**Business rates Retention Further Consultation feedback**

There were 228 responses to the consultation, however not all responses addressed every question. Consequently percentages are gaged from the response rate equalling 100% for that question. Where the differing views do not add up to 100% in a question this is because the remaining percentage of respondents did not express a firm position.

**Question 1: What are your views on the proposed approach to partial resets?**

**95% of respondents expressed an opinion on this question.**

* **Partial resets -** 85% were in favour of a partial reset compared to 5% against.
* **Frequency of resets -** 45% supported resets over 5 years, whilst 19% felt different time periods would be more appropriate.
* **Link with Revaluations** **-** 19% of responses suggested linking the partial reset to the revaluation cycle.
* **Transitional arrangements –** 36% of responses were in favour of using transitional arrangements, while 0.5% (1) were opposed.

**Question 2: What are your views on how we should measure growth in business rates income over a reset period?**

**91% of respondents expressed an opinion on this question.**

* **Measuring growth over an average or at a single point -** 62% favoured measuring the growth over an average of the reset period, whilst 2% (3) felt growth should be measured at a single point.
* **Measurements in real or nominal terms -** 54% felt growth should be measured in real terms, in contrast to the 1% preferring nominal terms.
* **Proportion of growth the local authority should retain** - There was no strong consensus on this figure. Many felt this would depend on the overall quantum.

**Question 3: What are your views on the Government’s plans for pooling and local growth zones under the 100% Business Rates Retention system?**

**93% of respondents expressed an opinion on this question.**

* **Secretary of State designating Pools –** 81% were opposed this power compared to 3% in favour.
* **Incentivised Pooling –** 47% were in favour of incentivised pooling compared to 3% against.
* **Local Growth Zones (LGZ’s)** 41% felt LGZ’s would incentivise investment compared to 0.5% who did not think that they would.

**Question 4: How can we best approach moving to a centrally managed appeals risk system?**

**92% of respondents expressed an opinion on this question.**

* **Centrally managed appeals risk** – 96% were in favour and 2% were against.
* **Funding of centrally managed risk –** 27% felt this could be done from top-slicing, 17% felt funding could come from the central list and 9% supported other means of funding.

**Question 5: What should our approach be to tier splits?**

**78% of respondents expressed an opinion on this question.**

* 21% of respondents expressed a need for greater detail on the final design of the scheme before they could express a definitive view.
* **Current Split -** 10% are happy with the current split.
* **New Split, universal or local agreement -** 29%favoured a new arrangement,11% wanted a new universal approach, whilst 18% favoured making local agreements.

**Question 6: What are your views on proposals for a future safety net under the 100% Business Rates Retention system?**

**93% of respondents expressed an opinion on this question.**

* 73% were in favour of increasing the safety net threshold to 97% while 1% (2) were against.

**Question 7: What are your views on our proposals for the central list?**

**93% of respondents expressed an opinion on this question.**

* 88% were broadly in favour of the Central List proposals compared to 0.5% (1) opposed to the proposals.