



BRIEFING PAPER

Number 7788, 8 January 2018

Local replacements for the Independent Living Fund (ILF)

By Tim Jarrett

Summary

This House of Commons Library briefing paper sets out how, following the closure of the Independent Living Fund (ILF), funding has been devolved for former recipients, and also research into the impact of its closure.

The ILF was administered by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) and was closed on 30 June 2015; in England, responsibility was devolved to local authorities, along with funding (although this was not ring-fenced). The Government committed to providing funding to local authorities until 2019-20.

This note provides information about the calculation of the funding pot, and how local authority allocations are determined, as well as the absence of ring-fencing and the fact that local authorities now determine eligibility criteria at the local level (rather than criteria set at the national level by DWP).

In January 2017, the Government published a review of the ILF's closure, and there have been surveys conducted by charities into the effect of the closure of the ILF and transfer of funding to local authorities, some of which are considered in the paper.

Further information about the former ILF and its closure can be found in the Library briefing paper [The closure of the Independent Living Fund \(ILF\)](#) (CBP 7787).

1. Transfer of the ILF to local authorities

In England, funding for the ILF, which was previously administered by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), was devolved to local authorities from 1 July 2015.

The October 2014 edition of the Department of Health's *Care and Support Statutory Guidance* (which has since been superseded) included a section on the closure of the ILF, which stated that:

Local authorities will have to meet all former ILF users' eligible needs from 1 July 2015. Funding in respect of former ILF users will be distributed to local authorities on the basis of local patterns of expenditure following transfer, to allow them to meet users' care and support needs.

2. Funding to local authorities until 2020

2.1 Method of calculating the overall pot

As noted above, the transfer of the ILF funding to local authorities occurred on 1 July 2015; therefore, for the first financial year that local authorities assumed responsibility for the funding, the Government provided nine months of funding (i.e. from July 2015 to April 2016).

In a written parliamentary answer given in February 2016, the then Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, Justin Tomlinson, said:

The Government has fully-funded local authorities to meet their additional obligations to service users previously in receipt of the Independent Living Fund for the remainder of the 2015/16 financial year and there will continue to be a separate grant to support them for 2016-17. Under proposals currently being consulted on, the Government will also enable local authorities to continue to fully fund the care packages of former Independent Living Fund users for the remainder of the parliament.¹

The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) document, [Funding Local Authorities to support former Independent Living Fund recipients: The Former ILF Recipient Grant – Technical Consultation](#) (February 2016), set out the proposed approach and in the subsequent [Government response](#) (May 2016) to the consultation, the Government confirmed it would adopt the proposed approach set out in the consultation.²

In terms of the funding “pot” available to the ILF, the Government noted that:

At the time of the ILF’s closure there were agreed support packages for English ILF users amounted to £186.2 million for 2015/16. The ILF Trust deducted 25 per cent of this total to cover payments during the first quarter of 2015-16. The remaining 75 per cent, £139.7 million, represented the maximum amount that local authorities would need to allow them to fully fund the remaining commitments to former ILF users for the remainder of the financial year. The Government therefore issued a grant worth £139.7 million to local authorities in England, covering the remaining 9 months of 2015-16.³

In terms of funding for the remainder of the Parliament, i.e. up to and including the 2019-20 financial year,⁴ the Government announced that:

To calculate the on-going funding required until the end of the parliament, the option proposed is to use the now-closed ILF Trust’s financial model. The model makes use of expenditure trends over several years to estimate the funding that would be required to enable Local Authorities to continue to fully fund the care packages of former ILF users, in each year of the parliament. The model predicts that commitments will decline year on year, as former users no longer need access to funding.

[...]

The assumptions in the model are as below;

¹ [PQ 28404 29 February 2016](#)

² Department for Communities and Local Government, [Funding Local Authorities to support former Independent Living Fund \(ILF\) recipients: The Former ILF Recipient Grant – Technical Consultation: Government Response](#), May 2016, para 2.15

³ Department for Communities and Local Government, [Funding Local Authorities to support former Independent Living Fund recipients: The Former ILF Recipient Grant – Technical Consultation](#), February 2016, p5, paras 1.5-1.6

⁴ At that point in time, the expectation had been that the 2015 Parliament would run until 2020 with regard to the *Fixed-term Parliaments Act 2011*.

- Attrition, where former users no longer need to access ILF funding, will be at 5.0 per cent, per annum – slightly lower than the 2014-15 year which ran at 5.2 per cent, and;
- average suspense numbers remain constant at the transfer level i.e. 67 users per month with a value of £1.13 million per year

where “suspense is defined as where funding to an individual is temporarily stopped during a period where the recipient does not require a care package – e.g. periods of stay in hospital”.⁵

The figures are then adjusted (or “protected”) for forecast inflation, as the table from page 10 of the DCLG consultation document shows:

Former ILF Recipient Grant	2015-2016 (£m) ²	2016-2017 (£m)	2017-2018 (£m)	2018-2019 (£m)	2019-2020 (£m)
Maximum Expenditure	188 ³	184.4	175.1	166.4	158.1
Expenditure after attrition	184.4	175.1	166.4	158.1	150.3
Expenditure after attrition and suspense	183.6	173.9	165.2	157.0	149.1
Protected for inflation	N/A	176.9	171	165.6	160.6

However, the Association of Directors of Adult Social Services (ADASS) and the Local Government Association (LGA) noted in their response to the consultation that there were a number of “cost pressures”, including the introduction of the National Living Wage for example. The submission noted that:

The funding in scope is solely for existing former ILF clients, and with attrition and suspense this understandably decreases over the four year period. The funding therefore takes no account of new demand – ie people who would have previously qualified for ILF funding. Under the terms of the transfer councils will simply be expected to absorb this additional pressure from existing budgets ... We accept that funding commitments for former ILF clients will decline year on year due to attrition and/or suspense. However, there is nothing in the model (as it is presented in this consultation) that suggests that the costs of increasing needs and/or worsening conditions is factored into the calculations. It would be helpful to receive clarification on this point.⁶

As noted above, the ILF Trust’s financial model did not appear to take account of these matters, and the Government response to the consultation did not specifically address the issues raised by the ADASS and LGA.

2.2 Distribution to local authorities

In terms of how the pot would be distributed between local authorities, the DCLG explained that “due to the significant geographical variation in take up of ILF funding

⁵ As above, p6, para 2.2 and Annex A

⁶ Association of Directors of Adult Social Services and the Local Government Association, [Funding local authorities to support former Independent Living Fund recipients: the former ILF Recipient Grant – Technical consultation response: LGA and ADASS](#), February 2016, paras 16 and 20

4 Local replacements for the Independent Living Fund (ILF)

across England, the Government believes that distribution of any future funding to local authorities should remain in line with expenditure patterns at the time of the ILF's closure. This approach is, the Government believes, the most accurate way of providing funding to local authorities that reflects former ILF client numbers in individual authorities".⁷

Information on the allocations for each local authority in 2015-16 (covering only nine months of the financial year, i.e. the period after 30 June 2015 when the ILF was closed) can be found in the DCLG publication [Independent Living Fund Grant Determination 2015/16](#).⁸

For 2016-17, the DCLG published [Independent Living Fund Grant Determination 2016-17 – Payments to local authorities](#), although the funding amounts for local authorities for each year up to and including 2019-20 can be found in Annex B of the DCLG's February 2016 [technical consultation document](#), and are reproduced in the Annex to this briefing paper.

2.3 Absence of ring-fencing

Local authorities receive non-ring-fenced ILF grant funding from the DCLG.

In reply to the question, "why they [the Government] do not intend to ring-fence monies identified by the Independent Living Fund as needed to meet the critical and substantial needs of recipients", the then Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State at the Department for Work and Pensions, Lord Freud, told the House of Lords in June 2014:

The Government's position on how local authorities manage their finances is clear; local authorities need to be allowed to meet their statutory responsibilities in a flexible and responsive way and the ring-fencing of funding prevents this. Allowing local authorities the flexibility to manage their budgets locally means they can respond to local needs and priorities to deliver more efficient services and better outcomes.⁹

During the process of closing the ILF, the then Coalition Government held a consultation. In its response to the consultation published in December 2012, the Government stated that:

Many users asked that, if funding is devolved to local government, it was ring-fenced to meet the needs of current ILF users. The government's position on how local authorities manage their finances is clear. The ring-fencing of funding prevents local authorities from meeting local needs in a flexible and responsive way. The needs of ILF users may change over time and local authorities are required to meet the care needs of all disabled people in a consistent way. We understand that when assessed ILF users may have current care packages reduced. Local authorities may choose to manage any changes to care packages in different ways, providing some transitional protection where required, but this needs to be considered on a case by case basis after a detailed assessment of user needs.¹⁰

2.4 Locally-determined eligibility criteria

Whereas previously the DWP determined eligibility criteria which applied across the country, now each English local authority determines its own criteria. As the charity Disability Rights UK noted prior to the transfer:

From 1 July 2015, your local authority is responsible for your care provision rather than the ILF. Each authority has received a monetary transfer of the Independent

⁷ As above, p7, para 2.4

⁸ Taken from Thurrock Council's website.

⁹ [HL Deb 23 June 2014 cWA127](#)

¹⁰ Department for Work and Pensions, [Government response: Consultation on the Future of the Independent Living Fund](#), Cm 8240, December 2012, p10, para 11

Living Funds. The amount of support you will receive will vary from authority to authority. Some local authorities may ring fence the transfer of the Independent Living Funds so the level of your support is unchanged. Others may not.¹¹

Because local authorities determine their own local eligibility criteria, they may not provide the same level of funding as the ILF used to. For example, as Bristol City Council noted:

The ILF had a different eligibility criterion than the one that Local Authorities were required to assess to. They were also able to fund for different reasons i.e. social activities. Bristol City Council ILF recipients will be individually assessed. The level of funding that a person will receive will be based on their level of need and their meeting the new Care Act eligibility criteria.¹²

3. Reports on the early findings of the transfer

3.1 The DWP's post-closure review

In January 2017, the DWP published *Independent Living Fund: post-closure review*, based on interviews with 50 former recipients of the ILF or their unpaid family carers, and staff from ten local authorities.¹³

The review found that users experiences of the closure of the ILF “ultimately hinged” on their new package of support from the local authority:

Those that were awarded improved, matched, or a small reduction in their care and support package had maintained the level of support and care they received prior to the closure, as well as a similar level of choice and control over their care. They also reported limited or no changes to their independence.

Those with a heavily reduced award experienced multiple changes as a result. They argued that reductions in care were unfair and denied them opportunities to participate fully in society. They encountered changes and restrictions to daily activities, including less support for engaging in leisure activities, work and volunteering. LAs [local authorities] found that face-to-face meetings with former recipients and their next of kin to sensitively discuss alternative provisions, changes and reductions to care, helped to mediate these difficult decisions.¹⁴

For those former ILF recipients who experienced a “heavily reduced package”, they were reported to have “a range of health implications including loneliness, particularly for those living alone; weight loss; and frailty due to worry, or due to the physical demands of having to perform everyday activities without the support of a carer. This was reported to be detrimental to their mental health and wellbeing”. In addition, they suffered a loss of confidence in the social care system, although these views were also shared by people whose care package had not substantially changed or had improved.¹⁵

The report also noted that ILF users had experienced “fear and anxiety” in the period before they were informed what level of support they would receive from their local authority. The review found that “former recipients felt vulnerable to future reductions to funded care and support”. The review also noted that poor experiences of the transition could have “potentially been improved by better communications with former recipients

¹¹ Disability Rights UK, [Independent Living Fund replacement schemes](#), factsheet F69, 8 February 2016

¹² Bristol City Council, [Independent Living Fund \(ILF\) Transfer – Frequently Asked Questions](#), undated, p1

¹³ Department for Work and Pensions, [Independent Living Fund: post-closure review](#), January 2017, p13

¹⁴ As above, p54 and p3

¹⁵ As above, pp51, 52 and 54

about how and when the arrangements would be decided” and that “future anxiety related to annual reassessments might likewise be mitigated by similar improvements”.¹⁶

3.2 Surveys conducted by the third sector

A survey was conducted the Greater Manchester Coalition of Disabled People of the ten local authorities in the area, using Freedom of Information (FoI) requests that were submitted in March 2016. The local authorities were asked, firstly, if they currently ring-fenced the ILF funding they received, and, secondly, if they would continue to do so to 2020. The Coalition reported that:

Q1: Of the 9 authorities who responded 7 authorities (Manchester, Salford, Bolton, Tameside, Stockport, Trafford and Bury) confirmed that for 2015/16 ILF transition funding had been ring fenced to maintain the support of former ILF recipients. 1 authority (Oldham) said that the 2015/16 ILF transition funding had not been ring fenced to maintain the support of former ILF recipients and 1 local authority (Rochdale), failed to directly answer the question, although we suspect the answer is ‘no’.

Q2: In response to the second question, of the 9 authorities that did respond, 2 authorities (Bolton and Tameside) gave an unequivocal ‘yes’ to continue ring-fencing the ILF transition funding to support former ILF recipients through until 2020 and 3 authorities (Stockport, Oldham and Trafford) gave an unequivocal ‘no’. The remaining authorities did not directly answer the question, with 2 authorities (Manchester and Salford) saying they were awaiting further clarification from central government before making a decision, 1 authority (Bury) suggested that former ILF recipients funding is currently ring fenced but this would be reviewed on an annual basis, and 1 authority (Rochdale) suggesting that money would not be ring-fenced.

This led the Greater Manchester Coalition to conclude that “it is clear from the responses received that independent living for former ILF recipients is a postcode lottery in Greater Manchester and that most of our local councils are refusing to use the government funding to support former ILF recipients”.¹⁷

A report was published in September 2016 entitled *One year on: Evaluating the impact of the closure of the Independent Living Fund*, by the charity Inclusion London, which explained that the report “seeks to evidence the impact of the closure with a focus on the situation in London. It brings together statistical analysis from Freedom Of Information (FOI) requests sent to all 33 London boroughs with findings from a survey sent out to London Deaf and Disabled People’s Organisations (DDPOs) as well as qualitative evidence provided by former ILF recipients concerning their experiences of transfer to Local Authority (LA) support”.

Inclusion London said that it had found a number of emerging themes:

- Post-code lottery for former ILF recipients across Local Authorities.
- The detrimental impacts of the ILF closure on former ILF recipients, ranging from distress and anxiety to removal of essential daily support.
- The lack of consistent practice across different Local Authorities regarding referrals for CHC funding.
- Limitations of the mainstream care and support system and failings in the implementation of the Care Act.

¹⁶ As above, pp3 and 55

¹⁷ Greater Manchester Coalition of Disabled People, *ILF – Postcode Lottery?*, undated; see also [“Government’s failure to ring-fence ILF funding ‘is leading to postcode lottery’”](#), *Disability News Service*, 5 May 2016

- The value of the model of support provided by the Independent Living Fund.
- The importance of Deaf and Disabled People's Organisations for making Deaf and Disabled people aware of and supported to exercise their rights.¹⁸

The report argued that there was an "urgent need for a radical rethink of how Disabled people are supported to live independently", and its conclusions included the following:

Despite assurances to the contrary in the run up to June 2015, the closure of the ILF has directly resulted in the removal of support from Disabled people with high support needs ... The postcode lottery of support provision this research reveals is simply not acceptable. Disabled people's independence, choice and control should not be dependent on the choices, compromises and dealings of local politicians. Disabled people need a national independent living support service that ensures consistent nationally applied levels of support ... [T]he ability and competence of local authorities to implement the Care Act 2014 is highly questionable.¹⁹

In response to the survey, it was reported by *Community Care* that:

Ray Puddifoot, London councils' executive member for adult social care, said: "Local government in London is facing a funding gap in adult social care of between £630 million to £817 million by 2020. Despite this, local authorities recognise the importance of continuing to support service users – including previous recipients of the ILF – to live independently.

"Councils are already experienced at working with service users and are doing their best to drive forwards the personalisation agenda; supporting and giving people more choice and control of the care they need and in the provision of services that will help to keep service users living independent lives for as long as possible."²⁰

¹⁸ Inclusion London, [One year on: Evaluating the impact of the closure of the Independent Living Fund](#), News story, 5 September 2016

¹⁹ Inclusion London, [One Year On: evaluating the impact of the closure of the Independent Living Fund](#), September 2016, pp46–47, paras 9.3–9.5 and 9.11

²⁰ ["Councils 'levelling down' care packages after ILF closure"](#), *Community Care*, 7 September 2016

Annex

Local authority funding allocations 2016–17 to 2019–20 – taken from the Department for Communities and Local Government's [Funding Local Authorities to support former Independent Living Fund recipients: The Former ILF Recipient Grant – Technical Consultation](#) (February 2016)

Authority	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Barking	£488,107	£472,034	£457,128	£443,242
Barnet	£1,476,044	£1,427,439	£1,382,360	£1,340,371
Barnsley	£1,830,619	£1,770,338	£1,714,431	£1,662,355
Bath	£468,244	£452,825	£438,525	£425,205
Bedford	£370,916	£358,702	£347,374	£336,823
Bexley	£684,392	£661,856	£640,954	£621,485
Birmingham	£4,497,367	£4,349,272	£4,211,923	£4,083,985
Blackburn	£424,968	£410,974	£397,996	£385,906
Blackpool	£185,564	£179,453	£173,786	£168,507
Bolton	£945,894	£914,747	£885,859	£858,951
Bournemouth	£275,103	£266,044	£257,642	£249,816
Bracknell	£272,943	£263,956	£255,620	£247,855
Bradford	£2,067,201	£1,999,130	£1,935,997	£1,877,191
Brent	£961,363	£929,706	£900,346	£872,997
Brighton & Hove	£621,780	£601,305	£582,316	£564,628
Bristol	£1,781,970	£1,723,291	£1,668,870	£1,618,178
Bromley	£666,054	£644,121	£623,780	£604,832
Buckinghamshire	£1,128,144	£1,090,995	£1,056,542	£1,024,449
Bury	£317,296	£306,847	£297,157	£288,131
Calderdale	£875,160	£846,341	£819,614	£794,718
Cambridgeshire	£1,313,546	£1,270,292	£1,230,176	£1,192,809
Camden	£865,327	£836,833	£810,406	£785,790
Central Bedfordshire	£458,090	£443,006	£429,016	£415,984
Cheshire East	£947,904	£916,690	£887,741	£860,776
Cheshire West	£1,650,693	£1,596,337	£1,545,925	£1,498,967
City of London	£7,948	£7,686	£7,443	£7,217
City of York	£366,946	£354,863	£343,656	£333,217
Cornwall	£2,854,519	£2,760,522	£2,673,345	£2,592,142
Coventry	£2,558,418	£2,474,171	£2,396,037	£2,323,257
Croydon	£1,057,560	£1,022,736	£990,438	£960,353
Cumbria	£3,569,217	£3,451,685	£3,342,681	£3,241,146
Darlington	£824,465	£797,316	£772,137	£748,683
Derby	£1,174,904	£1,136,215	£1,100,334	£1,066,911
Derbyshire	£2,790,815	£2,698,916	£2,613,684	£2,534,293
Devon	£2,887,837	£2,792,743	£2,704,548	£2,622,397
Doncaster	£751,065	£726,333	£703,395	£682,030
Dorset	£765,103	£739,908	£716,542	£694,777
Dudley	£1,114,278	£1,077,586	£1,043,556	£1,011,858
Durham	£1,699,391	£1,643,431	£1,591,532	£1,543,189

Ealing	£595,497	£575,887	£557,701	£540,761
East Riding	£971,832	£939,830	£910,151	£882,505
East Sussex	£1,052,855	£1,018,185	£986,031	£956,080
Enfield	£799,117	£772,802	£748,397	£725,664
Essex	£5,604,533	£5,419,980	£5,248,817	£5,089,384
Gateshead	£427,121	£413,056	£400,012	£387,862
Gloucestershire	£977,027	£944,855	£915,016	£887,222
Greenwich	£1,191,830	£1,152,584	£1,116,185	£1,082,281
Hackney	£780,854	£755,141	£731,294	£709,081
Halton	£722,640	£698,844	£676,774	£656,217
Hammersmith	£849,952	£821,964	£796,006	£771,827
Hampshire	£4,494,996	£4,346,979	£4,209,702	£4,081,832
Haringey	£749,468	£724,788	£701,899	£680,579
Harrow	£325,087	£314,382	£304,454	£295,206
Hartlepool	£641,457	£620,335	£600,744	£582,497
Havering	£644,777	£623,545	£603,853	£585,511
Herefordshire	£1,296,818	£1,254,115	£1,214,510	£1,177,619
Hertfordshire	£2,140,629	£2,070,140	£2,004,765	£1,943,870
Hillingdon	£542,807	£524,933	£508,355	£492,914
Hounslow	£541,324	£523,498	£506,966	£491,567
Isle of Wight	£164,081	£158,678	£153,667	£148,999
Islington	£1,301,804	£1,258,936	£1,219,179	£1,182,146
Kensington	£504,235	£487,631	£472,232	£457,888
Kent	£2,114,113	£2,044,497	£1,979,932	£1,919,791
Kingston upon Hull	£307,845	£297,708	£288,307	£279,549
Kingston upon Thames	£177,777	£171,923	£166,494	£161,436
Kirklees	£890,948	£861,609	£834,400	£809,055
Knowsley	£1,040,646	£1,006,378	£974,597	£944,994
Lambeth	£679,824	£657,437	£636,676	£617,337
Lancashire	£6,074,689	£5,874,654	£5,689,133	£5,516,325
Leeds	£655,753	£634,159	£614,133	£595,478
Leicester City	£921,187	£890,853	£862,720	£836,515
Leicestershire	£1,279,615	£1,237,479	£1,198,399	£1,161,998
Lewisham	£635,813	£614,876	£595,458	£577,371
Lincolnshire	£1,755,413	£1,697,609	£1,643,998	£1,594,061
Liverpool	£4,748,077	£4,591,726	£4,446,720	£4,311,650
Luton	£452,184	£437,294	£423,484	£410,621
Manchester	£2,184,599	£2,112,662	£2,045,944	£1,983,798
Medway Towns	£793,412	£767,286	£743,055	£720,484
Merton	£331,038	£320,137	£310,027	£300,610
Middlesbrough	£2,012,543	£1,946,272	£1,884,809	£1,827,557
Milton Keynes	£728,691	£704,695	£682,441	£661,712

10 Local replacements for the Independent Living Fund (ILF)

Newcastle upon Tyne	£1,233,153	£1,192,546	£1,154,885	£1,119,806
Newham	£644,369	£623,150	£603,471	£585,141
Norfolk	£1,518,286	£1,468,290	£1,421,921	£1,378,730
North East Lincolnshire	£189,352	£183,117	£177,334	£171,948
North Lincoln	£598,533	£578,823	£560,544	£543,518
North Somerset	£379,161	£366,676	£355,096	£344,310
North Tyneside	£673,993	£651,799	£631,216	£612,042
North Yorkshire	£1,505,686	£1,456,105	£1,410,121	£1,367,289
Northamptonshire	£857,201	£828,974	£802,795	£778,410
Northumberland	£925,688	£895,206	£866,936	£840,602
Nottingham City	£773,177	£747,717	£724,104	£702,109
Nottinghamshire	£2,918,203	£2,822,109	£2,732,987	£2,649,972
Oldham	£2,841,343	£2,747,779	£2,661,005	£2,580,176
Oxfordshire	£3,803,136	£3,677,901	£3,561,754	£3,453,565
Peterborough	£128,716	£124,478	£120,547	£116,885
Plymouth	£641,067	£619,957	£600,379	£582,142
Poole	£587,403	£568,060	£550,121	£533,411
Portsmouth	£491,763	£475,569	£460,551	£446,562
Reading	£258,732	£250,212	£242,311	£234,950
Redbridge	£816,883	£789,984	£765,036	£741,798
Redcar and Cleveland	£374,697	£362,358	£350,915	£340,256
Richmond upon Thames	£423,023	£409,093	£396,174	£384,140
Rochdale	£543,979	£526,066	£509,453	£493,978
Rotherham	£1,587,564	£1,535,287	£1,486,802	£1,441,640
Rutland	£67,888	£65,653	£63,580	£61,648
Salford	£865,145	£836,656	£810,235	£785,624
Sandwell	£1,129,191	£1,092,007	£1,057,522	£1,025,399
Sefton	£2,319,808	£2,243,419	£2,172,572	£2,106,579
Sheffield	£2,779,575	£2,688,046	£2,603,157	£2,524,086
Shropshire	£1,664,983	£1,610,156	£1,559,307	£1,511,943
Slough	£343,382	£332,075	£321,588	£311,820
Solihull	£846,645	£818,766	£792,909	£768,824
Somerset	£1,313,553	£1,270,299	£1,230,183	£1,192,816
South Gloucestershire	£914,599	£884,482	£856,550	£830,532
South Tyneside	£306,215	£296,132	£286,780	£278,069
Southampton	£441,989	£427,434	£413,936	£401,363
Southend-on-Sea	£418,867	£405,074	£392,281	£380,366
Southwark	£197,361	£190,862	£184,835	£179,220
St Helens	£1,191,321	£1,152,092	£1,115,709	£1,081,819
Staffordshire	£2,557,129	£2,472,925	£2,394,830	£2,322,087

Stockport	£1,015,373	£981,938	£950,928	£922,044
Stockton	£551,965	£533,789	£516,932	£501,230
Stoke-on-Trent	£657,547	£635,895	£615,813	£597,108
Suffolk CC	£2,558,986	£2,474,720	£2,396,569	£2,323,773
Sunderland	£896,972	£867,435	£840,041	£814,525
Surrey	£1,738,108	£1,680,873	£1,627,792	£1,578,347
Sutton	£123,742	£119,668	£115,889	£112,368
Swindon	£421,273	£407,401	£394,535	£382,551
Tameside	£799,561	£773,232	£748,814	£726,068
Telford	£924,509	£894,065	£865,831	£839,531
Thurrock	£320,565	£310,009	£300,219	£291,100
Torbay	£472,331	£456,778	£442,353	£428,916
Tower Hamlets	£422,800	£408,878	£395,965	£383,938
Trafford	£397,900	£384,798	£372,646	£361,327
Wakefield	£926,900	£896,378	£868,070	£841,703
Walsall	£890,225	£860,911	£833,723	£808,399
Waltham Forest	£1,210,036	£1,170,191	£1,133,236	£1,098,814
Wandsworth	£279,651	£270,442	£261,902	£253,947
Warrington	£580,291	£561,183	£543,461	£526,953
Warwickshire	£1,929,059	£1,865,536	£1,806,623	£1,751,747
West Berkshire	£444,463	£429,827	£416,253	£403,609
West Sussex	£4,745,060	£4,588,809	£4,443,895	£4,308,911
Westminster	£326,752	£315,993	£306,014	£296,718
Wigan	£1,603,583	£1,550,778	£1,501,805	£1,456,187
Wiltshire	£1,190,530	£1,151,327	£1,114,968	£1,081,101
Windsor	£124,076	£119,990	£116,201	£112,671
Wirral	£1,677,574	£1,622,333	£1,571,100	£1,523,377
Wokingham	£291,790	£282,182	£273,270	£264,970
Wolverhampton	£1,044,812	£1,010,407	£978,499	£948,777
Worcestershire	£3,115,042	£3,012,466	£2,917,332	£2,828,718
Total	£176,856,300	£171,032,551	£165,631,360	£160,600,281

About the Library

The House of Commons Library research service provides MPs and their staff with the impartial briefing and evidence base they need to do their work in scrutinising Government, proposing legislation, and supporting constituents.

As well as providing MPs with a confidential service we publish open briefing papers, which are available on the Parliament website.

Every effort is made to ensure that the information contained in these publicly available research briefings is correct at the time of publication. Readers should be aware however that briefings are not necessarily updated or otherwise amended to reflect subsequent changes.

If you have any comments on our briefings please email papers@parliament.uk. Authors are available to discuss the content of this briefing only with Members and their staff.

If you have any general questions about the work of the House of Commons you can email hcenquiries@parliament.uk.

Disclaimer

This information is provided to Members of Parliament in support of their parliamentary duties. It is a general briefing only and should not be relied on as a substitute for specific advice. The House of Commons or the author(s) shall not be liable for any errors or omissions, or for any loss or damage of any kind arising from its use, and may remove, vary or amend any information at any time without prior notice.

The House of Commons accepts no responsibility for any references or links to, or the content of, information maintained by third parties. This information is provided subject to the [conditions of the Open Parliament Licence](#).

Version control (from version 2.0 onwards)

2.0	8/1/18	Findings of the DWP's <i>Independent Living Fund: post-closure review</i> included, new summary added, minor structural changes and updating made.
-----	--------	--
