use
2	Increase revenue for P.C.C
3	I believe this would help recoup some of the costs of such properties when owners do not contribute to the local community / economy in other ways (shops, leisure facilities, schools etc.)

4	Such properties should be sold or rented or used as holiday homes and not left empty.
6	Second or holiday homes are a luxury. But it should not apply where someone is trying to sell their home but is finding it difficult to do so.
7	I live in Presteigne where there are many young people who cannot find houses to buy and some have moved into Herefordshire where the Council's attitude to allowing development is more realistic. The empty properties in Llandrindod will not be occupied now that the Housing associations have built so much.
8	If the properties are in disrepair yes, but not if they are just taking a London time to sell.
9	In the area in which I live there are many longer-term empty properties which could serve housing needs rather than new-builds a quota for which is imposed on local councils. The new-builds (often executive and not affordable for a vast majority) are then granted permission but the only people to benefit are the developers.
10	To share the burden more equitably.
11	Properties that are empty for a long period of time could have a premium paid by their owners if they wish them to stay empty or sold or rented. This could help issues for local housing stock.
13	We need people living in properties - people who have children and relatives who visit the area and bring money into the area - not empty properties waiting for them to be worth more money.
14	Homes needed and at an affordable level.
16	So much could be said here but, essentially, the property owner is still the beneficiary of all the services which a local authority must provide and this includes roads, street lighting and so on. Generally, they make no contribution to the local economy in the way that a resident owner does, by supporting local shops, tradesman etc., without which the community would be the poorer. Not being used enough is why most shops or businesses fail and when they fail they put people out of work. At the very least, the Council then loses revenue from Council Tax as well as the Business Rate which the failed business paid. The premium is a small extra price to pay in lieu of that contribution.
17	Will increase the pressure on landlords to fill empty properties to help housing shortage.
18	I don't think empty homes are an option at a time when many struggle with rent, and homelessness
19	Empty property has a detrimental effect on the surrounding community, it hold up precious property stock impacting on the property market and the premium should be greater than an occupied property.
21	At times of shortages of homes in many areas and, presumably accurately, it is suggested that such as Ministry of Defence may own thousands of empty homes when allegedly 25% of people "sleeping rough" could be recently military personnel, something constructive needs to be done NOW.
22	To provide additional income to a cash strapped authority without impacting on the poorest groups.

23	There are too many empty properties, many being kept empty for reasons of potential financial gain. Releasing them on to the housing market should make it possible for more local people to buy or rent homes.
24	Rather than a means of increasing PCC revenue the major inescapable logic that it is immoral for property to remain empty when people are unhoused or living in inadequate property
25	Encourage more empty properties to be let, sell them thus making more affordable housing potentially.
26	Homelessness is an issue, as is affordable property. These problems affect the community at large; if owners can afford to leave property untenanted for long periods, they should compensate the community.
29	Reduce private rents and increase housing supply.
30	There is no reason to have an empty property if it possible to utilise it.
31	It will have positive consequences on housing availability and ensure that people who can afford it pay a premium.
32	There are people living on the street because of lack of housing. There are others living in cramped conditions.
33	There is a shortage of affordable housing both to rent and buy in our part of Powys. Having long term empty properties just exacerbates this problem.
34	Homes in this category contribute to higher prices and homelessness. They also rob the local community of finance in general
36	It is one way the Council can put pressure on private owners to maintain and use their property. If they object to the charge, then perhaps it will encourage them to sell.
37	There are young people who cannot afford to live here and having empty holiday homes that do not pay a sensible amount to the Council should not happen.
40	Encouraging people to make use of empty houses is good for the community as a whole.
41	Owners maybe using property as an investment and in effect depriving homeless of accommodation
42	This would increase money for government, South could potentially force them to sell, which international would create more accommodation
43	Reasonable way to increase tax-take
44	To encourage the owner to either occupy or sell on the property.
45	Properties empty for extended periods attract vandalism, squatters, fly typing etc. and reduce the number available for sale or rent.
48	Properties left empty are a blight in the area becoming run down or dilapidated. This would push them to be maintained, let or sold thus increasing the available properties in the area. The longer its empty the higher the rate!

49	Unless there is a good reason for the property to be disused they should pay the premium. Families need to be housed at all costs. It is difficult to buy or even rent property. Bring as many as possible back for use.
50	To bring them back into use for homeless families.
51	It will encourage disused properties back into use.
52	I agree with your examples. Owners of second properties often have no funds to renovate them and make them either saleable or suitable for rental.
54	To help to increase available housing in Powys. To reduce the need to build on greenfield sites.
55	How can there be a lack of housing stock if we have properties for refugees available?
56	They go into disrepair - vandalism.
57	To avoid vandalism, to maximise on council revenue to ensure owners use properties which would add value to local communities either by occupancy, sale or rent.
58	I know of a few places that have been empty for years.
59	A very logical idea, should have been implemented long ago!
60	It depends why the property is empty e.g. it may be tied up because of probate and should not be charged. If it is empty largely because of the rules of a third party the owner should not have to pay.
61	Given that you do not charge ANY council tax on empty properties this seems a rather odd question. Since the valuation office is responsible for setting rates I fail to see how the council can implement the necessary change.
62	Because it would give you a new income stream derived from people who have failed to manage their own properties, which in my view is perfectly justified.
64	For the council to obtain additional income which in turn will reduce price rises for the general public of Powys.
65	Whether they are empty or not they are still a burden on council resources.
67	Encourage property owners to put the homes/properties back into use.
68	Needs more clarification before I can decide.
69	To give young people to have a home of their own, and could regenerate rural areas.
70	It may encourage property owners to renovate/let/sell properties more quickly.
71	It is bad for the house to be left empty and would help the housing crisis if owners are made to do something about them.
72	Someone is responsible, the longer it's left unattended the worse it looks and it degrades the area.
73	UK is not meeting targets to provide homes therefore ALL potential dwellings should be made available.

75	Land and property banking is immoral. Extend this to vacant retail units too.
76	Additional Revenue, enhance usage of 2nd homes.
77	Yes - a wakeup call that they haven't been forgotten.
78	It's a good incentive to make owners make the property available to buy or rent.
79	I believe when there is a desperate shortage of affordable housing to rent, increasing the tax on these properties will encourage the owners to put them on the market to rent or to sell at a lower price. For the second category "periodically occupied" it's essential to specify the period - less than 50%?
80	I think it is wrong to have holiday homes which are empty half the time when there is such a shortage of starter homes.
81	As stated the owner would be encouraged to sell, let or live in a valuable property.
82	Many people are struggling to find accommodation
87	If owners can afford to buy a property and leave it unattended then they can afford to pay council appropriately.
88	To encourage occupation of properties.
89	It should encourage people to have properties occupied. An empty property can deteriorate and can affect other nearby properties.
90	To incentivise landlords to either sell or let to assist the housing shortage. Plus to achieve extra income for the authority.
91	Introducing a premium would encourage owners to make a decision to sell the property or renovate it.
92	Encourage owners to do something (either sell or renovate) or let out for income to cover the added costs. It seems there are many many empty houses in Powys!!
93	But NOT if owner is trying to sell but is unable to.
94	It might give people a push to either rent or sell their property.
95	Empty Homes: As described to incentivise rent or sale. You should explore options of CPO and rent, sale AND to partner with housing associations to bring them into letting. You should NOT apply charge to empty council or HA properties taken out of letting as part of a scheduled decant and redevelopment. Holiday Homes: Agreed BUT holiday makers can contribute more to local economy than residents AND they are generally low users of services such as refuse collection but high users of leisure centres etc. Powys economy is relevant on the holiday *** - this I accept is different from 2nd home ownership.
97	Very good idea
99	It would encourage owners to do something with the property.
100	This will increase revenue for PCC. It may make more housing available locally. Occupied dwellings improve the appearance and atmosphere of a locality.

102	Everyone has to pay council tax just because it is empty should not be an excuse not to pay.
104	Need to give young people a chance to own their own property, as they can't afford to live here, which affects jobs and the character of our town (Hay).
105	The property in Brecon High Street that used to be called 'Top Draw' is a prime example. This should never be allowed to happen.
107	I would normally say that people should be free to do as they wish with their own property but in situations where people have no home or are forced to live in totally unsuitable circumstances it seems unreasonable to keep property empty.
108	We have a massive housing problem in the Machynlleth area, every empty property should be renovated if needed and available for rent.
110	Need to get them back in the housing market.
114	An incentive to sell/let
116	People who have money (clearly do cos they own 2+ properties) shouldn't have to have extra money cos they don't pay when you got people scrimping n saving to pay there's
118	There are people wanting somewhere to live and this would help the housing situation.
119	Increase revenue stops property becoming unused and possibly vandalised or derelict.
121	If a year empty is a long enough period if/when housing market poor. Why should there be long term empty properties with homelessness etc.
122	I fully agree but it's difficult if someone has a house on sale and cannot sell it or if it's been a family home and left to children who then use it as holidays or weekends, to keep contact with the area.
124	When people get hit in their pockets it makes them think if something is worth the extra cost.
125	Will encourage people to sell empty houses
126	Owner should be encouraged to renovate derelict and unsightly properties back to full use. Due to the sale of Council Houses and now this Government's plan to sell housing association stock we need all of the rental property we can get.
127	I know this can cause problems in exceptional situations, maybe an easy way to challenge this ruling could be introduced for this, but with money so tight it's not fair to other council tax payers that people are leaving properties empty at no cost. These houses need to be in the housing stock. In exceptional circumstances e.g. non pro** will but these cases would be very rare.
128	Not only will it give the council extra money it will also bring more much needed accommodation into play.
129	Because I feel houses should be available for local use - full time.

130	I do in theory but I think there are complications as in the case of the owner being unable to afford to get the property to a decent standard. It is one way of trying to address the housing issue.
131	It will be best use of the house property assets. I support all the arguments listed FOR produced by the Council. However for unfurnished property that has been left vacant for more than 1 year the premium should be 100%.
133	Too many second homes leaves a village with an "empty" feel. Young families should be encouraged to live here. Long term empty properties can give the appearance of a "dying" community.
134	Houses should not be left empty when people are living on the streets.
136	More money for the council and possibly help the homelessness.
137	I don't think that one year is long enough to allow property to be vacant, having known someone who took over 1 year to sell a property left to them. I would agree to a longer term empty property.
138	Powys Council has received inadequate funding from the labour government in Cardiff.
139	To encourage property owners to either sell or rent out empty properties.
140	Where there is a housing shortage, empty properties not being let are a wasted resource. Help and advice must be provided to assist with this. An extra charge may prompt people to do something about the extra properties they own and have left empty.
142	I think Powys CC do a good job with its housing policies, therefore, I would trust it to administer wisely.
144	If it is for investment then yes.
145	It encourages vandalism etc. Houses should be lived in, not left to rot. Especially when there are people trying to buy or rent properties. Community fairness also comes into it, as most of us pay our Council tax, so should we all.
147	Income generation to reduce Council tax for permanent residents.
148	Because hopefully it will deter people from buying second homes for holiday homes in our town and also free up empty homes for people that want to live here.
149	Properties unused can become unsightly to the area or broken into
150	This will increase housing stock available for use in the county - let or buy.
151	Properties left empty very often deteriorate quickly and lower the local area and deprive people the ability to rent or own their own home.
156	A modest premium might encourage owners to sell or rent. Long term empty property is detrimental to any area, look at the old Automobile Palace site in Llandrindod Wells.
159	As I feel it will help the owners to do something rather than leave empty.
160	The properties are still owned by someone and they should be encouraged to bring them up to standard, some unoccupied properties are an eyesore and would encourage vermin.

161	Will help the housing shortage
162	Help to the Council Exchequer - especially if staggered over 4 years i.e. 25%, 50%, 75% then 100%
163	It could help give people home and improve things.
164	Long term empty properties are a waste of a valuable resource, which could be used to provide housing that is desperately needed.
166	I believe that some properties will only sell if the price is reduced enough, this may encourage owners to drop the price, and sell the property. However, I do not believe this should be the more expensive premium.
168	Increase revenue. Encourage/force property to come onto market. Should be a 12 month period of grace for bereavements to allow estate to be sold off.
170	Better to see houses lived in than empty.
171	Providing the premium is not charged on properties that are being improved or renovated.
173	Additional funds for County Council. Encourage people for whom home is a second property to bring back into use i.e. town centres. Reduce nos. requiring new builds.
174	Such properties are of no use in the community and could be used for much needed housing.
178	Empty buildings affect nearby property prices, effect the housing stock and where property is sold cheap either due to its condition or financial pressure it only benefits first time buyers wanting a start or low income.
184	It would encourage owners to act, empty houses soon look derelict if not cared for, thus depreciating neighbour's property. They may also encourage squatters.
185	I do think people who own a property should pay, at least a proportion of the council tax, even if they are not living in it permanently.
186	They are often older, historically valuable buildings being allowed to fall into disrepair or worse dereliction. They encourage squatters also/or possibly vermin.
187	With Council HELP if necessary, it's a win win situation.
189	To encourage the owner to either sell it so someone or let it to a tenant at a fair rent.
191	It would encourage owners to do something about the properties such as sell them or rent them out, holiday homes could be let on a short term tenancy.
193	When property are in dispute between parties due to a will there is no reason that they should be exempt from tax and should be charged to the parties involved, there are properties that are in this category and have been for years, it would put pressure on the parties involved to do something about it and resolve the dispute either way and not left empty for years with no income to the Council.
194	Family member has an empty property next to their house and has had problems with damp and vermin, as house has been empty for over 20 years.

196	Gives Powys an income - ameliorates the cuts a little. Encourages local people to live locally possibly. Time the rich paid as the gap between rich and poor increases.
197	There must be an incentive for owners of these properties to be responsible owners. Many lower paid people would love the opportunity to own such properties. I live in a semi-detached house, where the house next but one has not been occupied for more than 20 years. Maintenance is minimal with large rear garden overgrown. Complaints have been made to the Council but nothing is ever done.
199	Because they are not contributing to local finances contributing to local economy and social cohesion.
202	If you can afford a second property you should be able to pay tax on it.
203	If they are empty for long periods do they need them?
204	To encourage occupation of those properties.
205	Empty deteriorating farm buildings/houses are a sad sight and a waste.
207	The owners should be allowed time to decide what to do with their property and then if they cannot decide then a premium could be added, the amount to be added should be determined by e.g. how long it has been unoccupied.
210	In this area there are large numbers of people who work in this area but are unable to get on the property ladder - empty houses do not regularly bring any income into the area (unless regular holiday lets) therefore, for the privilege of owning a house in the area - some financial payment should be made.

	Appendix B – Comments from panel members who didn't support the proposal to introduce a premium on empty properties.
5	I have had a property empty myself, doing renovations slowly when I can afford to do it and still waiting for solicitors to sort out my mother's estate, things are never clear cut. Things can take a lot longer than 12 months.
12	Don't believe that an empty house should be paying full council tax, never mind a premium!
15	Paying the normal full council tax on an empty property (which does not use any council services) should be sufficient incentive. An additional tax will just alienate owners of these properties
20	There are very few people who would leave a property empty unless there were good reasons for doing so. I feel that this will do little to improve council income with some people who pay now being unable to pay the premium and perhaps not then paying anything with the council actually losing out. Better to encourage people to get the property occupied by fast tracking planning and giving good advice and possibly a year with no council tax on properties bought back into occupation

27	If the Queen doesn't have to pay extra for the property she doesn't use then why should anybody?
28	I do not support a blanket premium. It should only be applied where the empty properties are in locations where housing pressures are high (i.e. it should be a selective policy set against published criteria supporting the case)
35	Outrageous. Houses in Llanidloes are often on the market for a long time as jobs are so few and far between, people cannot afford to get mortgages. The recent new homes built on the edge of our town mean that private owners are now struggling to get tenants. What is council tax for? Surely it is to pay for services used by citizens. How can you possibly charge the citizens who use the service least of anyone? If a house is empty surely there is no rubbish being collected, doctors being used, children bused to school. How can the owners of these homes be penalised to pay for more of what they are using less of. I know lots of sad reasons why homes are empty - death, divorce, illness - how can you capitalise on this and be morally correct! In the cases locally, no one wants there home empty - they are slow to sell.
39	Penalises people who may have a good reason for not occupying a home of use it as a second home.
46	It's not a simple yes or no. I may agree depending on the circumstances.
53	Its greedy
74	Council Tax pays for a service, you do not get a premium service if you own two properties so it is unjust to pay a premium price.
96	Charges for unoccupied properties were increased April 2015. Further charges would be prohibitive and could cause further debt/recovery problems. Probably depends on what 'help' is available for people to bring properties back into use.
101	It does not cost the Council in services when a property is empty, sometimes properties are empty to gain the right person.
106	Private owners may have already worked extremely hard in order to purchase a second property that they may intend to retire into or use for an elderly relative when the need arises. Allowing the property to be rented out to an unknown person can cause many problems, when they wish for that person to leave, hence the property is left empty.
111	It is none of the Council's business whether or not a property is occupied, provided the full rate of Council tax is paid. This whole business diverts attention away from the true issue. Successive governments and Councils have failed to build enough COUNCIL HOUSES (I'm not talking about 'affordable' homes built by developers).
112	Basically unfair
113	These properties are probably empty for a good reason - like property in probate or people not having enough finances to improve property to let it, or sell it. Increasing a tax on it is not going to help situation.
117	Why should they pay more when they are not receiving any services - they in fact, should pay less? Empty properties should pay a reduced Council tax.

132	The properties are empty for a reason, known only to the owner. The owner should be interviewed to ascertain why. Then something could be done, maybe leased to the Council for use.
137	I don't think that one year is long enough to allow property to be vacant, having known someone who took over 1 year to sell a property left to them. I would agree to a longer term empty property.
143	No guarantee that the property will be let if empty.
146	If the house is empty then the council is not using any resources for that house i.e. refuse collection, social care etc. If anything the owners should pay no Council tax since it is not partaking in any Council services.
152	There are few empty properties due to shortage of housing. People may be struggling to sell their homes and still paying mortgage on it, i.e. couples who have separated and have both moved into rented accommodation etc.
153	I might have missed some but I can only think of Police and Fire where you would be providing services. If you are charging for services not provided, refuse, ambulance, roads, schools etc. this sounds like extortion.
157	I think that it's unfair. If any payment should be made after 12 months then it should be the same payment as if a single person is living there, i.e. 25% less.
176	It is a vindictive and mean minded proposal by an authority that is, now, looking to kick a person, family who may be down rather than to effectively to fight the Welsh Government for fair/equal funding. For empty down at heel properties the Council has other powers to bring about an improvement. For so called holiday properties the owners bring about occasional local business which would not be there if they hadn't invested in them - the higher property values due to these holiday purchases is another issue - probably a far more important issue.
177	The Council should build more affordable homes and raise more income from the rents. There should be more incentives/grants for owners to get properties back on the market.
180	Probate delays. Planning delays. Planning blight. Insurance claim delay.
181	Should be assistance to renovate (where needed) ALL unoccupied premises (including shops/business) into low cost housing accommodation. There should be NO new properties built until this is achieved. Planning, especially in Park, is a barrier to ordinary people doing this. Using empty properties better for environment. New housing and concrete adds to flooding problem.
183	I think it is up to the owner to decide, it's their property.
188	Too many people on benefits not paying any Council tax and people claiming they live alone and actually have parents living with them.
190	Changes in current financial year already raised monies on empty homes, you have to cut outgoings.
192	Properties can be left empty for many reasons e.g. the tying up of an estate or the owner may be in a nursing home or even working abroad. I feel this could be an unnecessary financial burden on some who will be unable to meet these costs. Also students would also be away from the property if at University.

195	I used to own a second property (not in Powys), because of the slump in the housing market took over a year to sell.
200	If the Council tax is already being paid then I do not feel extra charges should be applied.
201	Anyone with an empty property in reasonable condition will either let or sell it for economic reasons. The costs of renovating a dilapidated property are excessive and if the owner is short of funds then imposing more financial sanctions will not help. Currently there is generally a surplus of property for sale or rent in Powys.
206	Property for rent or holiday homes is an income. Mid Wales has little industry left, heavily taxing what is left could result in people being left with less income.

	Appendix C – Comments from panel members who support the proposal to introduce a premium on periodically let properties. (second homes / holiday homes)
1	To support the economy of local communities.
2	increase in revenue
3	Absolutely - this is an excellence idea. Make the homes available for affordable rental or live in them.
6	Second or holiday homes are a luxury. But it should not apply where someone is trying to sell their home but is finding it difficult to do so.
7	In Presteigne there are many homes that are now used as holiday lets. I know one person who advertises 42 bed spaces in houses that have previously been occupied by full-time families.

8	If people can afford a second then they should pay more even if empty
9	I am not in favour of property being held as holiday homes if this is for the benefit of a small number of people. However, property rented out as part of a tourist/holiday business is vital if we are to further push Powys as a tourist destination, creating wealth and jobs local to the area.
10	Ditto.
11	Holiday homes will bring some income into the local area when they are occupied but not when they are empty. This proposal would help the community when there are no occupancy.
13	Second homes and holiday homes don't bring people to the locality all year round - some areas of Britain are blighted by second homes - we don't need this.
14	They do not support the trade in the locality, do not make any I put to the life of the locality.
16	For essentially the same reason although if it is used as a holiday let and occupied for more than a specified length of time then there should be some relief.
17	Additional income opportunity
18	Holiday homes take away potential homes for local people
19	The entire year flat fee should apply otherwise it will create confusion and abuse to how often/regular a property is being used. Anyone who can afford a second home or holiday home can afford to account for the cost to run it 12 months a year.
21	When, younger frequently, people struggle to provide homes for their families often in areas where they have lived possibly all their lives and with fast rising rent levels in some cities being quoted for such as Bristol, any arguably reasonable proposals are worthy of consideration.
22	Again generating money without impacting on the poorest.
24	See above
26	Same as above. They should help support the community.
29	Increase use of empty homes. Increase rental availability and property types
31	Because I don't like rich people
32	Again because of people without accommodation.
33	Second homes are good for the local tourist economy certainly but they also remove homes from the property market and push up prices for locals. Salaries in Powys are low and many of our young local workers end up in poor accommodation or having to commute from other areas to work.
34	My knowledge of this is that the occupiers contribute little or nothing to the local community. Example: repairs and alterations to the property are invariably undertaken by tradesmen from outside the area
37	If people value coming here on their holidays they should care enough to make a sensible contribution to the Council to maintain what they appreciate.

40	It is better for the community to have houses occupied throughout the year by owners or tenants who are invested in the local community.
41	This is selfish. No accommodation should be unoccupied as second or holiday home when there are people living in unsuitable houses or flats
42	This maybe the more fortunate. Maybe from England. Buying cheaper homes in Wales while keeping the one they live in across the border.
43	Reasonable approach to increase the tax-take
44	Greedy holiday home owners from outside of the area have moved into the area inflating property prices to the extent that local people in this low pay area cannot afford to buy themselves.
48	Those with 2nd homes presently do not provide any thing to the area - they bring their food with them etc. This would at least provide something to the region.
50	A small premium. We do not want to lose people who love to visit Powys and bring extra income when they visit.
51	Too many in Wales.
52	Properties used for sole holiday occupancy by owners and holiday lets should pay a premium.
54	To prevent the destruction of local communities.
57	But amount should be determined by occupancy. This determined by owner voluntarily estimating how many months per year.
58	They are empty for months when they may let them for young people.
59	The aim is to get houses/flats occupied as they should be.
62	Again, it would provide a new income stream from those people who are using their properties for other than residential reasons and who are likely to be wealthier, and who will have the means to recover the additional premium by increasing their rents.
63	If a second or holiday home is part of your lifestyle, it is safe to assume a premium could be afforded.
64	Think of your ordinary general public who need Powys every day. These second homes are not only a luxury but often a business.
65	They come into the area and use all the services in the area.
66	People who can afford second homes can afford to make a bigger contribution to Council Tax. If it makes people think they cannot afford a second home and not buy one this will make more properties available to people living/working in Powys.
69	Second homes prevent local young people from getting their first home and also further depress rural communities.
70	The occupants should contribute something to the area they have purchased their property in.
71	People that can afford a second home should pay more I don't think it should apply to holiday homes let as a business.

72	The property needs looking after and as so many youngsters are looking to buy a house it's like a smack in the face when a property is only used for holidays.
75	If you own a second property, pay the tax on it.
76	Recognition of asset in Powys and increase appreciation of property.
77	If you can afford another property you can afford to pay a premium! As a holiday home - enjoying the views etc. nice roads, parks, it has to be paid for.
78	Again not available for full occupation or as a holiday let - the owner is making money.
80	It may encourage holiday makes to use B&B or local hotels more and bring back life to them.
82	The premium should be aimed at properties that are empty most of the time There are two arguments 1) holiday homes boost the local economy if they are occupied regularly 2) Many people are struggling to find accommodation
85	Services still have to be paid for.
88	Second home owners should have the privilege of a higher rate as would be higher wage earners.
89	These houses are often at the cheaper end of the market and suitable for first time buyers so having them as holiday homes is removing housing stock for young people.
90	Same reasons as above (unless landlord can confirm they are fully let?)
91	If someone is fortunate enough to have a second home/holiday home then they should pay council tax.
92	They are still "empty" 90% of the year.
93	A second home is a luxury.
95	as above
97	Very good idea.
99	Homes in this category are a luxury would encourage a better occupation % i.e. renting out.
100	This will increase revenue for PCC. It may make more housing available locally. Occupied dwellings improve the appearance and atmosphere of a locality.
102	Again some council tax should be paid by the owner otherwise it becomes unfair on people who do pay.
104	Hay is becoming a shanty town as weekend-ers bring their own food with them not benefitting the community.
107	I think there should be reduction or exemption for property that is part of a genuine tourism business and is occupied for a minimum period of the year i.e. 3 or 6 months and is making a contribution to the local economy.
108	If home owners can afford a second home which is unoccupied, they should pay premium rates which they obviously can afford.

109	If they can afford to have a second home they can afford to pay.
110	Need to get them back in the housing market.
116	People rent houses periodically so they can avoid the taxman.
118	If you can afford a second/holiday home I consider they should pay for the privilege.
120	Second home owners are a mixed bag. One close to my home rents for short lets a few times a year and the owners maybe 6 weekends a year, limited parking (I have to park in visitor's car park) makes it hard for us. If approached they are rude and abusive, we are told that they own the house and we can all just F off.
121	Although only use the local services periodically, the local services are STILL being used.
124	This extra charge might make more 2nd home buyers sell up and give the younger starters a chance to stay in the area.
126	Some holiday homes are very rarely used if at all and holiday lets may only be used for 2/3 months per year.
127	Again this is housing which is not available to others who the council are desperate to house. If someone can afford to own 2 homes, they should pay all the costs.
128	Many smaller villages in Wales are almost uninhabited for six to nine months of the year, this due to second homes, at the same time local youngsters cannot find a place to live and they have to move away (this is a disgrace).
129	Because there is a shortage of housing and it would help towards paying for more houses.
130	There are a lot of holiday homes in the county and whether right or wrong it is a luxury when there are people without a home. I think it's reasonable to add a small premium to them.
131	I support the reasons listed but agree that a smaller premium would be appropriate for 'second or holiday' homes. However, I suggest increasing such premium to 50%.
132	If you can afford a second home, then you should pay all costs for keeping it well maintained and pay for the services that are provided.
133	Reduces the need for services such as schools to be maintained if the permanent resident numbers decline.
134	I think there should be more homes for people who need them! Why should people have more than one house?
136	If they can afford a second home, then they should pay a premium.
137	Payment should be made for the pleasure and convenience of a second home.
139	If people can afford second properties then this proposal would enable money to be made available for those who cannot afford a first property.
142	I think Powys CC do a good job with its housing policies, therefore, I would trust it to administer wisely.

144	If owners can afford a second home then they can afford to pay a premium.
145	Because if people can afford a second home then they should pay the appropriate council taxes.
147	To support the local economy.
148	Absolutely it should be 100% as the owners do not contribute to our community and are taking housing for local people and pushing house prices up.
150	Second homes such as a 'pied-a-terre' for work purposes should pay at least full rate. The premium should be modest as services such as refuse collection are not used full time.
151	I believe it is a huge privilege to afford a 2nd home or holiday home so a premium would help to cover the costs of PCC and ease the homelessness of those less fortunate.
152	A second home is a luxury and therefore should have an increase. There is a shortage of homes and second home owners should pay extra.
155	Potentially to "release" more homes for "permanent" residence by sole/family/couple occupiers' main residence.
159	It is only fair they pay as they use the services provided in the area.
160	Periodically owned properties still use the services at some time during the year.
161	Help the local economy
162	Help to the Council Exchequer - especially if staggered over 4 years i.e. 25%, 50%, 75% then 100%
163	It would be fair to occupiers of either a holiday home or second home.
164	Not sure about this question, I do not feel people should be penalised for providing holiday accommodation or using as a private holiday retreat.
165	In Hay houses are being built not for need but for greed. They are being taken out of circulation and used as holiday homes by the tourist industry.
166	Second homes are generally owned as investment (partially) by people who have funds to invest. They skew the market for homes for local people making it more difficult for young people to afford their first homes near their families. If they can afford this luxury, paying a premium Council tax seems appropriate and this should, I believe, be higher than the empty houses are.
167	Many rural homes are being bought as second homes, at inflated prices, so local people are priced out of the market. This premium in my opinion should also apply to holiday chalets which are being built everywhere, increasing traffic and rubbish adding to Council cost.
168	So that empty shells are discouraged.
169	To try and reduce the greed that people have when their property could make someone a home rather than waiting for house values to rise whilst empty.
170	Houses should be occupied let to someone who needs a home.
172	Lack of houses and people need to fill empty houses.

173	Again additional revenue to a cash strapped council.
180	Present usage provides little economic advantage to area. Many second homes are isolated so may not be attractive to full time occupants.
181	Second homes should be charged at full rate.
183	These type of properties should be paying the same as any resident in Powys paying Council tax. Holiday homes are a business to some.
184	Although I am resident of Powys since 1967 I was brought up in Cornwall where second homes have priced locals out of the market in some areas (Padstow for example). Make those who can't best afford it pay for the privilege.
185	The Council tax payments go towards lots of things - schools, libraries, police etc. even if the owner is living there or not.
187	Business, when not occupied by owners they are probably rented.
190	It is not right to raise more money in this way.
191	They could be let short term and it might make owner reconsider selling or letting.
192	Providing the premium does not exceed the average council tax rate for the areas, as council tax is paid based on services and if they are not using these why pay for them.
193	If any person can afford a second home or a holiday home, they can afford a staggered scale of charge depending on their income from the property as if they rented or let the property.
197	Certainly with the number of people desperate for a place to live, it is not fair that people possibly could have several homes, just in case they need a holiday. This does not apply to caravans.
199	Because they are not contributing to local finances contributing to local economy and social cohesion.
202	Owners are making a profit from letting (e.g. holidays periodically).
203	Don't bring or very little into the community etc., school, halls, bus
204	1. To penalise ownership of a second home when many people have no home. 2. Put some of the value of a second home back into the local economy / services.
210	All the amenities - roads, lights, police etc. continue to support the household - whether occupied or not so such a premium - all year should be introduced.

	Appendix D – Comments from panel members who were not in favour of the proposal to introduce a premium on periodically let properties. (second homes / holiday homes)
4	These homes are not long term empty. They are being maintained and used just like ordinary homes. When they are occupied the owners are probably spending money in the community etc.
5	What anyone does with their property is their business and no one else's. Council should get their own house in order! The registering of landlords is another case of this, resulting in less rentals as people will sell to save hassle
12	Do not agree in principle. This is purely a revenue stream for councils
15	Again, owners of such properties presumably consume few council services, so are 'cheap' for the council already, and probably bring much more income to the county in other ways
20	We need people to come to Mid Wales on holiday and bring money into the area.
23	It would be difficult to predict the length of occupancy of let holiday homes as bookings are sometimes at short notice.
25	Discourage holiday lets which will impact tourism, especially if many holiday lets decide to pack it in. After all it is seasonal business and they would be penalised for something they have no or little control over!
27	I don't support discrimination.
28	Again, I do not support a blanket premium. It should be a selective policy applied where housing pressures are present.
30	It would driver away holiday people and lose income.
35	How can you charge more to people who use local services least? How is that possibly fair? I live here 52 weeks a year and enjoy 52 weeks of service for the council tax I pay. How is it possibly right to live here for 3 months, pay full council tax and then 25% extra? How is that democratic? I have answered q1c but only because I could not submit without answering. This is unfair as I choose not to answer this question at all. I hope you remove my answer from the statistics collected.
36	I think having a second/ holiday home in this area is a positive and not a negative on the whole. I doubt that the kind of homes people buy for holidays are competing with for instance first time buyers, though it's probably the case that the demand does exert some upward pressure on the housing market. I know of a number of cases of people who came here for holidays, perhaps owning a house and at some point come and settle here, so I am not sure that penalising 2nd home owners would not be counterproductive.
39	This penalises people who have second or holiday homes. The latter may be a much needed source of income if the property is let for holidays. The increase in CT could result in increased rent and put holiday makers off visiting the area.
45	If a property is being used then I don't think it puts it in the same category as properties being empty for long periods.

46	They bring income to the community when in use and this is extra income. If used by a local person there is no extra income.
49	They should pay Council Tax only. The owners/family or holiday makers benefit the shops and businesses when occupied.
53	Greedy, unfair, will suppress tourism.
55	As an owner of a holiday cottage - I have already spent substantial revenue in achieving the relevant standards set by WTB. The fact that the property is let brings revenue into Powys through tourism. I object strongly to this possible premium. It's hard enough to make any profit at all now.
60	If someone can afford a second home they can afford council tax. If it is a place that is a holiday let it should not be. The owner will be paying tax on income and it is a way of earning money and so should not be subject to council tax.
61	Since this type of property is likely to be cheaper for the council to service, I can see no reason why the council should expect more income.
67	We do not want to discourage holiday makers/visitors from coming to our part of Wales and contributing into community i.e. shops, restaurants etc.
74	As long as Council Tax is paid at the appropriate rate for that property, no extra should be charged.
79	Without specifying the periodicity this is almost impossible to answer.
87	It should be collected in part only as surely council tax will be apportioned.
96	There is already a full charge on such (furnished) properties.
101	This does not encourage people to let properties out. Holiday homes bring much needed tourists to the area.
105	As long as the property is maintained to a set standard and current taxes paid.
106	Tourism is an invaluable element of bringing much wanted revenue into a rural environment. People will be less inclined to provide holiday accommodation if this proposal is introduced. Would the intention be to penalise people who rent out spare rooms on a B&B basis?
111	SECOND HOMES: undecided. HOLIDAY HOMES (for rental) NO. The owners pay (or should pay) tax on their rental income anyway.
112	Social engineering. Infringing civil and personal liberty.
113	Shouldn't discourage holiday homes as they bring a lot of tourist income in which many businesses need to survive.
114	Holiday homes bring revenue to the area and use less services.
117	There is a need for holiday homes for the tourist industry otherwise everyone will go abroad. Why penalise these businesses when they are not having any greater use of local services.
122	As I stated above a lot of these people are of the area has been left to them by family and have moved away to work etc. at least they are already paying council tax which should be charged at the same price as someone there full time.

123	Holiday homes bring money to this area. Holiday home owners already pay full council tax where they live.
138	A number of second homes are owned by Welsh people who want to take their family to Aberystwyth and Borth spending money in Wales.
146	As above and it could reduce tourism in the area.
149	These could belong to families who can only use them occasionally for holidays who live far away, and are sometimes let to holiday makers.
153	You already get Council tax from them and if they are not there for part of the year you are already on a bonus for not supplying services when no one is there.
156	Much better a 2nd home/holiday home than an empty property. If Powys charge a premium and other areas do not this will tend to discourage people from buying a holiday home in Powys - to our detriment? Could then adversely affect property prices which are already very depressed.
157	Why should people be penalised for being better off. Some people work hard for what they have and others just claim off the state and have all the benefits that go with that. You should be spending more time getting people back to work and not penalise people who work hard for their money.
164	Not sure about this question, I do not feel people should be penalised for providing holiday accommodation or using as a private holiday retreat.
174	Many people come to this area during weekends and holiday periods, contributing to the local economy when here.
176	The costs of servicing these homes will be less than servicing a permanently occupied property so the Council already has a benefit i.e. less costs associated with them.
177	This will penalise these people who have worked / saved up to buy a second home. More effort should be made to tackle benefit fraud which is rife in Powys.
178	Where it's a holiday home or second home a full property tax is already being made, then it's fair to say valuable public services are not being used BUT this must be registered as a holiday home with HMRC.
186	If people are not using services but are paying full rate towards them, in effect they are already paying a premium.
188	If you have a holiday home then money is spent in the area without having to supply jobs for those occupants.
189	When the owners are in residence hopefully they will spend money in the area.
190	I disagree with this proposal.
194	People who own second homes do contribute to the local economy.
195	People should not be penalised for owning a holiday home. There is a good case for saying if people are only in residence part of the time the council tax should be less.
200	If the Council tax is already being paid then I do not feel extra charges should be applied.

201	People who own these homes generate income for the Powys economy either through letting or living in them.
205	Not Holiday Lets unless never booked. Unused ones yes! Many people who have second homes are not particularly wealthy, often contribute a lot to the local community and may retire into their second homes. Means test perhaps (3rd and 4th homes - yes). How often used - if once a year then a premium.
206	As stated we need to be looking after people who are self-employed, not make them pay tax on their earning twice.
207	I do not support a premium on holiday homes, they bring in revenue to their community e.g. shops, restaurants etc. and help to maintain employment.
209	People who have converted buildings for letting for holiday purposes should not be penalised.

	Appendix E – Suggestions around where income generated could be spent.
4	Library's, helping local charities, reinstatement of 2 weekly rubbish collections
12	We could always spend more on social engineering. Therefore more Welsh street names. Basically anything that means more money spent on prompting Welsh regardless of the cost.
13	We need more homes and more people in the homes to support local services and businesses.
22	Given it raised from housing both homelessness and adult social care which are both problem areas.
27	Spend it on a police force that actually shows up to your how if you have been stabbed rather than giving your home address and phone number to the person that stabbed you.
29	Allocate as per need and corporate priorities
33	I suggest you use some of the money to support the library service in the county - which is a STATUTORY service but is at great risk currently from yet more cuts. This is not an expensive service but it is vital to the local community and required to be comprehensive and efficiently delivered to all of the community.
37	Public facilities like toilets
41	More teachers in order to reduce class sizes.
42	Solar panels- for schools, as our local primary school has lights on outside at night, permanently
44	Spread the income across all areas
51	Rail transport / public toilets should be statutory provision.
55	Disagree with the whole idea of the scheme.
56	Transport to Hospitals
57	Road in North Powys.
64	Reduce Council Tax rises.
67	Inform of grants to do up etc. Keeping our Day Centres open which are threatened of closure at moment.
68	NHS/Ambulance provision
74	Should not be a premium so no extra money to spend.
77	Keeping up the general appearance of our community, litter, flower baskets, low wattage street lights.
80	More passing places on narrow roads.
91	1. Reduction of council tax for the elderly. 3. Note Highways only - not Transport and Recycling. 5. Note Environmental Health only - not Trading Standards. 9. According to the press there is no homelessness in Powys! 10. Direct them not support them.

110	Public toilets
111	Providing more COUNCIL housing rather than affordable housing.
115	Reducing the Council tax on homes that are occupied.
116	Regenerating Housing Estates
117	Don't raise it in the first place.
118	Allow us to use our travel pass to go into England for shopping and hospital appointments, I am 5 mins from the border and penalised.
119	Assistance for disabled adaptations to homes above what is already done i.e. working disabled not able to access support currently but cannot afford work nor able to access purpose built/adapted properties.
120	Why are there so many people in Wales with special needs? Recycling Services - get rid of it.
123	Council tax premium is a way of getting rid of any money gained from holiday home owners.
128	Put it against the council debt.
130	Supporting local business.
132	Highways only, not Transport and Recycling Services
138	Health Service, no A&E services in Newtown, Mont.
144	Grants to refurbish older properties. We live in Llandrindod Wells it has a lot of properties in need of repair. We are one such place it is very hard to keep it to standard as it was built in 1899. We pay a maintenance charge for each flat owner, but every time we have something done the cost of scaffolding is very high before we even do any work, we do need help.
146	Additional resources for the Police.
149	Make large properties into flats.
151	Good in home care for elderly or incapacitated.
153	An incinerator producing electricity from potential landfill at Llandod or Llandead as it is sometimes called.
155	Equality not 2010 issues, including pupil information (for BME students) grants! Money to be spent on "confidential" delivery of free school meals AND better educational advantages for those NOW (in 28.1.16 ITV/BBC News in Wales) only having 31% of such qualified/entitled students gaining 5 GCSE grades A-C subjects.
157	Money should go back to where it was taken from.
165	Protecting the countryside from over development.
178	Marketing Powys to bring in business.
187	To reduce community charge only. (There should have been a box for this too).
188	Not supplying housing for people who will not work.

193	The extra revenue should not be spent on council expenditure consulting outside bodies to act on matters that the council could do themselves.
196	Regeneration projects important for income