

Service Priority Rankings

as voted on by you

#1 Education

#2 Social Care

#3 Housing

#4 Roads

#5 Transportation

#6 Leisure Services

#7 Operational Environmental Services

#8 Economic Development

#9 Environmental Health and Trading Standards

#1 Education

#2 Social Care

#3 Housing

Service Priority Shifts: Past Year

as voted on by you

#1 Education 34%

#2 Social Care 31%

#3 Roads 28%

#4 Leisure Services 26%

#4 Transportation 26%

#5 Housing 16%

#6 Operational Environmental Services 10%

#7 Economic Development 9%

#8 Environmental Health and Trading Standards 2%

#1 Education

#2 Social Care

#3 Roads

Council Tax Band Variation Proposal

42%
answered no



58%
answered yes

Strategic Reserve Additional Withdrawal Proposal

31%
answered no



69%
answered yes

Second / Empty Home Additional Charge Proposal

17%
answered no



83%
answered yes

Budget Consultation Findings

1. Please rate these services in order of importance to you, with 1 being the most important and 9 being the least important.

Item	Total Score ¹	Overall Rank
Education	1370	1
Social Care	1202	2
Housing	1052	3
Roads	1036	4
Transportation	903	5
Leisure Services	841	6
Operational Environmental Services	827	7
Economic Development	763	8
Environmental Health and Trading Standards	691	9
	answered	193
	skipped	14

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

Comment: (36)

1.	I am surprised your list does not include all the other "services" the council provides like for example legal, human resources, policy, performance, town planning etc. How can it be a "fair" piece of research if these services are omitted from the survey?
2.	I do not feel the council should spend any additional money on local services above the statutory requirement, i also feel far too much emphasis is placed on the isles - people choose to live there. I also feel as a tax payer we pay far too much to support the less fortunate in our community.
3.	It is important to support local businesses etc so that our Economy stays strong or the whole thing will collapse. Social care is very important but needs a complete overhaul. I think the Housing expectations here are way too high, especially with regards to the people swarming in and declaring themselves homeless. Also far too many young, single people in council houses that I doubt they can afford to pay the rent for, especially the ones who don't have any intention of working. I imagine these people are costing the OIC a substantial amount of money in debt recovery and repairs. I know the OIC will have to follow government guidelines regarding this, but surely proof of ability to pay and afford upkeep would be a good start.
4.	I found it difficult to order these as they are all very important and different aspects of each service are more important than others. For example, ensuring that all children get a good education is extremely important but we should be considering reducing the number of schools to save money on building and staffing costs and looking at school which are situated near to each other being merged.
5.	As a carer in a home please please no more funding cuts your losing enough staff without more pressure. Poor night staff have difficulty as it is
6.	Very difficult as all services important.
7.	Really impossible task as all so vital and inter linked
8.	To be honest, they are all important.
9.	To me you wasting money with all these stupid signs saying their a corner about 10 have gone up that I know of it ridiculous. If you don't know its a corner you should not be driving fill pot holes fix barriers take down stupid signs
10.	Education is only rated 9 as don't have children. Recognise that it would be more important to folk with children.










1. Please rate these services in order of importance to you, with 1 being the most important and 9 being the least important.

Item	Total Score ¹	Overall Rank
11.	A huge amount of money could be saved by getting rid of diversity officers and the like, and by stopping spending vast amounts of money on net zero.	
12.	Completely arbitrary ranking as these are all essential core services. Any reduction in any of these would mean a poorer services and quality of life e.g. maintaining the links down the barriers, maintaining the Amenities Centres such as the one at the Hope, ensuring the roads are maintained and in a fit state, ensuring the Inter-Island ferry services continue to run efficiently.	
13.	Economic development should be left to demand-led provision by business, with only statutory requirements relating to essential infrastructure being provided by the local authority	
14.	environmental health and trading standards are two different services, and Environmental Health does so much more than what is stated, and hasn't done public toilets for years	
15.	Far too much of budgets being used in staff costs due to new management jobs that do not deliver and form of service. Cut the management jobs and employ more front line staff	
16.	We must priorities the services that support the health, well-being of all, but particularly those that depend on the services our council provide that make a difference to their quality of life. We owe this to the elderly and infirm and also to our younger generation who are Orkney's future.	
17.	Stop wasting so much money on boats , bins, stone ,gravestones etc And start holding people accountable	
18.	Removed due to naming specific member of staff	
19.	Given the aging demographic adequate social care is vitality important, as is the provision for adults with learning disability, which is currently non-existent. Similar considerations apply to social housing need.	
20.	this part of the survey doesn't appear to work- resets to 1-9 on each attempt to rate	
21.	I would suggest easy savings by reducing refuse collection frequency where possible and shortening the times that street lighting is on.	
22.	its is unfair to priorities based on departments, when you cant really tell who does what anymore	
23.	We must look after the most vulnerable people in our community first. If we don't fulfil what is susrely a moral duty, what does that say about us? I have put Education further down the list a kuttke. While I agree with its importance it already seems to have a lot of support from the Scottish Government and is championed by many councillors.	
24.	There is no social care on some of the Isles - this is having a massive impact on health services on Isle and with patients then having to leave their home or remain in hospital longer as there is no care available on Isle.	
25.	Environmental Health/Trading Standards do not have any responsibilities with regard to public toilets. To ask opinions from the public based on that misinformation is WRONG. Examples of Environmental Health services are; Statutory nuisance (including noise) Antisocial Behaviour Public Health National Assistance Funerals Port Health Air Quality Private Water Supplies Housing in Multiple Occupation Housing - Below Tolerable Standard Housing - Repairing Standard Litter/Flytipping/Dog Fouling Offences	

1. Please rate these services in order of importance to you, with 1 being the most important and 9 being the least important.

Item	Total Score ¹	Overall Rank
<p>Smoking Offences Abandoned Vehicles Contaminated Land Sewer/Septic tank defects Food premises inspections Food complaints Food Sampling Export Health Certificates Infectious Disease Control Health and Safety inspections Health and Safety accident investigations</p>		
<p>26. Education is top of my list - I am at retirement age but the young people in our community need every help and support they can get now, in their early years. I've put Economic Development high up the list in the hope that enabling and supporting business, investment and tourism will help the council deliver other priorities; eg. by getting tour operators to help fund road maintenance; and by pursuing the idea of a tourist tax (which is levied in many other countries) to help pay for refuse collection and waste management.</p>		
<p>27. Too many people moving to Orkney and getting housing where as residents are left waiting and hoping. The whole economy is struggling with these people move here and bring elderly relatives and/or have issues which require a lot of input from health and care, neither of which can provide the necessary support due to staffing and capacity.</p>		
<p>28. The library is a lifeline service for many in the community.</p>		
<p>29. In the case of housing allocation it seems like people with no family connections to Orkney are allocated housing. Many have physical and mental health issues. This is placing an undue burden on support services and needs to be addressed urgently I</p>		
<p>30. Very difficult to rate as they are all essential.</p>		
<p>31. Not all areas of Leisure Services are equally important. I would place libraries first, followed by Heritage, Museums and swimming pools. I don't think that the Council should be running caravan sites, healthy living centres, hostels, sports development and active schools, These should be sold to the private sector.</p>		
<p>32. This ranking is based purely on my personal priorities at my time of life, not the priorities for the population of Orkney as a whole.</p>		
<p>33. we need better housing and more affordable housing. This means we can attract people to orkney to provide services we desperately need. There are too many holiday homes that should be released for this purpose. I know people in orkney who have 3 or 4 houses that they have bought and rented out for holidays. We have young people who are living on peoples sofas who need accommodation. Social care for the vulnerable, mental health folk is urgent. Our kids need more activities. The parks have fallen into huge disrepair over the last 20 years that i have lived here. We also need indoor entertainment.</p>		
<p>34. These services are all of vital importance and somehow all need to be funded</p>		
<p>35. I find it very difficult to order these. Important to me as to how they affect me personally? For example am retired so Education doesn't affect me personally so it could be number 9. But it i believe it is of major importance for the community so could be number 1.</p>		
<p>36. As part of the roads function the inadequate protection of the Barriers needs to be addressed on an urgent basis, this has been discussed for years and the Council have sloped their collective shoulders repeatedly. Are they waiting till someone is seriously injured or worse?</p>		

2. Have any of the services listed below become more important to you over the past year? Please choose any that apply and state why in the comments box:

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Economic Development		8.96%	12
2	Education		33.58%	45
3	Environmental Health and Trading Standards		2.24%	3
4	Housing		16.42%	22
5	Leisure Services		26.12%	35
6	Operational Environmental Services		10.45%	14
7	Roads		27.61%	37
8	Social Care		31.34%	42
9	Transportation		26.12%	35
			answered	134
			skipped	73

Comment: (91)

1.	Needing to be able to easily leave the Island due to aged parents down South.
2.	Family members have care needs and we've witnessed serious failings and reductions in service quality
3.	Whether it is sufficiently acknowledged or not by OIC and those in Orkney empowered to instigate change is arguable, but there is a severe lack of affordable residential accommodation in the county. Instead of building yet another leisure facility (in Bridge Street, a conservation area), which will inevitably have a negative on local businesses already struggling to survive in these tough economic times, more flats would have been a welcome addition to Kirkwall's housing stock and 100% supported by this Bridge Street resident. Furthermore, I understand that the county's network of roads needs to be better maintained. Additionally, imo, the annual number of cruise ships should be reduced and the behaviour of liner passengers regulated for the greater good and safety of Orkney and all who live here (eg no riding of bicycles in groups along the Kirkwall to Stromness road, staggering or reducing the number of visitors allowed to access archaeological sites at the same time in order to limit the detrimental impact of their footfall on the sites themselves and on the environment as a whole).
4.	We have an aging population and in order that support the local health board there must be provisions of improved social care systems. The education (all aspects of, including creative arts) of our young people must be supported in order to ensure we offer them the best start in their lives as we possibly can
5.	I rely on the ferries for work.
6.	About the same
7.	My father doesn't yet need additional support but is likely to need this soon
8.	None of them have become more important in the last year. The answer in Q1 is what is important to me.
9.	The ditches in my area are not being maintained leading to flooding and dangerous roads. The ferries are now not large enough for the amount of cargo meaning its not possible to get into or out of town when needed.
10.	The ditches in my area are not being maintained leading to flooding and dangerous roads. The ferries are now not large enough for the amount of cargo meaning its not possible to get into or out of town when needed.
11.	If we don't build our economy and generate more income we will just face cuts for ever

2. Have any of the services listed below become more important to you over the past year? Please choose any that apply and state why in the comments box:

12.	I have sons studying at university to education is important to me. It is also important that we have the opportunity to develop our skills in our working environment. I like to keep fit and I am sociable so think it is important to have good, easily accessible leisure facilities available. It is important that our streets are kept clean, our rubbish is collected regularly and that our roads are safe to drive on.
13.	I work in education and see huge gaps in funding/staffing to allow teaching staff and pupils to work and learn effectively.
14.	The north isles ferries are old and unfit for purpose
15.	We were really pleased with the support the school gave our children this year. We always find the Environmental Health service helpful and accessible. They do a great job, but go completely unnoticed. As a local business, they have been really useful to provide advice and guidance.
16.	Evie Primary School has additional needs children in all three classrooms and this is impacting on the education of the other children due to their behaviour Older people are blamed on the cost of social care but in fact it is the young adults with learning disabilities that drain social care. 2-1 staffing 24x7 365 days each year..... horrendous cost of staffing their homes Housing stock is a joke with expensive electric heating and poor insulation , shoddy repairs
17.	Retired couple with 2 young grandchildren.
18.	My children are currently doing exams and trying to get good grades to help them progress into good careers. This is a challenge with staffing issues at school
19.	Work in both sectors
20.	The ferry service is the backbone to most of the other services.
21.	My family doing sporting activities & having a healthy life I have children in education Living out East, public services for my older children is very poor
22.	Pot hole stupid signs health for teenager
23.	To maintain good roads network
24.	Frequent disruptions to ferry services due to Orkney Ferries boats needing repairs more often now.
25.	Potholes are awful in Papdale
26.	A key priority has to be meeting the needs of children in schools. More funding needs to be allocated to ensure that all children are able to learn in a settled and safe environment.
27.	Recovery from COVID
28.	Had a health scare, now make more use of leisure services to keep fit and active and healthy and social.
29.	As a volunteer with a local community day club facility I find this an essential service especially in our remote communities.
30.	The Inter-Island ferries need serious investment as do the roads and other transport links. Threatening to close the Hope Amenities Centre will only result in a massive increase in fly tipping because it is a long way to Hatston and not everyone has suitable transport.
31.	The clear deterioration in education provision is of great concern given that education is essential throughout life. The failures in the housing sector is of great concern, particularly the growing waiting list for social housing, while at the same time there are increasing numbers of second homes and short-term lets available. Which is more important? Long term societal security or short term personal gain? Operational environmental services are clearly

2. Have any of the services listed below become more important to you over the past year? Please choose any that apply and state why in the comments box:

	deteriorating, particularly in relation to street infrastructure and cleanliness as well as intrusion of traffic into civic spaces.
32.	Leisure services cannot and should not be marked against a monetary value. They should be measured against improving people's overall happiness and health, be it mental, spiritual, or physical. It would be a travesty if any institutions relating to leisure would be cut or reduced. Particularly when there are hundreds of thousands of users a year which is only going to grow as tourism increases and the population grows. They really are a keystone in a community.
33.	Still have children in the education system
34.	Some in poor condition.
35.	leisure services and the use of the Picky Leisure services have been a help in my recovery after surgery
36.	All three need improvement
37.	we need good roads, ferries etc to deliver basic essential services etc.
38.	Children now in nursery and of age to use leisure facilities
39.	Education is failing our children and has been for many years compounded by a complete failure over the span of vivid where children received little or no support and untrained parents were expected to educate their children. Social care is falling apart at the seams with numerous findings by the care inspectorate highlighting how we are failing the old and vulnerable people of our community. Waste services are obviously teetering on the brink of failure too with reduced services and commitment to assist the elderly and inform with collection methods.
40.	Vital for an aging population bur very short sighted due to smaller care home being built. Orkney needs a proper nursing home that hospital can discharge to to free up space in care homes for those requiring care and not nursing care!
41.	Roads are getting worse as less money being spent and too much patching and not enough renewing
42.	Because both are a lifeline
43.	Far too many cuts to the detriment of the children's education
44.	Too often we have inadequate housing provision giving little or no opportunities for young people to secure a house. We are increasingly seeing the challenges for care of the elderly. Most significantly we see the challenges of young people living in poverty and and facing mental health issues which we are struggling as a community to support. We must retain and if possible increase support in this area otherwise it will be a greater costs to society in the future.
45.	Social care and education are both crucial but are both really struggling in multiple ways. Doesn't feel to be getting same support.
46.	Main roads need to be gritted more in icy conditions, and priority 2 need to be assessed at least daily. Also the state of some roads are shocking verges falling away and repairs being done make the roads like a patchwork blanket - not smooth or decent at all!
47.	Sport and Leisure facilities, such as the Pickaquoy Centre, need to be prioritised. These facilities are vital for physical health and mental wellbeing, as well as socially, all of which are statically proven to reduce strain on our health services and create a better society all around.
48.	Although not directly, I am increasingly concerned that the budget spend within social care continues to be vastly over budget with a greater reliance on locum or temporary positions. Despite the recent recruitment drive, I fail to see how this service can deliver against its current budget, never mind any revision for 2023/24.
49.	My son is about to sit his Nat 5 exams and lack of teachers at KGS is shocking due to staff absence

2. Have any of the services listed below become more important to you over the past year? Please choose any that apply and state why in the comments box:

50.	Child started secondary school
51.	Lack of maintenance
52.	Poorly maintained and not fit for purpose
53.	Vital service
54.	The lack of social care availability and building a new care home in Kirkwall with 4 fewer beds is unacceptable
55.	Housing for large families is vital. This allows families to cross generations meet the social care needs of their family members and care for our disabled loved ones. We urgently need large accessible home, please! Leisure services are our children's future, a social hub and necessary for equality of education, employment, and social access. Please do not cut this service. I appreciate how tempting. But as a child in care, the library helped me go to college when I was homeless and dropped out of school. The swimming pool gave me a safe place to go burn off energy and shower regularly, and the parks gave me a healthy, safe place to go and gave me hope in my bluest days.
56.	I now have a granddaughter- her education revives my interest I'm a trustee for a local charity- economic development seems to hold the key to getting support locally
57.	The huge housing crisis needs addressing and the number of homeless households.
58.	Chronic underfunding and deterioration
59.	Very important allowing me to access facilities and avoid loneliness and anxiety
60.	My husband died in January and I don't drive so have had to rely on bus services as I live out of town.
61.	With elderly relatives, this is a key resource
62.	I rely so much on social care to help with a parent who is unbelievable frail. The home carers are amazing, it's a pity the services they provide do not seem to be valued and their skills and expertise is not acknowledged . I'm not surprised you can't recruit given how much they are paid. As my parent's condition has become much worse over the past year I have come to rely on social care more. Working seven days a week, being on call 24/7 and never having any time off takes its toll. That's the life of unpaid carers and I know many are struggling. Getting some respite would help the looked after person as well as giving the unpaid carer the strength to continue instead of becoming ill..
63.	These are always my top 3 priorities
64.	With no carers available on Isle, residents may need to leave their home and go into care. Also, some residents are not getting medication prompts and assistance that they may get in other areas in Orkney. The nurses are unable to undertake these roles as they are already very busy as they are single-handed. On Isle carers are needed and investment undertaken to train and recruit.
65.	Library and archive services have helped my mental health and wellbeing a lot over the previous year. The services offered in the library are amazing, providing a warm, safe space with lots of things to do. The social aspect of meeting people in the library reduces isolation and it gives access to free resources that I could not afford otherwise.
66.	In particularly the library which provides mobile and home library services to those who are less mobile. Also a welcoming and warm space for folk to sit and read.
67.	I have encountered several problems with transport in the last year that have resulted in great inconveniences. This includes bus, ferry and air transportation
68.	Due to medical care needed by a family member, the ability to get to Aberdeen Royal Infirmary has become super-important for me. But is this lifeline, emergency service something that OIC should be funding, or central government?










2. Have any of the services listed below become more important to you over the past year? Please choose any that apply and state why in the comments box:

69.	Working in social care with children with additional support needs, I see the importance of it daily. There is a huge demand for help for children with autism, ADHD etc. Demand outstrips what we can provide. I also work with adult services and see how vital services are for our older generation and how much they need and depend on carers.
70.	Have used the leisure centre and library a lot with having two young kids
71.	The state of them with pot hole state of barriers. Lack of proper ferry during bad weather its expected but 2 weeks without northlike banks will do his very best But disgraceful northlink life line ha ha
72.	I've marked roads because the state of local roads is shocking. This has an impact on all transportation and possibly a knock on effect on tourism as well. And leisure services because I use the library more each year.
73.	Living in Papay Orkney Ferries has been a lifeline
74.	Far to much flooding on roads as no maintenance. Also potholes more than ever caused by flooding. Refuse collection and recycling are vital and they never have enough vehicles or people. Too many breakdowns. Leisure facilities are vital for physical and mental well being.
75.	Elderly relatives
76.	As we age, we should be responsible for our own social welfare. But roads are degrading and rural daily transportation is abysmal and will get worse. Toursts have plenty of supprt for latter
77.	Swimming pool and library, in particular because other local authorities have taken them away
78.	Younger generation cannot drive and the bus routes are borderline unacceptable.
79.	We found ourselves homeless due to a landlord needing his home back
80.	It pains me to see no housing for key workers, and no prospect for young people starting out in life to rent or buy affordable property. Leisure services may appear to be extra, but personally I feel they are as important for healthy life as other essential services.
81.	Real concerns regarding social care crisis here and leisure because as a senior I am trying to stay fit and healthy. Housing concerns me due to the number of empty properties and lack of effort to bring these into use when we have enormous waiting list.
82.	I retired in the past year and increasingly depended on the library as a wonderful resource.
83.	Issues most connected to my work and personal life.
84.	i have 2 kids who may never afford their own home. We see folk arriving in orkney and given homes. you need to prioritise folk who live here first. This is not being hateful to others, its about being fair to folk who live here and wish to remain. Long waiting lists for social care/mental health. Bus service is poor. we have the x1 and people use this for work. EXCEPT when schools are running and the bus is taken off. This is ridiculous. Add on another bus for this route so folk can get to work.
85.	As a retired person this leisure services have become more import to me. I do appreciate that over service are probably more important to the wider population, in particular the availability of rented accommodation and social care.
86.	Have started using the mobile library, such a brilliant service
87.	The poor condition of the roads, and complete lack of drainage in places, has brought this to my attention as it feels hazardous when driving.
88.	In the bad winter months we pensioners are reliant on our library van and service - our quality of life would be awful without it

2. Have any of the services listed below become more important to you over the past year? Please choose any that apply and state why in the comments box:

89.	I have selected the most important services I feel we require as essential to our wellbeing. Education, housing and social care being the most relevant.
90 & 91.	No

3. Have any of the services listed below become less important to you over the past year? Please choose any that apply and state why in the comments box:

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Economic Development		24.05%	19
2	Education		17.72%	14
3	Environmental Health and Trading Standards		26.58%	21
4	Housing		12.66%	10
5	Leisure Services		34.18%	27
6	Operational Environmental Services		11.39%	9
7	Roads		8.86%	7
8	Social Care		13.92%	11
9	Transportation		17.72%	14
			answered	79
			skipped	128

Comment: (46)

1.	As a housebound, physically disabled individual I don't have a need and am unable to use leisure services, but I do recognise that their availability is vital for many folks' mental and physical wellbeing and fully support their presence.
2.	About the same
3.	From a personal point of view my children are no longer in education and I don't have to rely on transportation
4.	None
5.	my views have not changed
6.	Not services I use
7.	All of these services are important.
8.	Although I engage in leisure activities, they are not provided by the Council. (I use community halls provided by the Community Council).
9.	In my opinion these are less important than actually caring for the people of Orkney, future generation and decent homes. Roads are a disgrace although we pay sweetly to drive on them

3. Have any of the services listed below become less important to you over the past year? Please choose any that apply and state why in the comments box:

10.	Roads in Orkney are good compared to other authorities. Parking is not expensive..
11.	No all vital
12.	No
13.	No, all equally important.
14.	The desperation demonstrated by OIC in striving to become "world leaders" in this, that and the other in business areas that can only be provided by the private sector has resulted in significant amounts of public resources being squandered on projects that can never provide any significant return.
15.	Never used any of these services
16.	education, only because my children have left school, but the support for children and young adults with special educational needs is a high priority
17.	Much higher priorities. We need rubbish collected before going to the gym!
18.	I gave up on public transport and it's lack of ability to be used by the workers and commuters to other transport services many years ago so don't use them. Far too many empty busses travelling around our county, why?
19.	Too much money spent on picky centre and not enough money coming back
20.	Although important to maintain the Orkney economy at present Orkneys industries are thriving or new economic opportunities are appearing, we cannot ignore these areas for support but possibly we can target the most worthy / needy and attract inward investment.
21.	Think we need to focus less on cruise liners and more on our own locals
22.	The previous Council committed £1m towards the Island Games 2025. Already this year, we have heard Birmingham's position in the aftermath of the Commonwealth Games, together with other countries around the world now refusing to host them for financial reasons. The £1m was committed from the oil reserve fund and in the present budget Council moved to spend more from this fund than any other previous Council. There is now a danger that the Island Games Committee cannot fund the games from existing revenue streams, and given the recently announced grant to LA's from Scottish Government together with a capping of Council tax, a risk they will require additional funding. This was evinced recently by Mr Knight in Committee and I would be concerned that, whilst it would be lovely to host such an event, we are setting double standards in spending this money on something that under a new financial microscope is seen as a luxury when other statutory services are failing to deliver.
23.	Little time to make use of them
24.	The proposed deep water quay in Scapa Flow.
25.	It's a sin that people on good salaries expect and get subsidised housing
26.	This is tricky because they all tie in together. It's such a tough choice.
27.	The condition of the roads is generally very good so perhaps a year with a different priority could help elsewhere in the budget. I have no personal need of social care yet and hence just now it is of less significance for me
28.	Cruise tourism has spoiled places and it seems like we are failing to maximise return eg by introducing entrance charges for tourists at the Cathedral and introducing overnight parking charges at aikerness, brough of birsay and broch of gurness which are overrun with campervans so parking is limited
29.	it seems no matter what, nothing is done and the council merely makes excuses, so why bother

3. Have any of the services listed below become less important to you over the past year? Please choose any that apply and state why in the comments box:

30.	While I think leisure services are important, there is much greater need for services for the vulnerable people in our community.
31.	I feel that these are aimed too much at tourists to the detriment of locals
32.	This should be self supported by Tourism and businesses.
33.	I no longer have dependants in full time education
34.	I want good leisure services in our community. So it's not that this is not important, it's just that, if I had to prioritise, I would put it further down the list and suggest that there may need to be other ways to fund leisure services. eg. are there some things that I should pay for if I can afford it, such as access to library services? BTW why are Caravan Sites under the 'Leisure' budget and not part of Tourism in the 'Economic Development' budget?
35.	I have my own car so it's not an issue for me
36.	I have used these less - but have been out in Papay
37.	Do not use these at present
38.	With age comes the value of transport and LIBRARY facilities. We should make our own leisure and keep OURSELVES active, fit and healthy
39.	Tourism should not be something OIC is involved in. There are other government agencies specifically for this. (Visit Scotland).
40.	Have had a boost in tourism within the last two years and there are many jobs opening up in this section
41.	They are of course all needed
42.	Housing as I've recently moved to Orkney and own a house.
43.	I find it difficult to list the services that are less important as they are all part of our lives today. Cutting out any will be damaging to many. I find it difficult to pick out any services as we have become used to them all over the years.
44& 45.	No
46.	The council seems fixated with reducing Orkney's carbon footprint . Considering our contribution to global warming is negligible there are more important issues that need to be addressed.

3. Have any of the services listed below become less important to you over the past year? Please choose any that apply and state why in the comments box:

4. Take a look at the following statements and tell us how much you agree with them - where 5 is completely agree and 1 is totally disagree.

Answer Choices	1	2	3	4	5	Response Total
The Council should change or reduce opening hours for some public services and buildings.	20.88% 38	11.54% 21	30.22% 55	20.33% 37	17.03% 31	182
The Council should charge specific service users for the services they use, including raising new charges, and increasing others	16.57% 30	8.29% 15	32.60% 59	27.07% 49	15.47% 28	181
The Council should continue to sell the property it no longer has a use for.	7.03% 13	2.16% 4	2.16% 4	13.51% 25	75.14% 139	185
The Council should reduce or stop some non-essential services to protect other services.	8.24% 15	8.79% 16	36.26% 66	23.08% 42	23.63% 43	182
The Council should reduce or stop the grants it gives other organisations.	7.61% 14	17.93% 33	37.50% 69	14.67% 27	22.28% 41	184
The Council should reduce the number of properties that it operates from, even though this would mean that it would be more difficult to access services when and where you want to.	9.19% 17	13.51% 25	23.78% 44	27.57% 51	25.95% 48	185
The Council should review its service standards even if that means the service becoming reduced or delivery of that service taking longer.	10.93% 20	10.93% 20	36.61% 67	26.78% 49	14.75% 27	183
The Council should seek to identify new income generating opportunities, for example introduction of the Tourist Visitor Levy locally, or investing in commercial activities which generate revenues which can be used to support services	11.23% 21	3.74% 7	10.16% 19	20.32% 38	54.55% 102	187
					answered	188
					skipped	19

4. Take a look at the following statements and tell us how much you agree with them - where 5 is completely agree and 1 is totally disagree.

Comment: (57)

1.	Tourist tax needs to be managed properly, and limited to cruise ships, camper vans and caravans, NOT Hotels, Airbnbs etc.
2.	the council needs to concentrate on the things only the council can do, and do them well. Anything else is a bonus. The council should remember it is legally responsible for certain things, and avoid going chasing other things which are better dealt with by the private sector or other "partners".
3.	Totally agree with the tourist tax or similar as many other places charge this now and it is almost expected when you go on holiday - could be used to fund toilets at tourism sites etc.
4.	The council should charge a tourist tax of £1 per night per person for people who holiday in Orkney.
5.	the questions are too broad and depends on services offered
6.	The money from the cruise liners should be split across all services that are affected by the extra footfall of visitors, especially roads. I know this is not the policy now, but the councillors should be investigating how to implement this. I am sure the tourists would be happy to pay a bit extra for services they use here.
7.	Priority has to be reducing bureaucracy to become more nimble and generating income. The OIC needs to be more entrepreneurial!
8.	We absolutely should be introducing a Tourist Visitor Levy locally and this should be done sooner rather than later. It should include a contribution from all of the liners too. If the income from the liners is ringfenced for the Harbours budget only, the councillors need to change this so that it is shared across the whole council. These liners impact on many other services across the council eg. roads, toilets, waste, street cleaning and leisure. We absolutely should be selling off any property that we no longer have a use for, even if it is at a reduced cost to get a sale. We could reduce some non essential services that do not generate much income, and may even run at a loss eg. course bookings. We should be looking a more efficient ways of corresponding with our customers eg. reducing postage by using email and texts rather than posting out letters, invoices and council tax bills.
9.	"reduce the number of properties that it operates from..." should include reduce scale of operational bases; e.g. significantly reduce scale of School Place and deploy staff in a hybrid model of working from home and working in other council-owned estate, e.g school estate; which has potential to reduce operating costs and increase accessibility to services, and whole range of other potential benefits.
10.	The Council should look for opportunities to share "back office services" with other public sector organisations. For example, there could be savings from sharing IT infrastructure and support services between the Council, community councils, the Health Service and even the Police/Fire. Some things the Council does may be better provided by the private sector (unless this is a statutory responsibility of the Council).
11.	Giving grants to other organisations allows these organisations to attract other funding into Orkney I.e. match funding which allows organisations such as community halls to survive and provide services entirely run by volunteers for the good of the local community.
12.	We must do something. May not be palatable but is necessary
13.	More money from the tourism sector should be taken. Money from renewable energy
14.	Sell property but for full market price and advertiesd widely. Not to freinds and cronies. Keep the skips open plenty. it must be cheaper than having the lorry have to collect normal household rubbish from every address. Think about having a system where people can declare "No rubbish" by email or text if they have already taken their rubbish to the skips. We take all our rubbish to the skips but the lorry still comes down our road.

4. Take a look at the following statements and tell us how much you agree with them - where 5 is completely agree and 1 is totally disagree.

15.	Private works by the roads team but this would need to be an increase to the workforce however this would generate income
16.	The council should reduce officer travel outwith Orkney by a minimum of 80%
17.	Open the door to large businesses, who should have a premium business tax rate applied greater than that of local business' negotiating that prices are the same as stores across mainland. No competition has lead to unrealistic prices being applied by local business for a local to get rich quick and not necessarily provide a good service or item
18.	Support tourist visitor levy but for cruise ship passengers only. Individually, they put so little into the economy compared to the negative effects they have on life here and the environment.
19.	I do not agree with a levy for holiday makers coming to Orkney , by plane or ferry, as it affects friends and family coming to stay here .If levys come into effect as a general thing across the board ,it means that we will have to pay a levy when we go away to stay on holiday. It would be good to raise revenues from investing in commercial activities.
20.	To clarify the last two:- Review of service standards will depend on which service and the impact any changes might have. Income generation - there will be a greater risk of losing tourists if they suddenly find they have to pay additional levies to come to Orkney. The Council needs to be cautious as any commercial activity will require a large set-up cost and may involve additional staff to run it creating a further overhead that has to be funded.
21.	The council should certainly charge specific service users for what they use, particularly the "discretionary services" provided as subsidies to cruise lines. The council should certainly cease provision of non-essential services, particularly money spent on subsidising tourism.
22.	Invest in reducing the cost of staff absences and agency spend which is being used to backfill absences - e.g putting in a small but targeted team which helps managers monitor and better deal with staff absences through early, more informed, continual proactive management. Invest some of the reserve money in accommodation as it's likely there will be a continued demand for this, this would generate ongoing income. Repurpose some existing assets into accommodation where possible. This is what many other councils are doing and it's generating them a strong regular income. Definitely pursue a Tourist Tax / Visitor Levy.
23.	In recent years the council has become very top heavy with regard to its management structure. YOu have stated that by removing free car parking between October and December you will save approx £80k, which disadvantages a huge number of individuals and businesses. Removing ONE executive will save the same amount, if not more,money. I feel your priorities are misguided.
24.	Far too many airy fairy jobs created and too many management jobs. Services have been fairy constant for the last 30 years but the no of pffice based staff has grown out of control due to empire building and job justification
25.	The monies received by Harbours for cruise liners needs to be redistributed amongst areas which will benefit tourists and locals: eg roads, leisure
26.	OIC has a track record of wasting money on consultants looking at opportunities which are no longer viable by the time the procrastination has ended. Brush up your act and make something happen or stop wasting money and the time of councillors and officers who could be using the time better.
27.	Rationalisation of services should be shared across the county rather that close all services in remoter areas in favour of centralisation in Kirkwall.
28.	I think the council needs to go back to basics and get rid of jobs that are not required... too many office staff and not enough bin men and road sweepers




4. Take a look at the following statements and tell us how much you agree with them - where 5 is completely agree and 1 is totally disagree.

29.	I think some services which could be considered 'non-essential' are dependent on the individual. What are non-essential for some are absolutely essential for others. For example, exercise and sport is 100% essential for my entire family whereas others don't see it as a priority.
30.	Some responses are quite difficult as they offer no perspective. For example some grants will sustain employment so perhaps review grants would have been a better option. I fully support a levy for visitors and whilst tourism is welcome, the recent debate around public conveniences highlights the apparent lack of strategic overview of how this industry has grown and therefore supported within the County. Every opportunity should be used to realise estate but so should more flexible working arrangements and a rationalisation of school place assets - staff can work remotely and efficiently.
31.	A considerable saving of money could be made by stopping the deep water quay project in Scapa flow along with the associated road works in Holm neither of them being necessary.
32.	In the olden days ,when the council owned nearly all the housing , we had one building inspector, now you own half as much , you have 6 building inspectors, with secretary's just a thought
33.	The question regarding the tourist levy should have been better worded. I disagree with the introduction of a Levy, however that shouldn't stop the council from using their initiative to look at other revenue raising initiatives. OIC does charge a Levy via harbour dues, I.e, cruise passengers = £3.50 and ferry passengers = £1.94. Harbours profits shouldn't be ring fenced and should be made available to the hole of OIC.
34.	Absolutely!
35.	Without having further detail, I neither agree nor disagree with a visitor levy. However, the viability and appropriateness of it and other potential revenue generating activity should definitely be investigated.
36.	Care needs to be taken with tourist levy, so that islanders who have to stay over on Mainland for transport connections or appointments are not penalised any more than at present.
37.	Transparency about where the cruise money currently goes could help
38.	Modernise your services to reduce staffing. More effective online services and modern systems to workflow and manage cases reducing handoffs between departments and improving responsiveness would bring efficiencies
39.	council is not in the business of making money, but it is it a PUBLIC SERVICE - NOT A CASH COW TO TAKE MONEY FROM THE PUBLIC WHEN THEY ALREADY PAY FOR PUBLIC SERVICES
40.	Following the pandemic our businesses need to recover. Many business owners have said how they rely on cruise liners and tourists. Stop listening to the angry minority and take a proportionate and reasonable approach to this. I have concerns about what your ideas about investing in commercial activities would cost. I can only imagine how many staff you would take on, and how long this would take them with perhaps no result at the end. And I am quite sure they would be extremely well paid - and then Personnel would be asking for more staff to manage them.
41.	The council should increase council tax on second homes. Also, the council appears very much management heavy. Perhaps organisational change is required to make cost savings. Put a hold on non-essential recruitment. Look at staff expenses/costs - limit overtime and limit expenses to essential only. Four day week?
42.	Without specific detail in the questions it is difficult to answer. It depends on the service and what charges would mean to people and the impact it would have, especially on those who are vulnerable. Who classes what as an essential service or not? Who would decide on the charge etc?
43.	These questions are far to vague, broad and loaded! - change or reduce opening hours - consider change but not necessarily a reduction; charge specific service users for the services they use- maybe for some services; reduce or stop some non-essential services - what do you consider to be non-essential?; review its service standards even if that means the service becoming reduced - services should be constantly reviewed for improvement but not necessarily reduction.

4. Take a look at the following statements and tell us how much you agree with them - where 5 is completely agree and 1 is totally disagree.

44.	Paying interest on money borrowed to manage cash flow, just because the Scottish government doesn't hand over the cash agreed in the budget, is scandalous. You have to deal with that issue as a priority.
45.	Tourists need to pay for the damage they cause to the environment & additional pressures put on local services such as rubbish collections, toilet provision & roads.
46.	Warehouse building in Stromness should close as not very busy and a white elephant. Town house in Stromness should be sold off as a waste of money. Cut the politics where Stromness councillors support these when they are not viable. This would generate a lot of money.
47.	Questions have to wide a range to enable accurate responses
48.	These are very difficult questions to answer. Service users could be sounded out in relation to introducing costs and asked to be very honest with their answers. A charge of pence could become much needed revenue to the authority but have little impact on the user BUT these small charges should not be used up by the process required to administer them.
49.	Tourism is damaging the environment and draining some resource
50.	The Council exists to provide certain statutory public services. These should be a priority and every member of the Council's staff, from Chief Executive down to the bin men need to be made aware of and continually reminded of the fact that they are there to serve the public. The outcome of the tough times - tough choices exercise seems to have largely been forgotten, with high wage "non-jobs" being created.
51.	These questions are deliberately vague, worded in a way to give yourselves permission to take away as yet unspecified services and then say it's what the public wanted. You clearly have cuts in mind, but we can't know what until it's too late. I can see what you're doing here and it is not good.
52.	The Council should not attempt to continue with the range of services it currently supplies, and should work in tandem with the private sector to divest itself of some areas: for example, quarries and economic development.
53.	The options are broad and vague as outlined above - the detail would be important in order to make a fully informed decision about how much I agree/disagree with any of them.
54.	yes. anywhere else when we holiday we are charged at every turn. Charge visitors from cruise liners etc... charge for world heritage sites before they arrive. People paying thousands for a cruise will not even be concerned at a few pounds added onto landing fees to support this.
55.	As a former visitor Orkney and now a resident I feel that OIC should introduce a Tourist Visitor Levy. This would give the council a direct income stream, whilst at the moment the main beneficiaries of tourism are businesses and OIC indirectly has income via business rates and port charges. A TVL would underpin infrastructure spending, benefiting businesses and tourists as well as the council. This a policy that is being introduced or looked at by various other council both in the UK and elsewhere. To provide a meaningful TVL I feel it should be levied on both holiday let's and cruise ship passengers.
56.	If the council are to get involved in commercial activities they should be mindful of the "commercial world in Orkney and avoid conflict of other interests"
57.	The council should be wary of becoming commercially involved.

5. Should our 2024/25 annual increases be;

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Set below CPI		18.13%	33
2	Set at CPI		72.53%	132
3	Set above CPI		9.34%	17
			answered	182
			skipped	25



Comment: (29)

1.	No more than inflation as a rule.
2.	In this era of a cost of living crisis in which many people struggle to survive from day to day, OIC charges and price increases in general should rise as little as possible.
3.	I agree there needs to be an increase but this should not be set above CPI.
4.	again depends on service we are talking about - if it is a care home/parking then should be reduced if it something else such as leisure facilities - this should depend on what can be raised and consumer willingness to pay
5.	would prefer to think that there is consideration of this on case by case basis based on the impact that above inflation may have on customers - ie probably room for some things to be a lot more expensive where there is a clear choice as to whether to use or not (eg car parking) and others less so eg cost of any social care services
6.	It does depend on the service though as, if you charge too much, then it may not be used at all.
7.	Unsure
8.	I think we should look at the charges set across other councils and compare our charges to other councils. This might mean charging above CPI in some cases.
9.	Do not set it above CPI as folk are already struggling with price rises.
10.	The Council can't keep asking residents to pay for massive increases in charges for a service that is not improved or effective to use.
11.	CPI is not the only indicator that can provide guidance on pricing. Other indices should be considered, and the most appropriate index for different considerations should be used. Price should not be the only consideration. Societal gain is probably more important in many cases.
12.	Let the folk who want the service pay for it.
13.	why should folk be hammered with increased charges, just cut the overheads
14.	Unless the government is happy to increase pay in keeping with increases
15.	We have to play catch-up on our income generation so charging more will still keep us in an average charging band. We must also be careful we do not put a burden on those that cannot afford to pay. Eg Motorists can afford to pay for parking. Less well off as less able to put food on the table or pay for access to services for themselves and their children.
16.	Unsure what this means
17.	Dependent on the service and charge, adopt the attitude that you should be charging an average of what other councils charge plus 10% for islands additional costs.

5. Should our 2024/25 annual increases be;

18.	Household budgets are stretched to breaking, mortgages, food, energy and taxes have all increased significantly. OIC should focus on efficiency savings, stop wasting money and make better purchasing decisions. Close any services that are poorly utilised and offer poor value for money.
19.	The 10% increase in tax was quite burdensome for many, some common sense needs to be used in setting the rates
20.	A large percentage of people in Orkney are struggling to live on their wages whilst some get everything paid for them. Why should people who work have to pay extra to enable others to get loads of benefits.
21.	The no increase in council tax in Scotland should be honoured in Orkney - it is already expensive to live in and increasing will deter professionals from moving here to support infrastructure.
22.	I could pay more, and would be willing to, but I know there's many others who can't. Therefore a recognised metric such as CPI would seem fair. But it's going to hit some folk more than others.
23.	A lot of increases happening across the board so set at cpi or below to help citizens
24.	Ideally, but this depends on how much the OIC has 'fallen behind' in generating income & what shortfall it needs to make up.
25.	6.7% is hopefully going to look inflated in the near future.
26.	Like evryone, the Council should properly manage expenditure and budgets. We all have to move money in and out of priorities.
27.	CPI likely to fall over the next 12-18 months.
28.	we are struggling. i pay £230 a month council tax. The highest in scotland!!
29.	Again we have to be mindful of whom these charges are targeted at. Also remember the "commercial world".

6. To implement a 100% additional charge on second/empty homes in Orkney?

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes 	83.42%	156
2	No 	16.58%	31
		answered	187
		skipped	20

Comment: (50)

1.	Again, this needs to be managed carefully Empty homes - YES. second homes - not if it is required in order to work on Orkney.
2.	Seems reasonable as many properties in popular tourist areas are being eaten up by holiday homes and they tend to lie empty in the winter, adversely affecting local businesses etc.
3.	again making people who have worked hard and are successful pay when the lazy don't
4.	This is already in place. I agree with the additional charge but feel a period of notice should be given to home owners to either sell or bring second home(s) into use. I received this charge for a second home without any prior notice of this scheme.

6. To implement a 100% additional charge on second/empty homes in Orkney?

5.	Second homes on the isles helps maintain services to the isles.
6.	Second homes might then be rented out as long term accommodation.
7.	Additional charges to those who have holiday homes/ second homes, but don't reside on the island.
8.	2nd homes should be charged at 3x council tax just like in Wales where holiday homes have become a problem. Tourism and holidaying is a seasonal business. There should also be an increase in fares for holiday makers to come to the island on boats etc, to reduce the cost to the community
9.	Not for Second homes but.. ones for simply sitting empty and not being used.
10.	Definitely support this.
11.	Second homes could be charged at more, but empty homes could be for a variety of reasons, like unable to sell, or not ready to move into or houses being renovated and should not be charged extra. They already pay for services which they do not use!
12.	Empty homes should be considered on an individual basis as there may be a valid reason why it is not being used to house people. If there is no justification for it being empty then a surcharge could be made in order to encourage the owner to bring it into use, either by selling or renting it. Making a place fit to sell / rent involves a significant financial outlay. The Council already has a policy in place for second homes and this should not be changed. Is this to raise funds in the short-term or resolve housing shortage in the longer term?
13.	Implement this charge in full, and ensure that no councillor who is the owner of a second or empty home is involved in discussion or voting on the issue.
14.	May help the housing problem. This should apply to holiday let's also.
15.	An extra charge indeed but 100% too much
16.	Increase it to 200%.
17.	There should be a HUGE tax on empty / second homes. Owners do NOT support the local community and businesses for their couple of weeks stay a year, meanwhile there is no property for folk looking to move here permanently to local jobs, or housing for local people! It is ridiculous!
18.	This should be higher. Housing is in short supply and second homes are a nice to have, not a necessity.
19.	More than that for the rich fat cats who block properties for those who need it, the residents and workers the community need.
20.	If people are actively trying to sell.
21.	Absolutely it's disgusting that there are empty houses. It should even be trebled! Especially the isles
22.	But there are varying circumstances which should be factored in to avoid unreasonable application of the charges.
23.	Many second properties are operated as holiday homes or airbnb properties and generally, these are properties which offer opportunities for people to enter the property market. Whilst contributing to the overall tourist trade, we need to ensure owners who are being compensated heavily in terms of market rates for rental, contribute fairly.
24.	About time, and a forced let or sale of empty shops too.
25.	Unless it's only the individuals holiday home. If you rent out property you are housing individuals that OIC cannot provide housing for. If you charge more we will just sell therefore less housing as people cannot afford mortgages at present



6. To implement a 100% additional charge on second/empty homes in Orkney?

26.	Totally, there is a lack of housing in Orkney and this might free up some stock. If it doesn't, then extra income for the council.
27.	Yes, but it really depends on why the home is empty. There needs to be humanity in granting exceptions to this rule. Is Grandad frail and now living with his son and wife, but they can't sell his home, because his house has the only accessible bathroom, so they need his house for bathing him. And they can't get planning permission to build the extension for a, wet room? See how this is, tricky, because sometimes families are stretched accross two houses, sort of a little bit having one in little use, but it isn't easy to explain because life is complex. But these families are actually saving the council money by caring for their family at home
28.	The Scottish Government IS not ARE - it's a singular entity
29.	this is needed both to raise income and to try to reduce the number of such second homes- these properties don't benefit local communities sustainably
30.	Encourage housing to be available for those who need it
31.	Compulsory sale of empty houses together with some support to refurbish those that are not inhabitable could raise income in the long-term an make islands in articular more sustainable with new people and skills
32.	It would be fair as there is a lack of housing and why should second homes not have this charge?
33.	People work hard and invest in second homes as a means to make some extra to live on. There maybe should be small charges for second homes but all the existing rules, regulations and payments to OIC is pricing people out of the market and less accommodation available for holidaymakers therefore less money being spent on Orkney.
34.	Need dramatic measures to reduce empty homes
35.	We have too many holiday homes creating a shortage of housing and overinflated rents which in turn makes it hard to take lower paid jobs in service industries.
36.	Absolutely. Those with more than two houses should have 150% on each additional house.
37.	Owners of second/empty homes use less rather than more of your services so why should they pay more?
38.	Simply because a property is not lived in doesn't feel like a reasonable reason for levying additional Council Tax. I would rather see an additional tax levied when a second home is in use eg. if it's a holiday home, then levy a tourist tax.
39.	On Second homes, yes. On Empty homes, no - the reason being is that they may be empty because owners need time and funds to be able to improve the state of the property (or frankly make it habitable for modern living).
40.	Perhaps an additional 50-75% but 100% seems steep.
41.	Housing is a major problem in housing (availability) - if you can afford a second home (how luxurious), you can afford to pay for it!
42.	I would vote for a 200/300% charge.
43.	If folk can afford a second home they can afford to pay.
44.	Council have not utilised option for funding from SG for new housing for a number of years , There is now a housing shortage and this proposal is seen as an option to help resolve the issue of housing shortages
45.	Yes but perhaps also surcharging certain Council Services
46.	There is a housing shortage in Orkney. This charge would increase housing stock for people in need of a home.

6. To implement a 100% additional charge on second/empty homes in Orkney?

47.	More important for empty homes (depending on how this is defined).
48.	compulsory purchase on homes that have been empty for a certain no of years.
49.	Again this is a policy that is be introduced by other authorities in the Uk with similar issues around second homes
50.	Unsure about this. Will this release houses to the people looking for accommodation?

7. Should we vary the Council Tax Bands - ask those on higher bands to pay incrementally more than those on lower bands – to make the system fairer?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		59.46%	110
2	No		40.54%	75
			answered	185
			skipped	22

Comment: (43)

1.	Maybe
2.	Houses over 300000 should have to pay more
3.	We have already seen a marked increase in council tax. The banding works as it is.
4.	should be a flat rate - again making people who have worked hard and are successful pay when the lazy don't
5.	this depends as somne people may have higehr band houses but not be fliush wiuth money. Eg inherited houses or need a large house because they have a large family. It is not always the case that big house means big budget.
6.	No, as there are a huge amount of people in low band properties that have put on large extentions that are not penalised
7.	Properties must be re-evaluated when they are extended, aware of Band A with huge extensions and four bedrooms
8.	Definitely!!
9.	Higher brackets already pay more & pay more through other means also
10.	The 1991 value of a house doesn't say all that much about the means of the current occupant.
11.	This is a difficult one, as some folk with larger families or who have taken on caring responsibilities for example caring for elderly parents may need a larger home, and would be penalised for carrying out an important social function that takes pressure off other services.
12.	It is not fairer to expect people who work hard to have and are able to have a larger house to have to pay a bigger proportion of council tax.A lot of folk on lower incomes get a big help with benefits already.
13.	This would not make the system fairer. People live in houses they can afford and the services the council provide does not vary between a band A and a band G property. Any attempt to 'Tax the Rich' smacks of SNP policy and in inherently unfair on anyone who lives in Scotland, as it effectively punishes those who have provided a safe and secure living for themselves.



7. Should we vary the Council Tax Bands - ask those on higher bands to pay incrementally more than those on lower bands – to make the system fairer?

14.	As long as this is done following advice from experts in taxation and is not left to arbitrary decisions taken by officers or councillors.
15.	System should be fair in the first place
16.	I think tax bands are fair as they are.
17.	Make sure less all council tax payments are collected
18.	As either Q6, you have no idea of folk's financial situations and just because they bide in a house at a higher band does not mean they're affluent or have much disposable income
19.	Yes, we should use what power we have to be more redistributive on the tax we take in.
20.	Regardless of the property value the draw on resource is often the same or less than the breadline families.
21.	Think tax bands are all wrong as it should not make a difference in the size of house you live in but the number of over 18s that live in house
22.	Again those that can should carry the burden of costs, but unfortunately Council tax is a narrow tax which can impact on elderly folks in their lifelong homes.
23.	Not necessarily, someone may inherit a large house and then be unable to afford to live there
24.	Scotland is the highest taxed devolved nation in the UK. I believe the Council tax should not have been frozen by SG with a reduced grant to LAs but instead Authorities should have allowed to raise this. After years of capped charges, we had a 10% increase and I suspect this year would have been similar, but it is going to take a long time to recover to a position to where increases would have stood had the ability to raise these annually. I think this should be done on a consistent basis as those on higher bands will, by definition, pay more.
25.	How's that fare folk work hard to have better homes so why should they be targeted to pay more when they are the hard workers. Target the ones on benefits that could be working
26.	Council tax is already a very unfair tax I wouldn't be looking to do anything radical here as there would be an outcry
27.	Why presume that those with the largest disposable income live in the largest houses. The 10% increase last year was a major blow, no councillor lobbied for these increases in their manifesto, another 10% would be abhorrent. The council needs to be more efficient and learn to live within its means.
28.	The date of the property bands assessment was a long time ago and is essentially out of date. I know that on the sale of a property this band is increased for the new owners, but there a likelihood that an older house valued in 1992 is worth very much more in 2024 and this could usefully be reflected in rates to be paid. This income generation could assist in saving crucial services which are threatened.
29.	Council tax bands don't reflect the income/means of the occupants of properties- an income related tax would be much fairer and would likely raise more income
30.	No, it is like tax, why should people that has had to work hard for what they have , have to pay more when accessing same council services?
31.	Agree that higher tax bands should pay higher as they can afford it.
32.	Standard practice elsewhere
33.	Those on higher bands have worked hard to own a home and already pay significantly more.
34.	Higher bands already pay more than lower bands so how would increasing it further make it fairer? As above owners of property in higher bands do not necessarily use more of the services

7. Should we vary the Council Tax Bands - ask those on higher bands to pay incrementally more than those on lower bands – to make the system fairer?

35.	But the CT bands need to be reviewed first so that everyone is paying a fair amount as per the size of their property. Lots of people have extended property that they are not paying much for.
36.	The percentage increase should've the same across the bands. Totally disagree with a freeze
37.	Is that not what is done at the moment. Therefore don't understand the question
38.	This needs to be proportional to household income and number of residents
39.	The Council Bands reflect the house value, not the financial ability of the home owner to pay more. People can be stuck in a higher-banded house on a comparatively modest income. It would not be fairer, unless means-testing was introduced.
40.	Discriminatory.
41.	Tax bands have not been changed since 1990 or so. When folk increase number of bedrooms on houses, their banding stays the same till they move. I am paying band e and have many neighbours who pay d, even though they live in houses larger than my own, due to extensions in recent years.
42.	There should perhaps be exemptions/ support for low income households or unemployed.
43.	Any variation on the payments may affect low income tenants/owners paying disproportionate if they are tenants of larger properties.

8. Service users to be charged a contribution towards service provision of community alarms. Proposed Charge of £4.25 per week mainland, £2.00 per week non-connected isles

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		60.66%
2	No		39.34%
			answered
			183
			skipped
			24

Comment: (49)

Comment: (50)

1.	At this level, would the admin cost not exceed the value. Should be means tested with no charge for those on pension credits, etc
2.	Individual personal safety is a recognised human right and should not be put out of reach of vulnerable people who may not be able to afford these charges.
3,4,5,9,26,44,47,48	Perhaps this should be means tested?
6.	but charge should be the same not dependant on where folk live



8. Service users to be charged a contribution towards service provision of community alarms. Proposed Charge of £4.25 per week mainland, £2.00 per week non-connected isles

7.	i agree but feel that this charge may be to high for many individuals
8.	£2 a week for all areas
10.	Difficult but those who can afford it might be willing to pay if they got the option.
11.	Some wouldn't pay but at least if they pay they will use it.
12.	This service cost, so some sort of money back should be considered.
13.	Maybe means tested for those unable to afford but in general a good idea
14.	Why should people pay extra for their frailty and if this was implimented why should the isle get better treatment ?
15.	I think this should be on a needs assessed basis with this being provided free for those on certain additional benefits eg pension credit.
16.	I don't know what a community alarm is or what service it provides or for whom, so it is not possible to answer this question.
17.	Many people will not be in a position to afford them.
18.	I would not be able to have my community alarm if I had to pay for it, this alarm is my life saver
19.	Societal gain is worth more than the financial contribution such a charge would make.
20.	But This should be means tested so that folk who are unable to pay this are not excluded from the service if there is a medical need.
21.	I think this should be means tested so that those who are able to pay, do and those who maybe can't afford the full amount pay half or a reduced rate
22.	Great proposal attack the more vulnerable in the community! Our People yeah just a tick box for that warm cosy feeling the blinkers supply you until it affects you.
23.	Some elderly may not be able to pay these charges and may mean they do not have them which puts them at risk
24.	Unless benefits increase for them to afford this.
25. not having access based on ability to pay is a false economy as one hospital admission will cost much more in the longer term. The community alarm service is an extension of the Health Service objective free at the point of delivery. If charging is necessary it must still be responsive to ability to pay.
27.	Absolutely. We are providing a service
28.	This service is needed by vulnerable members of society who need to be protected rather than made to pay a living tax
29.	Only local authority that doesn't charge, tough times
30.	People who need this service are often the people who have nothing but state pension to live on so many would be unable to pay the proposed charge.
31.	In an ideal world I wouldn't want to see this. However we are living in very difficult times and the charges are not extreme so I would relucctantly agree. By the way, why is it more on the Mainland? This is not explained.

8. Service users to be charged a contribution towards service provision of community alarms. Proposed Charge of £4.25 per week mainland, £2.00 per week non-connected isles

32.	I agree that non-connected isles should pay less as they dont receive the same care and attention as those on the Mainland do
33.	No. This is taxing the ill and infirm. Through old-age or infirmity, many can not change their current situation. If they are on means tested benefits, then there is a risk of them not paying this charge and being at risk of falls and injury which will then cost more as they will require inpatient care and likely increased social care input thereafter.
34.	I agree with a charge but why less for the non-connected isles?
35.	I understand that this is the case in other local authorities
36.	I expect that this would only discourage the uptake of the service and so increase the risk to those who might require that provision . However, if the views of existing service-users overwhelmingly indicates otherwise, then a small charge might be acceptable.
37.	I would think this affects a lot of people who are already on or below the breadline.
38.	Not against this in principle but that seems a high weekly charge for mainland.
39.	Should be the same regardless of where you live
40.	I would suggest these mainland costs are too high. £2 and £1 would be better with an annual planned increase equal to inflation.
41.	Is this going from £0 to these suggestions or do they already pay something? It's not clear
42.	People should not be priced out of having a community alarm. An alarm can save money by bringing help promptly and thus preventing deterioration which might require hospitalisation.
43.	Already established on the rest of mainland UK
45.	With consideration to low income exemptions
46.	Any charge and the people who need these most will refuse or be unable to pay so will be at greater risk
49.	This should be means tested as £4.25 a week is a lot for pensioners and those on benefits. You need to also consider how the service will be provided in the future when householders won't have landlines but need access to the community care alarm service

9. Service users to be charged a contribution towards service provision of day centre attendance. (inclusive of lunch and transportation). Proposed Charge of £12.50 per day

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		54.24%	96
2	No		45.76%	81
			answered	177
			skipped	30

Comment: (53)

1,3,.	Means tested only.
2.	A charge may be appropriate for some, but imo £12.50 per day is too high.
4.	Maybe if means tested. These charges are affecting some of the more vulnerable so I don't know if it's fair?
5.	£12.50 is far too expensive. If you're not charging anything at the moment then better to charge a smaller amount (£5?) than to alienate users because they can't afford it. Day centre attendance may be the only time these people get out of their houses and see other people.
6.	Think folk may stop using the service
7.	This service cost, so some sort of money back should be considered. Most people who attend the day centre with have government funding to aid this.
8.	I think a charge is a good idea but the proposed amount seems high and might risk isolating some residents even more
9.	Not against charging full stop but £12.50 per day seems high. £7.50 might be better
10.	As above - on a needs assessed basis and free for some.
11.	Again, there is no information on what day care attendance involves or for whom, so it is not possible to answer this question.
12.	This will lead to an 'us and them' situation that only people with a decent pension will be able to access. Bearing mind that pensioners have already contributed throughout their working life and may only have a State Pension is completely unfair to expect them to pay again. This can be a lifeline for those who live alone.
13.	There again this is the only company that so many people get, charging for it would mean bot using it and many people feeling isolated
14.	Societal gain is worth more than the financial contribution such a charge would make.
15.	Agree a contribution (if client able to pay) bit think this amount is too high, maybe £10 would be more reasonable .
16.	I think this should be means tested so that those who are able to pay, do and those who maybe can't afford the full amount pay half or a reduced rate. if you charge too much, the ones that need it the most but can't afford to pay will be the folk missing out
17.	Great proposal attack the more vulnerable in the community! Our People yeah just a tick box for that warm cosy feeling the blinkers supply you until it affects you.
18.	Maybe should look at services users having to find there own way to centre then they would have more time there. And would cost less as would not have bus maintenance costs or driver costs



9. Service users to be charged a contribution towards service provision of day centre attendance. (inclusive of lunch and transportation). Proposed Charge of £12.50 per day

19. For same reasons as 8 above, if this is part of the service for care in the home let's make it work and see the savings on later care, which will be much more pensive in the long run.
20.	This again could be means tested but balanced against the scope of any reduction in use due to the introduction of a charging policy which would be counter productive. In addition, there is no measure for social inclusivity which will be one of the only stimulants available to some service users.
21.	It is a service
22.	But with a possibility of low incomes being given a reduction in price?
23.	This cost is prohibitive, this is a life line service
24.	Only if this is affordable by users
25.	Have to pay this for children, so why different ?
26.	Don't really have any insight into what this is so cannot comment.
27.	you already charge for folk in care and if this is the case, then more folk need to go into care, and so why charge folk for staying at home, when this is already saving the Council money...
28.	Again, you are targetting the vulnerable. I am appalled that you are even considering this as it will certainly mean people no longer attending.
29.	This is a valuable resource and a lifeline to many. Charging that much to attend will put a lot of people off using the service. This could lead to more health problems and strain on family and social services which will in turn lead to more money being spent on the person in the long run. Instead I think you should promote these vital services more and encourage more folk to use them.
30.	You charge folk who stay in care homes, so why not charge for the day centre attendance?
31.	Charge yes, but less than suggest - £5.00 per day?
32.	The proposed charge will be unaffordable for many of our less well-off service users but is often critical to their well-being. Possibly seek voluntary contributions instead. Means testing is too costly to administer.
32.	£12.50 feels like a high charge, especially as it hasn't been charged for so far - it's a big hike. Perhaps £5-£7 contribution might feel more achievable.
34.	A lower charge would be acceptable
35.	No, the people that attend are vulnerable already and probably a lot are on small pensions.
36.	Presume there might be some means-testing involved.
37.	Again fine in principle but charge seems high. That's over £60 a week, a lot of money for someone to find all of a sudden.
38.	Too expensive £10 would be more realistic
39.	Agree with charge but think there should be a cap For extra days... so for example £12.50 for one day but then free or lesser charge for second or third day
40.	It is wrong to charge the most vulnerable in society, for a service that is critical to there quality of life and give carers a break, putting greater pressure on carers is likely to end up having a greater long term cost to the council, as they may not be able to continue there caring responsibility if the person they care for has to reduce the use of this facility because of costs

9. Service users to be charged a contribution towards service provision of day centre attendance. (inclusive of lunch and transportation). Proposed Charge of £12.50 per day

41.	Again the proposed charge is much too high. If you consider this cost coupled with the one asked in the previous question I would suggest that the county will have a significant number of lonely old people sitting at home feeling very vulnerable.
42.	These must be the most needy so assessment is probaly required
43.	Only charge those who can afford it through some form of means test.
44.	Again, you imply it's going from £0 to £12.50. You need to explain what folk currently pay.
45.	However I feel the contribution rather large - if this is new charge Council should consider a lesser charge
46.	If people bring their own packed lunch and make their own way to the Day Centre, the charge should be reduced
47.	But not at £12.50/day - or it should be means tested.
48.	means tested
49.	With consideration for low income exemptions
50.	The amount is too much £ 5-6 is more acceptable
51.	£12.50 seems quite high, but it also needs to be worthwhile making the charge, as there are costs involved in administering and collecting all these charges.
52.	Again the clients situation may dictate thie ability to pay.
53.	Again this needs to be means tested for the same reasons as stated above

10. Consideration could be given to the charging of visiting school groups who are accommodated and fed whilst attending school events on the mainland. Proposed charge of £24.40 for overnight bed and breakfast, £31.75 for overnight and other meals

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		73.71% 129
2	No		26.29% 46
		answered	175
		skipped	32

Comment: (41)

1.	If clearly above their curriculum needs. Anything contributing to essential learning should not carry associated t and s costs
2.	Unsure
3.	I think as the council is the education authority it would be unfair to charge pupils from the isles for things the pupils on the mainland don't have to pay for. Doing something like you propose would surely fall foul of an islands impact assessment?
4.	Yes something should be charged, but again too expensive.



10. Consideration could be given to the charging of visiting school groups who are accommodated and fed whilst attending school events on the mainland. Proposed charge of £24.40 for overnight bed and breakfast, £31.75 for overnight and other meals

5.	Definitely
6.	This would be a yes only if the school events are also provided on the isles, and attendance at a mainland event is an option to attendance on home island. Where Orkney Mainland is only option for participation, hostel accommodation should be provided and / or consider restructuring provision to work in with ferry times. Also, if KGS started later on a Monday rather than finishing earlier on a Friday, then isles pupils could travel in Mon AM, meaning the hostel would not need to be open on a Sunday, or until after school on Monday, a tangible saving?
7.	I don't believe that there is enough staffing in place to allow space for these groups anyway.
8.	Children should be treated equally. Isles children should not be disadvantaged because they don't live in Kirkwall. If the education activity can only be provided at a Kirkwall school, the isles children should be funded to attend it.
9.	For families who can afford this. Need to consider how families on low income would manage. Otherwise has potential to increase attainment gap
10.	Don't understand -is this island groups visiting Orkney Mainland?
11.	Not qualified to comment.
12.	This service cost, so some sort of money back should be considered
13.	Absolutely - groups visiting other areas would have to pay accommodation costs.
14.	If the visiting school group is from within Orkney then I would be hesitant about charging, unless it can be certain that this would not reduce opportunities for children on the islands if for example the island school or individual pupils could not afford to go on visits. However if it is charging schools from outwith Orkney, then yes a charge would be reasonable.
15.	It already costs for them to get into town. This would have a negative impact on social life for kids not being able to take part in activities on the mainland.
16.	it is absolute nonsense to penalise children for living on an outer Isle and the likelihood is that children will not attend due to the financial pressure it would place on parents.
17.	Societal gain is worth more than the financial contribution such a charge would make.
18.	A reasonable suggestion but again I think the amount is too high. Parents with more than 1 child attending might find this prohibitive so some pupils may be excluded from attending and taking part.
19.	I'm not sure what is meant by visiting school groups? is this groups from the isles or those outwith Orkney? in which case the charging of isles schools would cause them to perhaps limit the amount of visits they can do plus it is not clear if the charges are per person ? would it not be more cost affective to rent out the halls of residence during the school holidays, for folk to stay, lots of universities do this, and there would be an endless supply of folk wanting accommodation in the holidays
20.	Too vague a question for a educated answer, which visiting groups? Ones from outside the county and if in term time where are the children who normally have to use it to go?
21.	But not that high and would need to be based on island communities supporting this ie through their own grant schemes for Community Councils and Trusts. Again ability to paty must be taken into account.
22.	By term time, I am assuming this is charging pupils in the outer isles for coming into Kirkwall/ Stromness to attend events. If this is the case then no, I am not in favour of this. I would have thought those travelling from south/ north of Orkney are charged and if not, should be.
23.	Absolutely, why isn't this already happening.
24.	But this rate is too high

10. Consideration could be given to the charging of visiting school groups who are accommodated and fed whilst attending school events on the mainland. Proposed charge of £24.40 for overnight bed and breakfast, £31.75 for overnight and other meals

25.	Again some exemptions if this is not affordable by the family
26.	Still very cheap and elsewhere in Scotland would have to pay
27.	Don't have knowledge on this but feel the charge being proposed seems quite excessive and would stop many school groups being able to use the service.
28.	This seems fair, it is a choice, not a need.
29.	This is equivalent to cutting of your nose to spite your face as this would probably end up coming out of our schools budgets.
30.	Do you mean Orkney school groups or groups from other council areas? Any charges for visiting groups from within Orkney should be at the same level as is charged for the longer term residents from the outer isles. Schools from outwith Orkney should be charged at a commercial rate.
31.	Not sure what is meant - does 'Mainland' refer to the Orkney mainland, with the charges applying to isles pupils during the school term? - In which case I'm not in favour of the charge. But, if the visiting groups originate from outwith Orkney, then Yes. (Although, how this can be offered during term time as the Halls will be fully occupied during term time, will they not - or is there an over-provision?)
32.	I think this should be means tested. In theory it is good but could be an issue for families who are struggling and it's not fair on the children if their parents cannot afford it and they can't go.
33.	But there is a need for proportional charges if the visit is educational and not just leisure
34.	Why should they not pay when staying in the hostel. They would have to pay to stay in other accommodation.
35.	Who would be expected to pay, individual families or the island school? You are not making it easy to understand what you are proposing.
36.	Difficult one ... perhaps charge, but not as much as stated above?
37.	But again as a new charge consider a slightly lower rate,
38.	But a lower charge
39.	means tested
40.	Or charge a small amount - say £5 pp p/n
41.	This will need to be set at a commercial level.

11. For those pupils / families who opt to reside in Papdale Halls of Residence outwith normal provision. Proposed charge of 5/7th of Child Benefit rate which is currently £24.00 for first child and £15.90 for each additional child per week.

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		86.44% 153
2	No		13.56% 24
		answered	177
		skipped	30



Comment: (27)

1.	This charge should not be increased, imo.
2.	this should be a minimum
3.	You are not paying for your children, food, hydro, washing when they are in halls
4.	very much so
5.	Charge linked to actual costs of provision rather than spurious connection to child benefit? Unless educational etc. reason for early transfer. So as per charges above.
6.	There is no need for children to be in the halls when there is an school on their island. Parents should be charged far more if they chose to use this service
7.	Not qualified to comment
8.	Yes if a child stays outwith provision, they should have to pay just like any other child paying to stay outwith their homes somewhere when they don't need to be.
9.	It's £100 a month in Derbyshire to send your kids to school on a bus
10.	This seems reasonable but as I don't have children it is not possible for me to fully understand the implications of this.
11.	Parents are not having to pay for food at home so should contribute to costs in the halls.
12.	Anything outside of the normal provision is a personal choice and should be self funded.
13.	Societal gain is worth more than the financial contribution such a charge would make.
14.	That payment is for all care of the child including clothing shame on you for even suggesting you take that much for a roof over their heads and food.
15.	Where provision of schooling is provided on island and a placing request is considered, unless clearly necessary for the needs of the young person, charges should be made as proposed.
16.	We should be in a position to accommodate all children from the outer isles to access education. By out with normal provision, does this mean outside of term time, where they cannot return home due to weather, to attend a special event or because of family circumstances or difficulties? How would this be paid and could the existing staff be able to deal with the additional demand?
17.	A charge for those who chose to put their children to Kirkwall Grammar School for S1-4 despite their isle having a Junior High that can accommodate their education for those years.
18.	Not sure
19.	Can't comment on this as don't know what normal provisions are.

11. For those pupils / families who opt to reside in Papdale Halls of Residence outwith normal provision. Proposed charge of 5/7th of Child Benefit rate which is currently £24.00 for first child and £15.90 for each additional child per week.

20.	they are kids coming in for education... why should they seek charges for an education
21.	I think this is fair given that it is a choice.
22.	Sorry, I don't understand! What is 'normal provision'? how is there an option?
23.	As above it should be means tested...
24.	I assume you mean they are staying out with school days?
25.	Again, perhaps a little lower might be advisable - say ¾
26.	I don't understand what this means
27.	Begs the question why the halls of residence are open to pupils out with Normal provision. Out with normal provision the Halls could be used for visiting sports teams at a charge or open to the public for overnight accommodation.

12. To introduce a charge for the signed certificate evidencing compliance with building standards legislation. Proposed charge of £75

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		73.08%	133
2	No		26.92%	49
			answered	182
			skipped	25



Comment: (33)

1.	Maybe, depending on the type of building or change is being proposed, ie how essential is it to the applicant or to the local community as a whole?
2.	Unsure
3.	I think charges like these would just be accepted
4.	I think other councils charge for this.
5.	Small charge, nobody would really notice.
6.	Definitely introduce a charge. There is a huge amount of work that goes into assessing building warrant applications that is not reflected in the current charging system.
7.	A charge is fine, but £75 is steep.
8.	The Planning Officer post is already funded by the council tax fund.
9.	Businesses should be contributing to the price involved in ensuring their operations meet statutory requirements.
10.	Definitely.

12. To introduce a charge for the signed certificate evidencing compliance with building standards legislation. Proposed charge of £75

11.	Is Building warrant not already paid for on application?
12.	If you can afford to build or develop properties, then paying for local governance is part of that process and needs to be factored in just as any other professional fees that are normally levied. The Council should never be in a position where these services are subsidised by the Council Tax payer.
13.	This is another area of the council that needs a severe shake up!
14.	In overall terms this is insignificant.
15.	I thought there was already a charge for this within the cost of applying for Planning Permission
16.	Large enough fees already for planning etc.
17.	This comment has been removed.
18.	The current process is tortuous enough as it is without being charged for it.
19.	The charges in this area are already too high. We have just built a house and have spent £10,000 on the "paperwork"
20.	Cost should be covered by extant BS fee structure.
21.	If you're charging £75 just for someone to sign a piece of paper, then that's a bit steep. What else do they get for their £75? If someone actually comes out to inspect, then that would help. Either that, or charge less than £75 for a certificate.
22.	Charge plenty already for a burdensome system.
23.	A graded scale would be fairer, so a lower charge for smaller things and a higher one for complete buildings etc.
24.	Again fine in principle, £75 seems a lot.
25.	But your planning officers must be instructed to be less aloof and more supportive to potential developers. Reference recent audit findings.
26.	Assuming you mean businesses? Not individuals?
27.	But consider lesser figure as starter
28.	The charge should be lower - perhaps £50.
29.	But at a lower rate (approx half the proposed rate)
30.	its expensive enough. what are you getting for £75
31.	Assuming that this is the completion certificate.
32.	Absolutely not. There is far too much red tape and built in frustration with building standards as it is.
33.	Hefty fees are already charged for building applications and warrants compliance certificates should be free.

13. To introduce a split fee approach to Exclusive Right of Burial (EroB) charges rather than the current flat rate of £763.00. Proposed rate for EROB at single depth cemeteries (based on 2023/24 fees): £550.00. Proposed rate for EROB at double depth cemeteries (based on 2023/24 fees): £810.00

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		68.16%
2	No		31.84%
		answered	179
		skipped	28




Comment: (24)

1.	Take it the additional would be for the first person only. If so, what is the charge for second as arguably should be less than single. Should the double be even higher cost and cover both, so no fee for second person?
2.	Probably -- personally unsure
3.	A split fee is a good idea, but too big a difference in the fee.
4.	makes sense
5.	Seems fair based on work load & slightly less at times for those in a difficult time (possibly). Overall cheaper for the person.
6.	Burials should be kept as low as possible for couples and individuals . You can be born on the NHS so why should a basic death be so dear in orkney when land is not in short supply. It is not like central London!!! Introduce a lower rate for Orkney natives (Birth registerd in Orkney) rather than single depth... and a rate of a £1000+ plus for incomers
7.	Another question without context that means it is not possible to answer. What is EroB? Who uses the service? What are the implications of charging? What do other authorities charge?
8.	No opinion
9.	I have no strong feelings either way on this, but it seems to me that administration costs could well outweigh any financial gain from varied charges.
10.	Funerals cost too much already.
11.	the cost of a funeral is already far too expensive due to the monopoly of 1 funeral director on the island, also more charges will possibly result in more funerals having to be processed through environmental health would then cause more of a drain on that services funding
12.	Not a recurring payment so can be planned for, or dealt with through hardship support.
13.	I think the burial charges are ridiculous.
14.	Seems fair
15.	Absolutely ridiculous charge for burial, outwith many older people being able to have loved ones buried. Putting extra strain on their already fragile emotions.
16.	I think this seems fair for the cemeteries looked after by the council. Those looked after by the community councils are not kept to the same standard, some of them are in a quite disgusting state with long grass, weeds and even dog mess. In some cases the grass is too long for older or disabled people to walk through. This is assuming they can even get in the gate which may be in very bad condition. Why not give some thought to taking this back in-house - economies of scale and ensuring the country cemeteries are in a decent and respectful condition in the same way the Kirkwall and Stromness ones are. It is a matter of respect.

13. To introduce a split fee approach to Exclusive Right of Burial (ERoB) charges rather than the current flat rate of £763.00. Proposed rate for ERoB at single depth cemeteries (based on 2023/24 fees): £550.00. Proposed rate for ERoB at double depth cemeteries (based on 2023/24 fees): £810.00

17.	There should be a charge for the plot whether it be single or double depth and a charge for each burial.
18.	No view.
19.	I would keep the fee for single depth plots at the same £763. But charge more for double depth plots.
20.	If people don't like it, folk should be cremated instead.
21.	I have no idea what this means
22.	The Council should consider installing a crematorium to provide choice and prevent the time consuming and expensive transportation of bodies to Inverness for disposal. Set crematorium charges competitively to encourage usage, offset the installation costs and deter the use of cemeteries for the disposal of bodies, which is wasteful of land.
23.	Not sure why this is more equitable/needed
24.	No comment. No doubt set at or going rate.

14. We are considering charging for the green dog waste bags. What would you prefer?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Stop providing dog waste bags at all as they can be purchased locally		34.22%	64
2	Provide them but charge for them		40.11%	75
3	Keep providing them and don't charge for them		25.67%	48
			answered	187
			skipped	20

Comment: (56)

1.	dog owners should pay for them
2.	Not against a charge, i would be happy to pay for green bags but many wont. I would be worried this may have a negative affect and dog owners stop picking up their dog mess.
3.	If you can afford to have a dog then you have to budget for all associated expenses. When I had my dog I bought bags and was happy to do so. At least this way OIC could make a small profit along the way. A charge for a dog licence would also raise a bit of money.
4.	If the bins go then people will just leave bagged waste on the ground
5.	I think this is a really valuable service and if the Council does not provide them (as they no longer have community safety wardens), it will lead to more dog fouling in Orkney.
6.	Dog ownership is a choice. However may need to consider fines for dog fowling
7.	Keep them free!!
8.	Higher fines for rules broken

14. We are considering charging for the green dog waste bags. What would you prefer?

9.	Can't be that expensive and a lack of supply will lead to even more shite caked on the pavements.
10.	Having a pet is a choice, if people want to have a pet then they should have to pay for bags to remove their pets waste. Additionally those who do not have pets should not be expected to subsidise waste bags for other peoples choice to have pets through the revenue generated via their ocuncil taxes.
11.	If you can afford a dog you pay for it. There should be more covert surveillance of fouling. If you put a law or fine in place to stop it make sure you enforce it otherwise people won't do it
12.	I would be tempted to say stop providing them particularly as they generate additional work and waste, but folk do seem to use them, so not providing them at all might discourage use leading to waste being left where deposited, creating pressure on other services to clean up the mess.
13.	Small amount ,not to put people off, but to cover costs, not to make a profit.
14.	Dog ownership is a choice and therefore the responsibility for cleaning up should lie with the owner. However it is helpful that dog waste bins and bags are available in some form. No one wants to see piles of dog faeces lying around.
15.	There's so many people who don't pick up after their dog ., for people on benefits it's a must, I do buy my own but spoke to so many dog owners who say they can't afford to buy them so free is such a help
16.	It is an individual's decision on whether or not to keep a dog, or any other pet. It is not a requirement for a local authority to provide support for such an individual decision. Instead any public resources presently used in supplying waste bags should be diverted into enforcement action against dog owners who do not clean up after their animals.
17.	A lot of folk don't clean up after their dog as it is so this would probably make it worse if you were to charge. Though I buy my own bags.
18.	The issues with this question is that the funding comes from the Environmental Health budget, which is already under funded, if the Environmental Health Dept stop providing the bags the dog fouling will increase, and will be more work for the EH department due to more complaints etc. If EH provide for the bags but don't charge then that is a big chunk of money that they are paying out, maybe this should be shared to waste services through COPLA The dog bags are given out to the vets, and police they could be asked to help with the costs, but I am not sure how this could be monitored and implemented
19.	Dog waste will become a problem if bins not provided with loss of amenity and greater cost required in clean up of public areas - nit necessarily and money saver
20.	Dog owners chose to have that pet so why including providing a bin should we subsidise them at all? Better fining of abusers of dog fouling should be looked at.
21.	If you are a dog owner your are quite willing to pay for bags
22.	As a dog owner I budget for this too. If you are a responsible dog owner then you'd budget for this before getting a dog. Also, I know of people using these bags for other uses.
23.	Never seen them offered especially in the isles
24.	Keep accessibility high but charge to cover costs, unfortunately emptying bins are the most expensive part, which is difficult to pass on to the users!
25.	Really need to know cost for this before can decide
26.	Are they often used from council? If so charge- it's part of cost of owning a dog. I pick up my cats movement from the litter tray and pay for those bags. You get them cheap in bulk.
27.	If you want the pavements kept clean I think free is best, although even then some still won't pick up after their dog



14. We are considering charging for the green dog waste bags. What would you prefer?

28.	As a dog owner I stopped using these several years ago and have bought my own. I suspect most dog owners would source their own or buy the council ones. Irresponsible owners will carry on regardless.
29.	We already have a dog poo problem around our area if you stop giving green bags this could get even worse.
30.	Encourage people to use them by prosecuting those that don't.
31.	They're not expensive, and we should encourage owners to collect their dogs waste.
32.	Either charge or get rid of... This is part of keeping a pet.
33.	Dog owners generally are responsible, but this service does need to continue
34.	I wasn't aware they were provided free. N.B. there are far too few bins to put them in on popular dog walking routes
35.	Owners responsibility for their pets so should pay the charges but if they are charged then how many will just not pick up the excrement.
36.	You provide dog waste bags? Didn't know that but what a ridiculous waste of money!
37.	unless you want more and more dog waste in the streets.... charge for this, because it will only cost the council more in clean ups. common sence prevails.
38.	If you change your current policy some people would use it as an excuse not to use them at all. {Now, if only we could teach them to use the appropriate bins instead of chucking them over the dykes into people's garden I'd willingly pay for that!}
39.	There is too much dog excrement not being picked up - if you remove the free bags then I would be concerned that the problem would be worsened.
40.	Any charge might however be justified if that resulted in greater provision and servicing of dog waste bins across the county.
41.	Definitely charge for them - I'm appalled that you don't already. Or just stop providing them - they are available in local shops and it's a waste of OIC resources to have to source, purchase, store and deliver them.
42.	This may cause some people to not pick up after their pets if there is a charge.
43.	The folk that leave their dog mess all over the pavements and verges are not the ones making use of the free provision anyway! I am a dog owner and I would like to be able to obtain bags via School Place or the Warehouse Buildings, but am content to pay a charge for them.
44.	If people choose to have a dog (luxury item) they should pay for their poop bags.
45.	Yes you should charge, but then monitor to see if compliance with the rules for disposing of dog waste reduces. Because if it does then that's a whole new problem to deal with.
46.	These bag costs should lie solely with the dog owner. Should also consider clamping down on dog owners who do not cleanup after their dog.
47.	Take a Much stronger line with pet licences at cost and to revoke them for social misbehaviour . Provide more and better waste facilities
48.	A typical example of the Council being involved where it doesn't need to be.

14. We are considering charging for the green dog waste bags. What would you prefer?

49.	Can't believe this would make much difference to the budget, but would make a big difference to the cleanliness of the environment and children's health
50.	If you charge for them based on average dog walkers will go back to using cheaper, less environmentally friendly options
51.	And fine more dog owners who don't use them
52.	people are greedy and if they have to pay, they may not use them. Its a small cost.
53.	Either A or B - think it is totally reasonable people are charged.
54.	I have never had a dog, so charges won't affect me. I hate seeing discarded used bags at beaches and in areas like Muddiesdale; these are worse than people not using bags at all. I don't know what the answer is unfortunately.
55.	Charging may be relative to dog owners financial situation..
56.	If you have a dog it's up to you to clean up after it at your own expense. I strongly object to my council tax being used to supply dog bags to those who choose to have a dog.

15. To allow organisations or members of the public to utilise the Council's secure degaussing system which ensures hard disk drives in old IT equipment can be deleted securely. Suggested charge of £40 per drive.

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		84.92%
2	No		15.08%
			answered
			179
			skipped
			28

Comment: (38)

1.	Or more.
2.	Agree in principle, but unsure about the amount
3.	not sure this is really a revenue raiser, but as they say "every little helps". As long as it does not introduce a risk to the council - eg someone buys this service, the degausser fails and they then try and claim from the council for data protection beach (eg a scam artist got hold of their data from a hard drive they had paid the council to clean) - if the insurance premium needs adjusting to cover this risk, is it worth introducing the service?
4.	Although I would not use this service, I believe others would.
5.	Nobody would use it as a screwdriver and a hammer do the job for nothing.
6.	My husband destroyed a dark disk with a hammer!
7.	Seems fair
8.	I can wipe a hard drive no bother myself with a neodymium magnet, hammer, software, screwdriver or fire and none of these cost £40. Most people have moved on to SSDs now anyway so this "service" is virtually pointless



15. To allow organisations or members of the public to utilise the Council's secure degaussing system which ensures hard disk drives in old IT equipment can be deleted securely. Suggested charge of £40 per drive.

9.	Sounds like a no-brainer in order to generate revenue, with that said in order to ensure hard disk drives are erased securely, people disposing of their drives have to be able to witness the erasure/destruction as you are putting your root of trust on to a third-party (the council and the persons doing the erasure).
10.	Great idea - would definitely use this.
11.	This is a useful service - but need to make sure it does not compete with local businesses, if there are any that offer the same service.
12.	It's a good idea but £20 per drive should be sufficient.
13.	This is an area that should be left to private enterprise.
14.	this may be useful for businesses but is not something I would use
15.	Not needed . just stick a pick tho the hard drive of smash it up with a hammer
16.	Unlikely to bring in much income but worth trying
17.	This is an insane thing to offer folk don't think to get a service like this done
18.	At least this should be seen as a commercial service.
19.	Concentrate on your own needs, if they have spare time get them helping in another dept
20.	These things need to be deleted and £40 charge might not be affordable to everyone
21.	Safety for people's privacy.
22.	Not sure what this means
23.	it is in the interest of Council IT Security and Data Protection to ensure all data is deleted securely. hence cyber security. - I am sure there is free utilities to wipe hard drives so why charge! ! If your IT were any good then they would also need to look into the RAM cache and what data resides on these, through to mobile phones, USB pen drives.... this should be part of Councils remit, and to not charge, when we already pay through our taxes.
24.	Agree on principle, but would this mean you taking on more staff to do it?
25.	A long as the charge covers the cost
26.	win, win.
27.	I have the IT facilities to do this already - but it's a good idea for folk who don't.
28.	Maybe 20 pounds per drive
29.	Great idea making use of existing equipment - believe businesses would really benefit from this.
30.	Good idea!
31.	Again charge seems high. I have no idea where you are getting these figures from; is there a calculation related to estimated uptake and based on council costs (power, space, staffing) to provide it? Or is it just a number plucked from the air that someone thinks is 'about right'?
32.	Did not even know the council undertook this
33.	Any service available commercially should not be provide by the Council.

15. To allow organisations or members of the public to utilise the Council's secure degaussing system which ensures hard disk drives in old IT equipment can be deleted securely. Suggested charge of £40 per drive.

34.	If the facilities and staff are already in place for this service, and there is no additional cost involved, then this seems like a good idea.
35.	Not a service I'd use often but charging makes sense
36.	As long as security is ensured.
37.	Agree in principle
38.	But do discount on two or more being done at the same time

16. For 2024/25 should Orkney Islands Council;

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Reduce the amount that is being withdrawn from these reserves now – meaning that there is less funding available and we have to significantly reduce services or projects.		30.95%	52
2	Use more of the reserves – this will mean that core services and projects are maintained - but there will be less earnings in future which could affect current service provision		69.05%	116
			answered	168
			skipped	39

Comment: (69)

1.	Reserve fund should fund long term benefit eg more house building or grants for business development. Not more for ongoing revenue costs. Seem to be seeing more non statutory jobs being created recently, which is a worry.
2.	Impossible to determine since any meaningful decision would depend on knowing what financial support OIC will receive or be able to claim in future years.
3.	Both choices are a sticking plaster response and are not dealing with the core reason. OIC needs to reduce unnecessary expenditure (investment OIC wind farms - not needed), be smarter at procurement and eliminate waste (become leaner at what it does).
4.	Use more if changes do not bring in the required amounts
5.	Time to spend some of the reserves for the benefit of the islanders. It is constantly complained about by James Stockan that Orkney doesn't receive a fair deal compared to the other island groups. Why would you keep giving money to a council that is sitting on millions refusing to spend it? The 'rainy day' that keeps getting spoken about is here - so use the money to help us!
6.	important to continue to do this in a managed and planned fashion and still on the basis that we are moving through unprecedented times - ie this should not be considered the normal approach to making council budgets work - but in the context of continued international pressures and also in the knowledge that council investments in wind farms etc should in time produce new income streams it seems reasonable to spend some of the oil reserve now in a time of need to ensure life in orkney remains better than other places.
7.	to use more of the reserves only helps in the short term

16. For 2024/25 should Orkney Islands Council;

8.	Not going ahead with the Deep Water Quay project would save an awful lot of money
9.	Reduce on general projects with the exception of ferry services.
10.	Reserves are for a rainy day and currently, according to Mr Sunak, it's raining ...
11.	Continue with similar
12.	Maintain what is being withdrawn, but heavily invest in future income sources.
13.	Start treating the "Renewables" companies and the scottish "government" like your predecessors treated Oxy and the UK government in the '70s and you would be able to keep the reserves topped up no bother.
14.	You should use more of the reserves to bring the wind-farm project online as fast as possible in order to generate more revenues refill the reserves and restore them to and maintain them at previous levels.
15.	This is the rainy day! We need to use the reserves. Key area - providing additional funds to support children in schools. This needs significant additional funding.
16.	Use reserves on a one off basis, for example, an annual 'bonus' paid to social care staff in order to make the profession more attractive to people considering a career in social care - this would save money since agency staff costs would be reduced...
17.	Another question without sufficient context. Without knowing how much the reserves are, how much they generate each year and how much is currently being taken out, it is difficult to answer. I think I would choose a third option however - keep the withdrawals at the same rate as just now.
18.	Use same amount- not increase or decrease amount of reserves used. It would have been helpful for a comments section. I will share mine here. I have noticed with several friends who are on benefits and who's children would be classed as in poverty, are actually not badly off at all. Their houses are warm and they have money to spend on taxis and soft play / meals out. They get money for electricity, clothes, bedding, holidays, Christmas and much more. I know of folk who get a decent wage, spend it on items of expensive clothing/ drink on pay day and then go to food bank and get their food, vouchers and electricity paid for. It squews the figures for folk who really do need help and are in poverty. I just don't believe the high figures about how many folk / children are living in poverty. It does make me think that the baseline for what people expect these days is set way to high. I just used to budget and live within my means and that often meant going without things I would have liked.
19.	The situation requires that all core services are maintained. Economic pressure will inhibit the ability of people to pay increased charges for services and the council tax and will definitely lead to a further increase in poverty levels within Orkney, putting even more pressure on benefit services in terms of funding.
20.	The fund is abused by the council for stupid projects, stop buying things and projects that are a waste of money, bring back the Christmas bonus for the disabled who really do struggle at this time of year
21.	To offer a simple use more or use less of the reserves choice is disingenuous. It depends entirely on which service is being discussed, and why it might be necessary to use reserves to support provision. If it is a statutory service, this should be fully funded by central government. If it's non-statutory, why is it being provided? If it's to gold-plate a statutory service why is such gold-plating considered to be necessary or desirable?
22.	Invest in accommodation which will earn ongoing income.
23.	Stop all services that are not well supported or charge more for them.

16. For 2024/25 should Orkney Islands Council;

24.	However, a balanced approach should be taken. For example, use reserves at or just below interest earned on reserves for the previous year. Consider council management restructure as it is too top heavy. I manager equals 3 class room assistants for example. Do you really need that many managers?
25.	Maintain as it is now, not more or less.
26.	Maybe the Council should have thought about funding when it was giving senior management and heads of service significant and frankly obscene pay rises
27.	Take a serious look at the island games spend this has all the makings of blank cheque territory
28.	Orkney can't afford hosting the Island Games in 2025, this is going to cost millions of pounds for a few locals. That's money wasted which could be used better used on our elderly population who struggle to feed and heat them selfs
29.	Surely there should just be a set % of the income that can be used annually, which is then used to budget with - no more, no less?
30.	Use more than in previous years due to predicted budget shortfall, but this must be addressed going forward worth less dependence on reserve use. Strong chance of change in national government means budget position may improve slightly in coming 5 years
31.	As there is no comments box for general suggestions I'll leave them here. The council should review the bloated management structure. There are considerable roles at 80-100k+ which can be seen in OIC online organisational chart. In addition, it's very well know in Orkney, the horrific rates that are paid to agency staff particularly in social work and care. Remote working and return to virtual meetings only for employees would also support downsizing of required space in council buildings. It worked effectively through covid-19 for several years. This saved space would reduce building running costs and CO2 emissions or alternatively spaces could become a new source of income as it could be leased to new business or existing businesses. Come into the 21st century as many businesses are embracing across Scotland.
32.	Use it up, these are the rainy days the Scottish Government will not allow the local authority to go bankrupt.
33.	Use more but wisely and not on white elephants!
34.	Should consider cutting personal in school place too many people that realy just cost too much
35.	Stop borrowing from other local authorities use the rainy day fund!
36.	This is the big quandary - my view is we must get a balance but I am convinced to spend more now will protect a generation who will be better placed to be strong members of the community in future, out projected income to reserves looks bright with new sources of income anticipated, investments will improve and the political climate will change with a better outlook for restored public services, so yes use some more now - so that the pain of cuts do not impact too severely on the future investment in our people! If you consider a child now, think carefully on how cuts can and will impact on their future prospects and in turn Orkney's.
37.	The increase to the Councils revenue budget two years ago accommodated an increase to its staffing profile to allow services to have the right levels of management in place. The funding provision for this was short term and I believe now requires to be funded from either the grant or ORF. The overall funding position is never going to get better and the Council must focus on reducing the funding to services, increasing revenue opportunities or using the ORF. The latter was in place to allow decommissioning for Flotta at that time estimated at £25m, however if this is a legislative requirement, the potential for part decommissioning is not that far away. It is time the Council put this Genie to bed, openly disclosed the arrangements and the question should be Is Orkney Islands Council being treated differently than its peers because of the ORF? The answer to that in my view is yes. The long term picture for public financing is bleak but issues such as stalling council tax increases is creating an issue for the future which compounds this further. The Council's housing stock is challenged, its ferry fleet is on its knees, its property maintenance budget is depleted and these issues alone would decimate that fund. Councillors, according to their pre election manifestos stand to make a difference and it is their opportunity to demonstrate this now.

16. For 2024/25 should Orkney Islands Council;

38.	Make sure it's going to the right projects and cut back
39.	You have over £320,000,000 ,its time you helped the people , it was supposed be used for a rainy day ! Well its pishing down now , the people are already struggling to pay Bill's, and all you want too do is change us more , it's time to give a little back , you waisted more last year than we needed
40.	Follow Shetland Islands Council It's the Orkneys money not the Councils ...
41.	As inflation and interest rates reduce there is an expectation that investments will rally over the next 1pm months so better to keep money invested.
42.	Investigate ways of increasing reserves by tourist tax or cruise tax??
43.	Maintain core services, but reduce services that are nit essential to minimise drawing from reserves
44.	OIC need to curtail excessive spending on projects which are not benefiting the Orcadian people.
45.	Top up reserves from tourist levy and similar initiatives
46.	Find efficiencies before you draw on more reserves
47.	question is weighted and cannot be answered properly. need more options - Do Nothing or reduce management - top heavy... stop the reports suggestiong Council reserves. stop departments top slicing budget.
48.	We must protect core services. While I appreciate the opportunity to respond to this questionnaire, I would like to comment that you agreed a restructure just over two years ago which brought in a raft of senior positions at an initial cost of over £1million. At the time the then Interim Chief Executive said, "There is no doubt that Phase 1 is a significant investment - just over a £1million - by the Council to address the capacity, workforce development, recruitment and retention issues that have been raised by staff, managers and the public over recent times. Together with Phase 2 which is in development, it will ensure that the Council can deliver its priorities and develop our leadership, culture and workforce – improving the way in which we provide services to the public and becoming an employer of choice again. "In serving our community, we now have a duty to ensure there is a recognisable and positive impact from these changes, that we advance our priorities and invest in Orkney's future." Perhaps this investment would have been better utilised at the other end of the pay scale. Speaking personally this survey doesn't convince me in any way that we are seeing the rosy future that was predicted when the decision was made.
49.	The reserves are substantial, if you were to just use the interest made each year the core fund would be maintained.
50.	Drawing down more is an unsustainable position and, in addition, would send entirely the wrong message to the SG. CoSLA must increase the pressure on the SG to provide adequate LA funding. Greater use of reserves would also weaken any case for increased budget allocation for 2024-25 and/or a fairer settlement in the future from the SG (eg parity with Western Isles and/or Shetland). The SRF was never intended to fund core services. The use of reserves to fund projects should only be considered following robust scrutiny of the cost and wider and lasting benefits.
51.	There is not enough information provided to answer this question. It's called a 'Strategic' reserve fund, so surely the funds should be used 'strategically' eg. as investment to enable something to happen, rather than just to pay for day to day running costs of the islands. 'Strategic' investment could be building infrastructure to enable improvements to services eg. why not take control and build a visitor centre in Stenness for the Stones of Stenness/Ring of Brodgar rather than just wait for someone else to install a toilet ... a visitor centre would bring more revenue/investment/commercial activity/jobs and provide a hub for education, as well as being a mechanism for improving/maintaining roads and transport in the area.
52.	This is a poorly worded question.

16. For 2024/25 should Orkney Islands Council;

53.	Why not keep at present level?
54.	Review senior posts in OIC & pay scales accordingly, surely downsizing would save money?
55.	Stay as it is.
56.	Can it be kept at a similar level or very slightly increased?
57.	The large wind turbines projects should be shelved as costs excessive and very long time to recoup costs, no money from reserve fund should be taken for this type of project.
58.	I think the answer should be somewhere in between these two answers depending on what is decided re the other matters addressed in this questionnaire.
59.	Thats too tough for me.. The Council should be generating income with environmental taxes. Fines and levies for land and air and sea use. Even farmers could contribute. Fish farms, leisure boat owners and the like. Fines for derelict vehicles that are tainting the environment including those on private land. Small levies on wind generators. Refuse and waste disposal for tourists fee (otherwise paid for by residents)- radical eh
60.	Change the system so that income from harbours operations feeds into the general coffers and can be used for the good of all.
61.	Not sure how less earnings (sic) in future can affect the present? Do you mean future provision?
62.	Because we have always been told these reserves were for the hard times.
63.	It is unsustainable to draw on the reserves to support services that the Council has to provide. It would be better to use the reserves on a major project that would benefit Orkney: a subsea tunnel from South Ronaldsay to John O'Groats to increase visitors to Orkney, reduce costs of transportation of goods, reduce costs of locums and agency staff and ensure that sailings are not continuously disrupted, as they are now.
64.	Who knows what the future government spending rounds for these services will be beyond the next 2-3 yrs; they may actually rise
65.	they are supposed to be for a rainy day. In case folk have not noticed, its raining heavy now. Invest for the future. Housing, transport, tourism will generate income for years to come.
66.	Could similar levels of reserves be used as in prior years, rather than more or less?
67.	Prudent use of the reserves is essential to ensure we retain an income adequate to meet future requirements or some unexpected expenditure not budgeted for.
68.	Undecided
69.	No strong opinion either way.