

Kettering
Concerned citizen

LCTS Officer Kettering Borough Council
Municipal Offices Bowling Green Road
Kettering NN15 7QX

Dear Sir/Madam

I have to ask a simple question, regarding your LCTS proposed scheme:
Is it your intention to drive into poverty the disabled, sick, and the mentally ill thereby inspiring a riot?

Because if that's your intent, you are going about it the right way.

If it is *not* your intention to do so then this is a failed proposal.

Look I understand that the central government has forced you into a difficult position, and that this is not wholly your choice however there really must be better options than this, because looking though the proposal reads like a attempt to cleanse Kettering of dependants, and undesirables.

Going though the consultation(ill start at 3 since that is what I have the most objection towards):

Q3 " Do you feel the following amendments should be introduced?

" Limit applicable amount to two dependant children"

This is the least objectionable of this review and it is the one with the most merit – Britain is overpopulated and so is Kettering, frankly it is a bit irresponsible to have lots of children that you cannot pay for, there is one scenario in which your proposed change is problematic – a couple who earn lots of money losing their jobs (after April 2017) and then being unable to pay for their (extra) children.

To implement this you would need to make it VERY clear to people that they will not be paid for having more children, you are going to need a substantial awareness program – or expect poverty.

"Reduce absence from home outside of Great Britain to 4 weeks"

The problem here is that there are good and bad reasons as to why an individual would be on CTS and leaving the UK for 4 weeks you list mariners and grieving relatives, you also have to consider those who are leaving for health reasons to seek private medical help abroad, I really doubt though that this amendment will really result in a lot more money for the council – unless you can prove that there's a whole lot of people taking holidays for more than 4 weeks whilst on CTS – which I doubt! Although I can see some merit in it compared to the below....

"Remove work related activity component"

Immoral, self defeating, possibly discriminatory, and frankly reflects poorly on Kettering.

Employment support allowance is paid to those who are mentally and or physically disabled with the support group being those who are severely so and a risk to themselves, and the work related activity group being those who are less severely disabled and not deemed a general risk to themselves or the public.

The Work Related activity group includes people with disabilities such as, dyslexia, ADHD, Autism/Asbergers syndrome, and epilepsy people who theoretically could work but who in this economy frankly have little to no chance of doing so, since employers are not going to tolerate them.

These people live in constant fear of their benefits being taken away by ATOS /the department of Work and pensions because they are not 'disabled enough' they face constant rejection when ever they apply for jobs, some of them even have to go on to Jobseekers allowance where they have little or no chance of actually finding meaningful employment, (or even temporary jobs in many cases) and as a result face arbitrary sanction by the jobcentre resulting in desperate poverty, hopelessness and in some cases homelessness.

The **Last** thing these people need is more money taken away from them – if this is done then frankly expect, heavy deserved resistance. May God strengthen their arm against you.

Lastly...

"Remove severe disability premium where another person is paid Universal Credit (Carers Element)

So you are going to take money away from people who are severely disabled because they have another person looking after them who happens to receive slightly more than under the old system?

Immoral. No wonder the UN is looking into UK benefit systems.

Question 1 is basically just asking how much more those on CTS would like to pay – to which I say Kettering has one of the highest rates for those on CTS in the country.

I'm not putting my name to this because frankly I would rather not end up on a dissident list somewhere for daring to object to official policy, seeing as the Prime Ministers Data retention laws would very likely mean I would end up on such a list with all that entails.

This will be the fuel that fuels first poverty, then council tax arrears then social unrest and infamy for Kettering.

I hope you gain some sense before then.

Concerned Citizen
Kettering

cato