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Introduction

Purpose of the consultation


These proposals are being considered due to a requirement for the service to make savings as part of the Council’s budget setting process for the period 2017 to 2020, during which time the Council must make cash reductions of almost £100 million. Many other Council services also face reductions in budget for this period, and are also expected to make savings.

This report summarises all responses to this consultation, and will be made available prior to a full Council meeting on Thursday 23rd February 2017, where a decision on the future provision of the service will be made.

Consultation supporting evidence

Prior to this consultation Cheshire East Council commissioned a Household Waste Recycling Centre review, which examined service provision against best practice, and against the Council’s Municipal Waste Management Strategy objectives. One aspect of this review presented 3 possible options for making savings. A copy of this review was made available during the consultation process, and is available on request.

A summary of these options, and a further option which the Council put forward as their preferred option, was also made available as part of the consultation, most notably as part of the consultation questionnaire, a copy of which is included in Appendix 7. This consultation then asked for respondents’ views on the preferred option, as well as on the wider consultation itself.

Consultation methodology and number of responses

The consultation was widely promoted, most notably: via email to all Cheshire East Town and Parish Councils; online via the Council’s website and social media accounts; via the Council’s online Citizen’s Panel; and in paper format at all Household Waste and Recycling Centres in the borough, where 200 paper surveys were made available at each.

In total 7 local newspaper articles were written about the consultation, and 2,385 individual consultation responses were received, including:

- 2,007 online survey responses
- 326 paper survey responses
• 51 email responses and 1 letter response
• A number of social media postings relating to the consultation.

Consultation responses were received from a wide range of stakeholders – see Appendix 5 for a list of some.

**Reading this report**

Sections 1 to 6 of this report summarise responses to the survey which formed the main part of the consultation. Sections 1 to 4 in particular summarise support and objection to each of the 4 proposals made by the Council, as part of their preferred option.

Appendices 1 to 4 contain all other responses received as part of the consultation, the main bulk of these being in Appendix 2, which contains all consultation email responses.

Appendices 5 to 7 then contain extra useful information relating to the consultation.
Section 1 – The closure of Arclid Centre

Overall support or objection to the closure of Arclid Centre

As part of the consultation, Cheshire East Council presented their preferred option for the future of the Household Waste and Recycling Service. The preferred option consisted of 4 proposals, the first of which was as follows:

**Proposal 1 summary** – The Council’s preferred option, subject to consultation, is to close the Arclid Household Waste Recycling Centre from the 1\textsuperscript{st} April 2017, maintaining service through the surrounding sites of Middlewich, Congleton and Alsager.

Proposals not to be taken up: Closing of Congleton, Poynton, Middlewich, Alsager and Bollington Household Waste Recycling Centre sites.

Overall, a majority of respondents (60%) supported the closure of Arclid Centre. This included 35% of respondents who strongly supported its closure.

28% of respondents objected to the closure of Arclid Centre, and of these 24% strongly objected to its closure.

Opinion on this topic was polarised with large proportions of respondents either strongly supporting or strongly objecting to the proposal – this is an unusual distribution of responses to any question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How strongly do you support or object to the closure of Arclid Centre?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support: 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to support: 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor object to: 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to object to: 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly object to: 24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of respondents = 2,184
Support or objection to the closure of Arclid Centre, by location

Strong objection to the closure of Arclid Centre was concentrated amongst those who currently use the site – those most likely to be against its closure were residents of Holmes Chapel, Sandbach, Arclid, Goostrey and the surrounding rural areas. In summary:

- 81% of respondents from Holmes Chapel were against the closure of Arclid Centre
- 73% of respondents from Sandbach Town were against the closure of Arclid Centre
- 69% of respondents from Congleton Rural were against the closure of Arclid Centre.

Those most likely to support the closure of Arclid Centre lived in the north of the Borough – Knutsford, Macclesfield and Wilmslow.

The following chart shows level of support/objection to this proposal by Cheshire East Towns and Rural Areas. See Appendix 8 for a map of Town and Rural Area boundaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town or Area</th>
<th>Support (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Object (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knutsford Town (24)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macclesfield Town and Bollington (105)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutsford and Wilmslow Rural (42)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macclesfield Rural (36)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmslow Town and Handforth (44)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nantwich Town (32)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alsager Town (79)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe Town (106)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlewich Town (94)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe Rural (59)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poynton Rural (121)</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congleton Town (62)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poynton Town (667)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congleton Rural (173)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandbach Town (189)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes Chapel (93)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number answering in brackets
Reasons given for objection to the closure of Arclid Centre

Reasons for objection to the closure of Arclid centre came under the following main themes:

- Loss of a local waste and recycling service (381 comments in total)
- Access issues (316)
- Environmental concerns (317)
- Loss of a good quality Waste Centre (144)
- Concerns about cost (60)
- Alternative solutions (26)
- Other responses (50).

Loss of a local waste and recycling service

The main objection to the closure of Arclid Centre was due to the convenient location of the current Arclid Centre for local residents (141), and the resulting loss of a local household waste recycling service if it were to close (55).

Respondents also felt that the service is only going to become more necessary with ongoing housing developments in the area, which will only increase demand for a local waste recycling service (115), hence why they were strongly opposed to the closure of the site.

Respondents felt that the closure of Arclid Centre unfairly and disproportionately affected Sandbach, Arclid and Holmes Chapel, and their local communities, in particular (64). Some also highlighted the impact the closure would have on certain residents, including the elderly and those without cars, who might struggle to access alternative sites (6).

Access issues

Respondents also objected to the closure of Arclid Centre on access grounds, specifically respondents highlighted:

- The potential increase in traffic levels both travelling to (114) and around other sites (29), which respondents felt would act as a barrier to accessing other sites. Respondents felt that traffic around sites such as Middlewich and Congleton was already bad, and would only get worse with the closure of Arclid (29)
- The extra distance they would have to travel to get to alternative sites (161)
- The unsuitability of roads to other sites such as Alsager and Middlewich (12), which were felt to be both busy and narrow.

Environmental concerns
The main objection on environmental grounds was that some felt the closure of Arclid Centre would cause a drastic increase in fly-tipping in the local area (192). They felt fly-tipping is already a significant issue, which would only get worse if this proposal goes ahead.

Other objections on environmental grounds included that closure of the site could lead to:

- A decrease in recycling rates. Whilst respondents accepted individual accountability for recycling they did stress the role the local authority plays in enabling recycling, and suggested that closing the Arclid Centre would be detrimental in this regard (63)
- Increased car emissions as a result of extra travel to alternative sites (54)
- Issues with garden waste, particularly during the winter months when garden waste collection is suspended (8).

**Loss of a good quality Waste Centre**

Several respondents made positive comments about Arclid Centre (93) and negative comments about alternative sites such as Congleton (28), Alsager (11) and Middlewich (12).

Positive praise for Arclid Centre centred around compliments towards the staff and towards the general running of the site. They stressed how frequently they attended and how well-used it seemed to be. Negative comments towards the other sites centred on poor locations, access, traffic levels and that staff at these other sites did not seem as good.

**Concerns about cost**

Some felt closing Arclid Centre would be costly in the long term, in terms of individual expense (e.g. increased fuel costs to access alternative sites), costs of dealing with increased fly-tipping and future costs arising from a lack of investment in services now (60).

**Alternative solutions**

A number suggested that investment rather than the closure of Arclid would be more acceptable, and that if Arclid was deemed unfit for purpose then this was down to a failing of the council (21). A small number suggested the creation of a “super-centre” instead of the provision of small household sites (3) or that Arclid could become a community run venture to ensure its continued opening (2).

**Other responses**

Finally, some expressed negative sentiment towards the proposal (15) and the Council (26). They expressed a lack of trust towards the Council, and felt that money could be saved elsewhere internally rather than through frontline service cuts. A number also suggested that a “deal” had been made for the site e.g. that it had been sold to developers (9).
Section 2 – Charging for disposal of rubble

Overall support or objection to the introduction of charges for rubble

As part of the consultation, Cheshire East Council presented their preferred option for the future of the Household Waste and Recycling Service. The preferred option consisted of 4 proposals, the second of which was as follows:

**Proposal 2 summary** – Our preferred option, subject to consultation, is to introduce a charge for rubble, phased in by 2018-19.

A majority of respondents supported the introduction of charges for the deposit of rubble, with 55% supporting this proposal, and 31% objecting to it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How strongly do you support or object to charging for disposal of rubble?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tend to support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neither support nor object to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tend to object to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly object to</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of respondents = 2,239

Reasons given for objection to the introduction of charges for rubble

The main objections given to this proposal were:

- That it would lead to an increase in fly-tipping (457 comments in total)
- Some felt they are being charged twice for the service (246)
- Confusion over charges for small amounts of rubble (154)
- Confusion over the difference between rubble and household waste (129)
- Other comments (64)
- Alternative solutions (154).
An increase in fly-tipping

The main concern about this proposal was the feeling that fly-tipping would dramatically increase in direct response to a rubble charge being introduced (363).

Respondents felt that fly-tipping is already a significant issue, hard to monitor and costly to clean up. They expressed concern that income generated through the introduction of a charge for rubble would be offset against the cost of clearing up increased fly-tipping, and that in the long term this would not result in any savings being made (94).

Being charged twice for the service

A large number of respondents expressed that they felt a domestic charge for rubble would be inappropriate as they would then effectively be being charged twice, through council tax and the extra charge for the service. The stance of many here was “I pay enough already” in response to this proposal. Some viewed the proposal as a charge for an existing service, rather than seeing it as an expansion of a service (246).

Confusion over charges for small amounts of rubble

Respondents were confused about potential charges for small amounts of rubble e.g. that weigh less than 100kg. They felt the information provided with the consultation was not clear about charges for the disposal of small amounts of rubble, or whether this will be free of charge as is currently the case. If there is to be no charge for the disposal of very small amounts of domestic rubble, then this may alleviate much of the objection to the proposal (154).

Confusion over the difference between rubble and household waste

Some were confused about the difference between ‘rubble’ and ‘domestic household waste’. They wondered if they would be charged if the rubble was produced as part of domestic household waste, such as through household DIY projects. Because small amounts of rubble have been accepted in the past at household waste sites for free, some felt this has set a precedent, and that this should continue if it was genuine household waste (129).

Other comments

Respondents made a number of other comments in objection to this proposal, including:

- Concerns over how such a system might work, particularly in relation to having cash on site and the admin aspects of implementing the charges (10)
- Concerns that the charge may lead to an abuse of the household waste collection service, if people try to dispose of rubble through their regular bin collections, or that they might try to store rubble at home before taking it to the tip (54)
**Alternative solutions**

Respondents once again made alternative solutions to the proposal, the two most popular being the resale of recycled ‘hard-core’ to generate income from the disposed rubble (46), and the introduction of these charges only to the trade, with an exemption for charges on domestic rubble (63). Some suggested that a frequency based charge may be more appropriate than a flat charge for rubble (20) while others stated the system needed a full assessment to be viable (6).

Finally, a small number of respondents stated they were conditionally in favour of such charges if the Arclid site could be retained (19).
Section 3 – Reduced opening hours at all sites

Overall support or objection to reduced hours at all sites

As part of the consultation, Cheshire East Council presented their preferred option for the future of the Household Waste and Recycling Service. The preferred option consisted of 4 proposals, the third of which was as follows:

**Proposal 3 summary** – Our preferred option, subject to consultation, is to reduce opening hours at all sites from an average of 10hrs/day to 8hrs/day by the end of 2017-18. Sites shall remain open 7 days a week.

Proposal not to be taken up: Closing minor sites for 2 days a week.

A majority of respondents supported reduced opening hours at all sites, with 63% of respondents supporting this proposal, and 25% objecting to it.

| How strongly do you support or object to reduced opening hours at all sites? |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Strongly support            | 22%                         |
| Tend to support             | 41%                         |
| Neither support nor object to | 13%                         |
| Tend to object to           | 14%                         |
| Strongly object to          | 11%                         |

Number of respondents = 2,258

Reasons given for objection to reduced hours at all sites

The main objections raised in response to this proposal were:

- The negative impact on full time workers (219 comments in total)
- A lack of flexibility in the proposed opening hours (139)
- Potential for weekend congestion (83)
- Environmental concerns (121)
- Other comments (124).
Negative impact on full time workers

The main area of objection towards this proposal was in relation to the negative impact on full time workers that the proposal would have, effectively meaning they would not be able to access sites during the week – respondents here felt that the proposed hours were not compatible with the hours of most full time workers. Many felt that having the ability to fit trips to household sites in after work was an essential service.

Some suggested altering the proposed opening times so that they could be more accommodating of full time workers during the week. This included opening sites later in the morning, and then closing them later in the evening, so that hours are reduced, but so that full time workers still have access through the week. Others suggested having late night opening at least once a week to enable full time workers some weekday access.

Overall, respondents were not totally against the reduction of opening hours, however, they did feel they would need to be more flexible in their implementation in order to consider the needs of the working community, something that they felt the current proposals were not (219).

A lack of flexibility in the proposed opening hours

Respondents generally felt the opening hours could be more flexible and should be as convenient as possible to encourage use – they felt those proposed were not flexible enough (65).

Some suggested limiting hours or even having partial closing in the week to maintain the longer access hours at the weekend, while still maintaining a reduction of overall operating hours (12).

And whilst reduced winter hours were seen as acceptable, some respondents considered the proposed summer hours too short and asked for these to be extended, particularly in high summer when household waste is more likely to be created through DIY and gardening (62).

Potential for weekend congestion

Respondents were also concerned that reductions to opening hours during the week would lead to increased congestion at the sites when they were open, particularly on the weekends. The importance of longer weekend opening hours was raised due to the increased weekend visits that would arise with full time workers not being able to visit during the week (83).
Environmental concerns

Respondents once again raised environmental concerns in objection to the proposal, with a potential increase in fly-tipping as a result of reduced opening hours a concern (80). Some respondents felt that unless the changes to hours were well publicised then many people would fly tip as a result of making the trip to the household site and finding it closed. Some respondents commented that they were not sure of the current opening hours (14) and some respondents felt that changes would need to be well communicated (12).

Respondents also considered the impact reduced hours would have on recycling rates and the environment, again bringing up the perceived barrier to recycling that reduced availability would represent (15).

Other comments

Respondents made a number of other comments in objection to this proposal, including:

- Again, some respondents were conditionally in favour of reduced hours, or partial closing of sites, if it meant the retention of the Arclid Centre (50)
- Some respondents were against changes to opening hours stating that as it is a paid through service from council tax the sites should suit their needs as a “paying customer” (22)
- A few respondents felt that current opening hours were adequate, and therefore should not be reduced (18)
- Some requested extended opening hours, rather than a reduction (11)
- A number of respondents raised concerns about the Centre staff and how the proposal could affect both their jobs and pay (11)
- Finally, there were requests for more information about opening times as some respondents were not aware of the current ones. Respondents also asked if future changes to opening hours could be displayed clearly to avoid any confusion around any changes made (12).
Section 4 – Opening sites to trade waste

Overall support or objection to opening sites to trade waste

As part of the consultation, Cheshire East Council presented their preferred option for the future of the Household Waste and Recycling Service. The preferred option consisted of 4 proposals, the fourth of which was as follows:

Proposal 4 summary – Our preferred option, subject to consultation, is to open key sites to small traders to deposit rubble from 2017-18 onwards.

A majority of respondents supported opening sites to trade waste, 68% of respondents supporting this proposal, and 15% objecting to it.

How strongly do you support or object to opening sites to trade waste?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>26%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tend to support</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor object to</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to object to</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly object to</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of respondents = 2,200

It is interesting to note that respondents completing the survey who identified themselves as a “local business owner or small trader” were more likely to support this proposal (83% Vs 68% – see Appendix 6 for detail).

Reasons given for objection to opening sites to trade waste

The main objections raised in response to this proposal were:

- Further increases in traffic and congestion at sites (280 comments in total)
- Loss of priority for domestic waste (209)
- Environmental concerns (77)
- Potential cost implications (76)
- Other comments (22).
Further increases in traffic and congestion

The main objection respondents had towards this proposal was that it would further increase traffic and congestion at the sites, something which would already have been exacerbated by the closure of Arclid Centre and a reduction in opening hours. Opening sites to trade waste would clearly increase traffic and congestion at all the sites (189).

Respondents also raised concerns around the narrow access roads, and the smaller sites being unable to cope with the larger vehicles that would come with trade, whilst others were concerned about potential damage to vehicles. Respondents were concerned that the sites are unsuited to handling an increase in use from trade vehicles (91).

Loss of priority for domestic waste

Respondents were also highly concerned that trade waste and vehicles should not be given priority over domestic waste/vehicles – they were clear that domestic waste should remain the priority. Respondents raised concerns about the capacity of household sites and their ability to accommodate such an increase in waste. Some felt there should be allocated time slots when trade waste is accepted, or even trade only sites run by the council. Ultimately they were clear that a clear line should be drawn between domestic and trade waste, with domestic waste having priority (209).

Environmental concerns

Environmental concerns were raised again although fly-tipping was not the major focus here with a number of comments considering that such changes could reduce fly-tipping in general. The disposal of trade waste concerned some respondents as well as the possible environmental risk of allowing trade waste onto domestic sites. Trade waste was perceived as more dangerous compared to trade waste, requiring more strict regulations and monitoring as well as seen as needing specialised disposal. Some respondents were particularly concerned about the health risks that trade waste would pose (77).

Potential cost implications

Some respondents feared the cost of dealing with trade waste would be much higher than for domestic waste, however, others felt that as long as trade was charged for the disposal of waste then this was acceptable (76).

Other comments

Once again, some expressed that they were conditionally in favour of allowing trade waste if it would keep facilities, such as Arclid Centre open. Some respondents were sceptical that the changes would work in practice and asked for a trial period, at the larger sites, to be put in place before full implementation (22).
Section 5 – Groups or sectors most likely to be affected

In reply to the question “are there any groups or sectors which you feel would be affected by our preferred option?” respondents listed the following:

- Small businesses and trades people (128 comments in total)
- Residents living in the immediate vicinity of Arclid Centre (85), particularly Sandbach (17)
- Third sector organisations (26)
- Tax payers (12)
- Elderly residents (11)
- Those in full time employment (8)
- Low means residents (6)
- Rural residents (4)
- Disabled residents (2).
Section 6 – Further comments

The final question of the survey asked “is there anything else you would like to add about this consultation?”. The main themes given in reply to this question were:

- Waste Centre provision (485 comments in total)
- Environmental concerns (352)
- Alternative service suggestions (197)
- Funding the service (179)
- Criticism and praise for the Council and the consultation itself (314).

Waste Centre provision

Here respondents stressed their support for various Waste Centres within Cheshire East remaining open, with the Centres at Arclid (76), Poynton (256), Middlewich (5) and Bollington (1) all receiving support. It is interesting to note that such a large number of Poynton residents completed the consultation, and campaigned against the closure of Poynton Centre, when the closure of the Poynton site was not part of the Council’s preferred option – this was probably in response to a significant media campaign run by the Poynton Post.

A small number of responses raised concerns about the future of the Arclid site upon its closure, with some suggesting there was developer involvement with the site (10), and others raised the query about a permanent traveller site being built there (4). In general these comments called for the need for transparency about the future of the site, suggesting that knowing what intentions with the site were at this stage may go some way to mitigate concerns and objections to the Centre closure.

There were a number of respondents who stated that more sites should be closed, with Bollington (14), Poynton (15), Arclid (5) and Middlewich (5) all being listed. Some pointed out that there was significant overlap of catchment areas between some of the Centres, with Bollington being specifically mentioned in this regard. Some respondents suggested the further closure of smaller sites to create larger “super-centres” to deal with household waste.

Respondents also used the open comment section to reiterate their concerns about increasing development in the local area, which in turn increases the need for services, rather than reducing it (50).

Others suggested that waste sites in Cheshire East should be exclusively for use by Cheshire East residents, and that they would be in favour of the implementation of a permit system at border sites if it would help with savings (44).
Environmental concerns

Environmental concerns were once again significantly commented-on, with the main issue raised being concern around the potential increase in fly-tipping as a result of the proposals (187).

Respondents were also concerned with what they perceived as barriers to them being environmental friendly, something they were quick to point out the Council encouraged. Overall respondents were concerned about the ability to access recycling services, and about the impact that increased driving to alternate sites would have on the environment (123), as well as the increase in congestion at sites (19).

A final environmental concern related to garden waste collection – with the suspension of this service during winter months, some respondents were concerned they would not be able to take this waste to the waste centres if they are closed or the hours are reduced (23).

Alternative service suggestions

Respondents reiterated here that opening hours should remain flexible, especially with full time workers in mind, and again asked for extended weekend and late night hours to accommodate them (77).

A number of respondents suggested the Council create “Recycling Shops”, which respondents felt may help provide extra income, as well help recycle waste items. Some gave examples of other authorities that have introduced such schemes with the general perception that they worked well in other locations (56).

Charging ‘trade’ was seen as an acceptable solution for some respondents (33).

Other respondents suggested that improvement to sites would be required if services were to reduce – the centres at Middlewich and Congleton were specifically listed as needing improvement (31).

Funding the service

In terms of funding the service, some respondents felt that the budget savings should be found elsewhere instead. Many felt they “pay enough already” and could not see why they should continue to pay as much or more Council Tax for a reduction in service provision (103).

On the other hand a smaller number of respondents stated they would be happy to pay more Council Tax to maintain the service that was currently provided, rather than see cuts to service (12). A number of respondents also felt that the implementation of “minimal”
charges to use household waste centres would also be preferable to the proposed service reductions (8).

A significant concern expressed by a number of respondents was that the proposed savings would only be offset by increasing costs, with the most commonly cited concern being an increased cost of clearing up fly-tipping, as an outcome of the service reductions, would completely offset the proposed savings (56).

**Criticism and praise for the Council and the consultation itself**

A number of respondents took the opportunity to criticise the Council itself, with the main criticism being of the Council “wasting money”, and that the cuts for budget savings should come from within, particularly from those on high wages, or working in back offices (123).

With regard the consultation itself, some respondents commented that they did not feel this was a “proper” or “real” consultation and that simply didn’t feel they would be listened to whatever they chose to comment (63).

Many regarded the lack of a survey question asking them to select their preferred option as an indication that the council would act regardless of input given, and were therefore discouraged to complete the consultation. Some actually used the final open comment box to pick their preferred option from the four presented within the consultation supporting literature, with 52 nominations given to option 4, 21 for option 3 and 7 given for option 1.

Alongside the criticism, there was also some praise for the consultation process, with respondents praising the content of the supporting literature saying it was well collated and presented, fair, and that they wished other Council policies and proposals were as clear (37).

Finally some respondents expressed concern about the loss of jobs that a site closure would entail (11), whilst others questioned the relevance of questions in the “about you” section of the survey which asked for gender, age etc. Some felt these questions were irrelevant to the topic of waste service provision, whilst others found the questions intrusive/offensive (12 comments written in reply to the “any comments” question, and 92 comments made in the actual “about you” section of the survey).
Summary and conclusions

Introduction

Cheshire East Council conducted a Household Waste Recycling Centre consultation between 17\textsuperscript{th} November 2016 and 10\textsuperscript{th} January 2017. The consultation presented a number of options being considered for the future provision of the service, one of which was the Council’s preferred option. The consultation then asked respondents’ views on 4 proposals of this preferred option, as well as on the wider consultation itself.

The consultation was widely promoted, most notably: via email to all Cheshire East Town and Parish Councils; online via the Council’s website and social media accounts; via the Council’s Citizens’ Panel; and in paper format at all Household Waste and Recycling Centres in the borough.

In total 7 local newspaper articles were written about the consultation, and 2,385 individual consultation responses were received, including:

- 2,007 online survey responses
- 326 paper survey responses
- 51 email responses and 1 letter response
- A number of social media postings relating to the consultation.

This report summarises all responses to the consultation, and will be made available prior to a full Council meeting on Thursday 23\textsuperscript{rd} February 2017, where a decision on the future provision of the service will be made.

Overall sentiment towards the proposals

Overall, a majority of respondents supported each of the 4 proposals of the Council’s preferred option:

- 60% supported the closure of Arclid Centre, 28% objected to it
- 55% supported the introduction of charges for disposal of rubble, 31% objected
- 63% supported a reduction of opening hours at all sites, 25% objected
- 68% supported opening sites to trade waste, 15% objected.

These are somewhat unusual results, given that the Council is proposing to reduce the level of service being provided to residents. This may reflect the fact that residents are aware of the tough economic circumstances facing local authorities, or may reflect that the consultation supporting evidence was clearly presented.
Reasons given for objection to the proposals

Despite a majority of respondents supporting each of the proposals, there were significant proportions of respondents who objected to them. If the Council chooses to pursue the proposals, there are a number of actions that can be taken to mitigate their impact on residents.

Closure of Arclid Centre

This proposal elicited the strongest levels of objection of all 4 proposals (24% strongly objected to it).

Whilst a majority of respondents support the closure of this centre, it is clear that a small section of Cheshire East society will be affected by it – those most likely to object to it lived in Holmes Chapel (82% objected to its closure), Sandbach (73% objected to its closure) and Congleton Rural (69% objected to its closure). 11% of Cheshire East residents live in these areas.

In the eyes of these residents the closure of Arclid Centre is unfair, and sentiment here is perhaps best summarised by the consultation response received by Sandbach Town Council (see email response 002 in Appendix 2). Sandbach Town Council raise a number of points in objection to the closure of this site, including their belief the Arclid Centre is more efficient than other sites in Cheshire East, that Poynton Centre should be closed instead, and that Sandbach is due to have more development than other areas in Cheshire East. Ultimately they questioned whether closing Arclid Centre was worth the amount of savings it would potentially generate. As part of this consultation Cheshire East Council will be meeting with Sandbach Town Council to discuss their response and objections.

If the Council does choose to close Arclid Centre, it could attempt to mitigate the effects of the closure on residents in Holmes Chapel, Sandbach, Arclid and the surrounding rural areas. This could perhaps be achieved through a process of engagement with these stakeholders, with information being provided as part of that process. Throughout the consultation respondents suggested the sorts of information they might find useful if it were to be closed, including details of the closure (including reasons for it) and information about alternative Centres they could access instead. Respondents were concerned about the extra distance they would have to travel to get to other sites, as well as the suitability of access routes and levels of traffic both to/from and at the alternative sites.

Respondents were also significantly concerned that the proposal could lead to increased levels of fly-tipping in the local area.
Charging for disposal of rubble

This proposal also generated significant levels of objection, however, it may be that the reasons for objection could be significantly mitigated with a clearer explanation of the proposed charges.

Respondents were unclear as to whether they would be charged for small amounts (e.g. less than 100kg) of rubble disposal if it was genuine household waste (e.g. from a DIY or home improvement project). Not charging for the disposal of relatively small amounts of rubble from household waste would mitigate much of the objection to this proposal.

There was also some confusion over how this proposal is different from the current policy – some respondents were not aware necessarily that Household Waste Centres are not currently obliged to accept all types of waste, and they therefore felt they were being “charged again” for a service they already currently receive. It would seem essential that the Council clearly communicates that accepting rubble is a supplementary service, rather than extra charges being imposed for a service currently provided.

Respondents were again concerned about the potential impact of this proposal on levels of fly-tipping. They also suggested that the proposal may be more acceptable if the Council were able to generate income through the acceptance of rubble, perhaps through the resale of ‘hard-core’ for example.

Reduced opening hours at all sites

Whilst there was also significant objection to this proposal, again they are objections which could perhaps be mitigated fairly easily.

The main reasons for objection to reduced opening hours seemed to be the impact they would have on full time workers. Respondents felt that having more flexible reduced hours, enabling full time workers to use the sites at least once a week in evenings, especially during the summer, would go some way to mitigating objections to the proposal. Respondents also asked for extended weekend opening.

As well as requesting greater flexibility in opening hours to accommodate full time workers, respondents were again concerned about the potential impact this proposal would have on levels of fly-tipping in the borough, and were also concerned that reducing opening hours would increase the level of congestion at the sites when they were open.

Opening sites to trade waste

Objection to this proposal was not as significant as it was the others, however, those who did object were concerned about the potential increases in congestion at the sites as a result of the proposal, stating that it was essential that the priority should remain with those
depositing household waste. Essentiality respondents were concerned that the costs of this proposal might outweigh the benefits.

It is also interesting to note that a higher proportion of small local business owners were in favour of opening sites to trade waste than householders, perhaps indicating this proposal would be well received by local business.

**General views on the consultation**

Respondents expressed concerns that this service reduction was occurring at a time when significant development is taking place in Cheshire East. They also highlighted the hypocritical nature of being encouraged to recycle as much as possible, whilst recycling services are being reduced.

A number of respondents commented on the quality of consultation itself, with some stating that they would have liked to have been given the opportunity to indicate what their own preferred option for the service was.

Finally the large number of survey and email responses from residents of Poynton should also be highlighted, with 34% of all survey responses coming from Poynton Town – residents from this town were encouraged locally to respond to the consultation. 9% of survey responses came from residents of Sandbach Town, see Appendix 5.

**Overall Conclusions**

That a majority of respondents supported each of the 4 proposals of the Council’s preferred option could be testament to the benefits of a comprehensive and clearly presented consultation.

Given the large scale response to the consultation, and the level of support for the proposals, if the Council does pursue them it may wish to mitigate their impact on residents by doing the following:

- Minimising the impact of the closure of Arclid Centre on those living in Sandbach, Holmes Chapel and the surrounding rural areas as much as possible. This might include a process of engagement and communication to ensure concerns are heard, and, where possible, mitigated.
- Explaining more clearly the charges for rubble deposits, particularly those for the disposal of small quantities of rubble.
- Have greater flexibility in the reduced opening hours, to enable full time workers to make visits in the evening, particularly during summer months.
- Carefully monitoring the impact of trade waste disposal at sites, to ensure domestic waste disposal remains the priority.
• Carefully monitoring the levels of traffic and congestion both to/from and at the sites, looking to reduce severe levels as and when they arise
• Carefully monitoring the levels of fly-tipping in the borough, again looking to reduce it as much as possible
• Clearly communicating with all residents about any changes that do take place.
Appendix 1 – Consultation newspaper articles

Online newspaper articles concerning the consultation were published on the below dates, up to and including 16th January 2017.

22/12/2016

http://poynton-post.co.uk/save-poynton-waste-and-recycling-site/

06/12/2016


05/12/2016

http://www.macclesfield-express.co.uk/news/residents-charged-using-public-tips-12273779

30/11/2016

http://www.middlewichguardian.co.uk/news/14937194.Croxton_Lane_tip_closure_up_for_consultation_as_Cheshire_East_Council_reviews_household_recyclingSites/

23/11/2016


http://www.wilmslow.co.uk/news/article/14748/changes-to-waste-recycling-centres-proposed-to-save-money

04/11/2016

Appendix 2 – Consultation email responses

The following 7 email responses were received as part of the consultation from Cheshire East Town and Parish Councils or local organisations. These responses are printed in date order (from most recently received to least).

Email response 001

Date received: 20/01/2017
To: Ben Buckley, Cheshire East Council
From: Congleton Town Council

Please find below the councils responses to the:

Closure of Arclid – strongly support (no comments)

Charging for Rubble – strongly object (increase in fly tipping, excessive charges, concerns about costs in collection of payments)

Reduced opening hours – strongly object (proposed hours – closure too early in summer, needs to be later in winter – may lead to more fly tipping)

Opening sites to trade waste - strongly support (no comments)

No comments as we disagree on charging

Would like to commend, encourage and support the recycling programme. Suggest current performance of CEC and Congleton recycling is promoted more which will hopefully provide positive message on what is being achieved through residents and council efforts

Best regards,
Chief Officer.

Email response 002

Date received: 13/01/2016
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: Sandbach Town Council

Sandbach Town Council’s response to Cheshire East Council’s (CEC) Consultation on Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) Provision.

Introduction

1.1 CEC has a STATUTORY DUTY to provide HWRCs.
1.2 CEC Municipal Waste Management Strategy Objective is “to maintain the role of HWRC and maximise recycling and reuse of items”. CEC has achieved the highest recycling rate compared to 11 similar/benchmarked local authorities with its current facilities and model.

1.3 HW Martin Waste Ltd manage all CEC HWRCs on a performance based contract which is due for renewal in 2018.

1.4 Sandbach is a growing town and so the future need for HWRC provision locally will be greater. Hence closing Arclid does not make sense.

**Key points**

There are a large number of concerns, discrepancies and bias within the report which draws into question its validity.

2.1 CEC is aware of the need for improvements in some sites, but costs are not included within the report, so the full cost implications cannot be considered.

2.2 Increase in fly tipping as a result of closure of centres is acknowledged but the increased costs in dealing with this is not included in the report. These could well be considerable.

The report suggests taking on 2 additional enforcement officers to deal with additional fly tipping, but they would not be able to stop the fly tipping and hence the considerable additional costs of removing tipped items.

2.3 Other costings not included in the report are stated in Appendix 3 HWRC Policies, Details and Assumptions p.43. “The actual savings will be dependent on how HW Martin calculates savings associated with each site. Conversely, the costs of the closure of a site will need to be absorbed elsewhere within the network are 95% of site waste arisings and 50% of site service fee”.

So the savings stated may not actually materialise, or may be very different.

2.4 The report states that Arclid and Congleton are the most expensive sites to run based on throughput and cost, but the figures quoted do not show the true situation for Arclid.

Arclid was previously far more cost effective to run but a change of policy by H. Martin/CEC has doubled the number of skips required, thereby greatly increasing costs. Arclid was previously far more efficient, since it compacted waste on site and so required half the number of skips to hold the waste. A re-introduction of compacting would decrease Arclid’s costs making it less expensive to run.
2.5 Arclid is described as “the least efficient site” but there are no figures provided for people to look and consider. Indeed Arclid is consistently in the top 3 HWRC league table for Recycling Efficiency, in the report it is stated as second at 79% compared to Alsager at 81.4%. In December Arclid’s efficiency level was 81%. Arclid can be shown to be the MOST efficient based on recycling efficiency- when it is ALWAYS in the top 3 sites for recycling levels.

2.6 Arclid can be shown to be the MOST efficient based on size of site against tonnage throughput:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Size m²</th>
<th>Tonnage 2015/16</th>
<th>Tonnage per m² site area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arclid</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>2648</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alsager</td>
<td>6240</td>
<td>4652</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>9510</td>
<td>11762</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7 Savings (Table 5 Costs and Savings p.21 of Resources Futures report)

Closure of Arclid saves only £120,064

Closure of Congleton saves more- £126,764

Closure of Poynton saves £111,700

The much higher percentage of savings suggested in the report come from rubble charges, reduced opening hours, commercial waste centre.

Is it worth closing Arclid or other sites for such little savings, which may well be spent on collections from fly tipping and capital expenditure on other sites to cope with the increase diverted from Arclid?

2.8 The report states that Congleton is the most expensive site to run (alongside Arclid) based on throughput and cost, but there is no mention of closing Congleton.

Congleton site is leased, but all other sites are owned by CEC.

2.9 A third of Poynton’s catchment area is outside CEC boundary, which means that CEC will be handling waste from outside CEC.

All of the Poynton HRWC catchment area, that is within the CEC boundary, is contained within 2.5 mile radius of Bollington HWRC, so could be catered for at Bollington upon closure of Poynton, thereby eliminating CEC taking non CEC resident waste via Poynton.
2.10 Resources Futures review of all the sites provides details of how the sites operate. All sites were visited with the exception of Arclid and Congleton. Both these sites were reviewed based on a desktop study of previous reports and discussions with council staff, which appears to bias the report.

2.11 Waste Resources Action Partnership provide guidance for level of provision as maximum catchment for a large proportion of the population of 3-5 miles and yet the Resource Futures Report suggests that if 86% of households were within 6 miles of an HWRC (as per their scenarios) this would be acceptable.

2.12 In planning for the future, the report assumes 1500 homes per annum built, distributed evenly within the authority. This does not acknowledge the 34% increase in houses to be built in Sandbach in the coming years and so an increase in the need for HWRC provision locally.

2.13 Table 11 p.32* shows Number of households closest to each site, with Arclid having much higher figures than Alsager, Middlewich and Poynton - and yet Arclid is the site proposed to be closed.

2.14 Bias in the report can be illustrated clearly in Appendix 3 HWRC Policies, Details and Assumptions p.43 “Arclid is the smallest site, with the smallest throughput (actually very close figures to Middlewich), the smallest population nearby (not according to their own figures in Table 11 p.32 as above*), but is the most expensive site to manage (based on the change in policy by H. Martin/CEC which has caused the increase in costs).

2.15 There are other ways to increase income from waste recycling, which should be considered in preference to site closures:

Metal recycling- Metal items stripped and sorted by metal type would increase £ per tonne from £45 to £100 approx.

2.16 What will be the effect on other tips if Arclid closes? Could they cope with the increase in volume/traffic?

2.17 The closure of Arclid will be pressure on other sites, increasing journey times forcing extra burning of fossil fuels and traffic levels. There will be a negative impact on air quality

**Conclusions**

1. Sandbach Town Council oppose the plans to close Arclid HWRC until a viable alternative is available. Sandbach residents need to have close access to a HWRC.

2. The conclusions reached by Cheshire East in its Report are flawed and based on incomplete information and misinterpretation of key details.
3. Sandbach Town Council should request a meeting with representatives of CEC to reinforce its representation regarding proposals to close the Arclid site and to discuss other options that may be being considered by CEC.

Sandbach Town Council
Sandbach Literary Institution
Hightown
Sandbach CW11 1AE

Email response 003

Date received: 11/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: Moston Parish Council

At a meeting of Moston Parish Council this evening, 10th January 2017 is was resolved to forward the following comment as part of the consultation undertaken by Cheshire East Council consultation into a Household Waste and Recycling Centre.

Whilst accepting the need of Cheshire East Council to find budget cuts we object most strongly to any measure which may discourage the use of household waste sites.

All the proposals put forward create barriers to correctly disposing of waste, in particular the considered charging to tip builders rubble.

Within our parish we are constantly picking up builders rubble along with other items which have been dumped. Ansa are contacted and asked to remove the offending which they do with commendable speed, however this is an increasing problem even without a charge being incurred.

Any paper cost saving would undoubtedly be outweighed by the increased time, effort and resources to remove what would certainly become an even bigger problem if charges were imposed.

Moston Parish Council do not agree with any of the proposals which have been set out, sites should be more accessible not less. A very short sighted attempt to make paper savings.

Moston Parish Council.

Email response 004

Date received: 10/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: Moston Litter Pick Group
Whilst understanding the need to find budget cuts as a litter picking group we object most strongly to anything which may discourage the use of household waste sites.

All your proposals create barriers to correctly disposing of waste, in particular the considered charging to tip builders rubble.

We are already constantly picking up rubble along with other items in the lanes of Moston, or informing Ansa directly for them to pick it up. This is an increasing problem without a charge being incurred

Any paper cost savings would surely be outweighed by the increased work required to move the material.

Summary....Do not agree with any of your proposals.

Coordinator of Moston Home and Neighbourhood Watch and Litter Picking Group.

Email response 005

Date received: 03/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: Adlington Parish Council

At its meeting on Monday 12th December 2016 Adlington Parish Council considered the current consultation on the future of household waste recycling centre provision in Cheshire East.

Adlington Parish Council is supportive of preferred Option 4. The Parish Council is concerned that any closure of the Poynton centre, as per options 1-3, may lead to fly-tipping in surrounding areas such as the lanes of Adlington.

Clerk to Adlington Parish Council.

Email response 006

Date received: 29/12/2016
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: Mere Parish Council

Hello,

In response to the e-mail received on the 22nd November Mere Parish Council has considered the contents and support Option 4 but with the amendment not to charge for household rubble. The reason being we feel if you charge for household rubble then it will encourage fly tipping.

Regards,
Email response 007

Date received: 28/12/2016
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: Crewe Town Council

Dear Cheshire East Council,

The Town Council makes the following comments in relation to proposed changes contained in the Household Waste Recycling Centre Consultation. The Council restricts its comments to matters that it sees as relevant to Crewe and the surrounding area:

- The Council does not wish to see any reduction in the service. Making it harder to use and access the Pym’s Lane facility can only add to the already unacceptable level of fly tipping in Crewe. It would as such be a false economy. Increased access is seen as critical if problems with illegal waste disposal in Crewe are to be tackled.

- Site procedures, rules and practices should be reviewed so as to remove any actual or perceived barriers to users. Minimising the number of users who are turned away for whatever reason must be reduced to an absolute minimum.

- Improvements could be made in the site to help access and to make the site appear more attractive. Its location close to the Bentley Showrooms makes it inevitable that visitors to Crewe’s most prestigious business will pass the site and as such it is important it is as attractive as possible but accepting the nature of its function.

Clerk to Crewe Town Council.
The following 4 email responses were received from members of the public all concerned the closure of Arclid Centre. These responses are printed in date order (from most recently received to least).

**Email response 008**

**Date received:** 10/01/2016  
**To:** Cheshire East Council Customer Services  
**From:** A member of the public

Dear Sir or Madam,

I only found out about the consultation today.

I have read your options and want to express my support for the preferred option 4

I think considering the savings are really small it is a shame that Arclid is being closed but this is the least bad option. Surely more money is wasted lighting public buildings or buying paperclips.

Waste services are an essential and moving them further from people increases traffic and pollution and risks more fly-tipping, which is no doubt expensive to clean up.

I hope you are lobbying our MPs to provide more resources for local communities and essential services, rather than giving it to their rich friends prior to the next election.

Yours sincerely.

---

**Email response 009**

**Date received:** 05/12/2016  
**To:** Cheshire East Council Customer Services  
**From:** A member of the public

**Summary**

The Arclid Household Waste site is located in a developing residential area. The site is extremely limited in the area, access and facilities. Whilst it is very convenient for local residents, nearly 100% is public access to the site by private vehicles. Hence it would be only slightly less inconvenient to use the other, better equipped and more environmental waste recycling sites provided by Cheshire East Council.

The critique below is most probably not appreciated by the average resident who uses the site only a couple of times a year.

The access lane (Davenport Lane) is used daily by pedestrians, is narrow and has no footpath to avoid the heavy Waste vehicles or mud thrown up as they drive past.
Residents living close to the Household Waste Site are more apprehensive about both the current and any future possible use for the site. In the past neighbours, have had to fight proposals for a permanent and temporary Travellers site and the removal of a bulk Waste Transfer site (similar to the controversial plan for the Lyme Green Transfer Site at Macclesfield which also had to be abandoned). The bulk Transfer Facility which ‘arrived’ at Arclid overnight in absolute secrecy as far as residents were concerned. Following 2 years of arguments the Council eventually remove the Transfer Site – at an estimated cost, we were told, of £1million)

The current Household Waste facilities at the site do not come up to current safety standards for either the operatives or public use. For this reason, a number of residents prefer to use other Cheshire East Waste sites which provide safer access.

The local residential area comprising Davenport Lane, the Villa Farm Park Estate, John Ford Way Estate, Brereton Green, Brereton Heath and future developments in planning/building stages such as Brereton Grange Estate (91 houses), a planning application at Paces Crane site and further development applications in Newcastle Road at Brereton.

No detailed risk assessments have been undertaken on either the operations on site or the suitability of the locality for this facility (reference notes of meetings with the Council and contacter’s emails on this subject and Freedom of Information Requests which have failed to provide such information). Local residents have and still make representations to the Contractor and Cheshire East Council to reduce and control the nuisances, such as noise, road congestion and spillages of waste from Contractor vehicles, caused by operations at the Waste site. Also waste is spilled or dumped by public travelling to the site.

The operation of the Household Waste site which is in a residential location accessed by narrow lane with restricted visibility from the A534 conflicts with several Principles within the Local Brereton Neighbourhood plan on noise, and environmental matters.

Most of the issues arising from the waste operation, which originally was intended a temporary, short term activity are associated with its location but some could be reduced by improving the management of the site and implementation of consistent controls.

A detailed critique of each of the existing issues associated with the operation of the Arclid Household Waste Site is provided below, these issues need to be permanently addressed if the Site is to remain operational:

Access

The following outlines some of the relevant safety features on the highway:

Davenport Lane is a narrow lane subject to the National Speed limit from the St Johns Way estate and Brereton Grange estate i.e. 60mph. It has no suitable passing places for large
vehicles such as the Waste Carriers and Farm Tractors – this is especially relevant in view of the Speed at which vehicles travel in the Lane.

The Lane is regularly used by residents and walkers who are at risk to their safety there being only very limited grass verges to escape the traffic also the wide vehicles transverse these verges in order to pass. Pedestrians also risk being struck by items falling off overloaded Waste vehicles. The additional, current, building developments in Arclid and Brereton will make the safe use of Davenport Lane even more dangerous for pedestrians.

In addition when there are accidents on the M6 or traffic is held up the following local roads A534, A50, M6, Davenport Lane is used as an alternative short cut to avoid the hold ups. This use is quite frequent and likely to increase when the Congleton By-pass is built and diverts traffic to the M6 from Holmes Chapel onto the A534.

Davenport Lane is also used by the Police as one of their fast emergency routes.

Access from the A534 for waste carriers is restricted at the very sharp junction and parked cars along the first 50 metres from the junction to the mini roundabout. It is impossible for the Carrier vehicles to avoid traversing over the mini roundabout and the view of other vehicles coming from the Waste Site direction is severely restricted.

Contractor vehicles cannot comply with the Highways Road Regulations and Highway Code at the mini roundabout and they have to drive over – not round – this mini roundabout.

**Site Access and egress**

Access from Davenport Lane into the Waste Site access lane is narrow and restricted, necessitating the Carriers to drive over the grass verge and a main drain cover. Visibility from the private access lane into Davenport Lane is restricted and there is a regular screeching of brakes at this junction as vehicles speed out of the access lane.

Access and egress at the junction of Davenport Lane and the A534 is hazardous due to the restricted visibility, narrow oblique junction, overgrown hedges and parked cars which reduce the carriage width to a single lane.

The traffic congestion at this junction will increase significantly when the 91 house development at this corner is completed and the Congleton Bypass is opened.

**Access within the Household Waste Site**

The site is extremely small and does not provide any spare bays to deposit incoming empty containers. This means that the site is closed to public access whilst the Carrier vehicles manoeuvre on site.
Consequently, public users have to queue in the narrow access lane and at busy times also along Davenport Lane and across adjacent entrances to residents' homes. This in turn blocks access and egress and restricts traffic in Davenport Lane.

When two or more Carrier Vehicles arrive in the same period of time this is even more aggravated and gives rise to safety issues and congestion.

There appears to be no Contractor scheduling programme to avoid Carrier Vehicles arrival and departure times.

**Public Safety**

**Vehicles access on site**

There is no control on the movement of private vehicles once on the site. The consequence is that cars often pulling trailers reverse in an uncontrolled haphazardly fashion. This gives a risk to vehicle collisions AND vehicles striking members of the public and operatives as they cross the site on foot to access the various waste containers.

**Public Access to containers**

Access to the waste containers is via metal steps which are in poor condition. These entail members of the public carrying heavy, large and awkward items such as furniture (arm chairs, settees, chests of drawers etc.), heavy bags of green waste and tree trunks etc. up the stairs and the recycling of domestic appliances, Cookers, refrigerators lawn mowers etc.

**Operational Issues**

The Site Operational Hours start at 08.00 hours each day and finish at times according to the time of year. The Contractor clearly has difficulty in controlling the times which Carrier vehicles arrive on site. Waste Containers Vehicles have frequently arrived as early as 07.10 hours and since the site is not manned at this time they have remained outside the gates – with engines running- and partly blocking Davenport Lane. One excuse being the local road conditions and traffic. On occasions, more than one vehicle has been in the queue awaiting for the site to open. Should the site open before 08.00 hours the Drivers proceed to unload empty and load full containers with all the associated noise.

On Sunday mornings, in particular, this is not appreciated by neighbours!

**Noise**

Until very recently a JCB has operated at Arclid and between sites. This has entailed the JCB travelling along the A534 and other roads and dangerously along the lanes to Arclid site. At Arclid site the JCB has been used to hammer waste – although this was contrary to the Cheshire East Contract and the approved safe use for the JCB. It is understood that the Health and Safety Executive have visited the site to review this practice. It is understood
that a breach of Statutory Safety Regulations could result in a vicarious prosecution of Cheshire East Council, ANSA and the Contractor HW Martins.

The noise generated by crushing waste was a significant disturbance to neighbours – especially those with children and unsociable work hours – and numerous complaints have been made to the Council. The only excuse given for the Hammering operations has been to save cost - at the risk of breaching the Environmental Licence conditions and disturbing the otherwise peaceful neighbourhood.

Noise is also generated by the breaking up and dismantling of metal items and others large items deposited for recycling and the reversing alarms fitted to Carrier vehicles.

The dropping of waste such as armchairs, metal containers, settees etc from the high walkway into a container creates an impact noise which disturbs neighbours.

**Environmental Damage**

Local residents have regularly complained that containers leaving the Waste Site are overladen and inadequately covered. This results in items of waste including wood, plastic, cardboard boxes and paper strewn along the Davenport Lane and presumably along the Main routes such as the A534. Not only causing damage to the environment but a possible cause of injury to walkers including the many children using Davenport Lane and also vehicle accidents.

Waste Carrier Vehicle regularly need to mount the grass verges in order to pass. There is also a proposal for Carrier Vehicles arriving before the Site Opening Hours to ‘park up’ in Davenport Lane. This would also entail them mounting the grass verges causing damage and obstructing the lanes to other wide vehicles and Farmers’ Tractors.

The JCB also caused damage to grass verges and environmental pollution on its three hourly travels between waste sites.

**Operational and Highways Risk Assessments**

Copies of the Contractor Operational Risk Assessments addressing the above issues have been requested via Freedom of Information Requests and at meetings but the lack of such documents appears to be a criminal breach of Safety Regulations!

Responses from Cheshire East appear to imply that the Council Highways Dept. are satisfied with the safety aspects of the continued operation of the Waste Site despite the many issues raised above.

It is also suspected, from the signage on a number of vehicles and local knowledge, that sole traders and commercial waste is also accepted at the Arclid Site.
Email response 010

Date received: 05/01/2016
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

As a resident of Brereton parish I wish to challenge all the options that have been put forward as they all involve the closure of the Davenport Lane site in Brereton; often referred to as the Arclid site.

Surely a reduction in hours to all sites would give a similar saving to shutting this site. These sites contribute to the good record of CEC recycling and with the closure of this site people will not be so careful about recycling as they can’t face driving miles to other sites and queuing for ages contributing to the already terrible pollution in the towns. The result is a large bill for extra staff to mop up fly tipping which will inevitably result if the site is closed. A rethink is needed before the knee jerk action re. closing the Davenport site valued by so many local people. Regards.

Email response 011

Date received: 18/12/2016
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

Sir,

As a local residents living in the Post Code area CW4 7QP my wife and I object most strongly to the proposed closure of the Arclid Waste Site.

In recent times the Council has reduced its waste collection service and, as a result of its incompetence in not having compiled an acceptable Local Plan in reasonable time, the Borough has been and still is being damaged by the unwanted, unnecessary and wanton development of the area by greedy developers and this is very true of Holmes Chapel. Looking at the catchment area of the Arclid Waste Site it can be seen that it includes amongst other areas Holmes Chapel, Brereton, Sandbach, Middlewich and Alsager. Each of these areas has been subjected to quite unreasoned over-development, both actual and planned, and so to even consider abolishing what is a much needed and useful waste site is utterly irresponsible. Through its failure to produce a Local Plan, the Council has played a significant role in helping to enlarge local communities most often against their will and so is culpable of creating more and more waste which fact demands the retention of the Arclid site.

The Arclid site is centrally located for a good portion of the Borough’s territory and in my experience is very well used. It is also fair to say that the site is well managed and a real convenience. Additionally, the closure of the site and the resultant need for local people to
use alternative sites would necessitate many extra road journeys that would cause further congestion to already congested roads which will in any case get worse, again because of the unwanted developments facilitated by the Council’s failure to prepare an acceptable Local Plan in reasonable time. All this extra traffic will result in the emission of more fumes that will damage the environment not to mention the populace. As part of the older generation we must also point out that to have to use waste sites other than Arclid would be at least an inconvenience not to say a problem.

We would have no objection to builders’ rubble etc being deposited at the site provided a charge was made for it. Nor would we object to materials being sold on site provided the value obtained was greater than that received from recycling.

Please note that I did refer to the consultation form on the Council’s website but did not complete it as I found the questions it posed were incomplete in that they did not cover all the important issues. Additionally, I object in the strongest possible terms to the document containing unnecessary, irrelevant, intrusive if not abusive questions about respondents’ sexual orientation, religion and origin. These questions have no place in the consultation and should be removed forthwith.

The standards and performance of the Council have not been impressive and there are surely other economies that could be made in order to preserve a valued, much needed and important local facility that serves many areas of the Borough and will increasingly do so in the years to come, not least for the owners of the new properties in the area for which the Council’s incompetence and failure are responsible. Yours etc.
The following email response was received from a member of the public, and was a general comment on the proposals.

Email response 012

Date received: 22/12/2016
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

Dear Cheshire East Council,

Really? How much fly tipping do you think this will cause? Plus car emissions, inconvenience to your paying public? Plus extra load on Bollington / Macc?

I pay my council tax and expect a level of service.

This is not it.

If this goes ahead, I expect a rebate on my council tax to cover my expenses.
The following 39 email responses were received from members of the public, and were all in opposition to the potential closure of the site at Poynton (the closure of which did not form part of the Council’s preferred option). These emails were received shortly after the printing of a newspaper article in Poynton Post (see article dated 22/12/2016 in Appendix 1) both in online and paper publications. The newspaper article, titled “Save Poynton Waste and Recycling Site”, urged readers to respond to the consultation and support keeping the Poynton site open. These responses are printed in date order (from most recently received to least).

Email response 013

Date received: 10/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

Sir,

Please count me in as an strong objector to the above recycling Depot being closed.

The elected Council MUST take into consideration the following points against such a closure:

1. Closure will undoubtedly lead to an increase in flytipping in the area and wider areas around- a peril for residents and wildlife alike let alone an eyesore in our beautiful landscape that no one at council seems to care about or even consider

2. The site is well used and therefore viable, with residents from neighbouring areas of Hazel Grove, Disley, Wilmslow and Handforth using the facility and there will be much future usage from thousands of residents in the new housing development at Woodford and planned housing developments in Wilmslow and Handforth. Where will all these families be supposed to dump all their unwanted items???

3. The fact that residents now and lots more in the future, (for this is an area of mass planned urbanisation), will be forced to travel long distances to dump their rubbish legally, often through traffic- contributing to even more traffic congestion and pollution - this would make a mockery of Cheshire East’s pledge to fight pollution!

I await developments with gloom and trepidation. Please remember that we the public have elected the council to work for us, not AGAINST us.

Poynton resident who cares about the environment

Email response 014

Date received: 10/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services  
From: A member of the public

I wish to add my voice to many others who are opposed to the closure of the waste and recycling site at Anson Road. I have used and continue to use the site on several occasions and have always found it very busy. To close it would be very short-sighted for the following reasons.

Proposed increase in local population.

More fly tipping.

More congestion and traffic pollution as people would have to travel further afield to dispose of rubbish.

Poynton.

Email response 015

Date received: 10/01/2017  
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services  
From: A member of the public

I have tried unsuccessfully this evening to add my comments regarding the possible closure of the Poynton waste and recycling site.

Perhaps the link to the survey was closed at end of office hours today.

My view is that the site is a valuable and much utilised asset, and if responsible habits are to be encouraged among the public, the more local a facility is the more they may be inclined to use it. This in turn sets the example for the next generation, who need the right attitude even more than we do!

Please keep our site open – many thanks for your consideration.

Poynton.

Email response 016

Date received: 10/01/2017  
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services  
From: A member of the public

Re.: Poynton HWRC.
I believe that it would be a big mistake to close the above site. It is constantly in use and would create continuous queuing at Bollington and Macclesfield sites.

Email response 017

Date received: 10/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

Dear sir/ madam,

I would strongly be against the closure if the recycling centre in Poynton. It is a very busy site, essential to the local community and its closure would I feel lead to a decrease in local recycling and an increase in rubbish and fly tipping in the area.

Thankyou, Poynton.

Email response 018

Date received: 10/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

Dear Sirs,

Please don’t close this site. The journey i will have to make from home SK12 1UT will become much longer, generating air pollution and carbon dioxide that is quite unnecessary and as a higher Poynton resident I am very concerned that the verges and car parks will become targets for fly-tipping which the Council will be challenged to control in these difficult times.

I mainly use the site in the winter time to compensate for the loss of the Green Bin Collection in the winter. I didn’t complain about that because i had the Recycling Site. Now that the noise about that has died down I’m worried that the Recycling Site is under threat and i’ll be dragging prunings and weeds to Bollington!

It does seem as if Poynton is being unfairly singled out because we are near a Council Boundary but we pay our taxes - quite a lot of them actually - and should have reasonable access to all the services we pay for. This is East Cheshire after all - not just Macclesfield.

Please also remember that Poynton is targetted for many new homes which will need services but also then have even more residents driving long distances to alternative facilities - by then the land will have been sold - probably built on - and it will be too late.

Finally as this is a key service has any consideration been given to making a small charge for heavy users and also getting a bit tougher on Trade waste and out of area waste being
sneaked in. Friends who live in other Council areas talk of having to have a C. tax bill or similar to prove entitlement. Also a casual observation suggests that there's a lot of stuff that arrives by car but in volumes and regularity that looks more like trade waste being slipped in. Perhaps a review of the CCTV tapes would be interesting.

Please keep our site and run it effectively for the benefit of all Tax-Payers.

Poynton.

Email response 019

Date received: 10/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

Dear Sir,

I am writing to object about the potential closing of the Poynton waste and recycling site at anson Rd. I have lived in Poynton for 35 years and find the anson Rd site one of the main services left in the community which provides a facility for all residents.

The cost cutting by Cheshire East is going a step too far with this ridiculous idea, the obvious backlash will be tipping rubbish in areas in Poynton where people won't want to see and this will cost to clear up, then you have impact on the environment and attract vermin. A series health and safety issue for the council.

There must be better ideas. What about the CEO wages bill??

Resident

Brookfield Avenue, Poynton.

Email response 020

Date received: 10/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

Dear Sirs,

We wholly protest about the proposed closure of this site as is a well used site and to have to travel to Bollington or Macclesfield is totally unacceptable. I have frequently made visits to this site as have my family and there are always people making use, we believe that should this be taken away then there would be more dumping/fly tipping putting extra strains on the already reduced rubbish collections and council services.
Regards.

Email response 021

Date received: 09/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

I was very surprised to read that the council intend to close the waste site on Anson Road.

From a personal point of view I use this site regularly particularly for garden rubbish & cardboard packaging. The amount of garden rubbish I produce and packaging I accumulate is far too great to fit into the bins and therefore the garden rubbish has to go to the waste tip and the packaging goes into recycling.

If I had to take it all to Bollington or Macclesfield it would be expensive & inconvenient. It would also increase pollution due to using my car for the longer journey as well as increasing my car maintenance costs which I can ill afford being a pensioner.

Apart from the personal view the above site has a good record of recycling which I would have thought offsets the cost of running the site.

If people have to travel further to get rid of their rubbish it is likely to encourage fly tipping and increase the councils cost of collecting and disposing of the same, quite apart from the unsightly mess and health hazards. It could also result in hidden dangers where rubbish has been tipped by the roadside on dark or unlit roads or lanes.

I hope you reconsider your illthought proposals.

Email response 022

Date received: 09/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

Dear Cheshire East,

The local tip (household recycling centre) is a valuable facility for any community and I would not advocate the loss of this service to anyone.

Just before Christmas I heard of this consultation and at the same time the national news reported that councils were to have a Christmas crackdown on fly tipping and the multi million pound cost that this creates.
Whilst I appreciate that Councils are under pressure financially this is one of those services that should be promoted and readily available to all, especially with the illegal tipping that takes place. I do not see that reduced hours and further levies will improve this situation and could probably make it worse. Just because other councils have taken this approach does not always make it the right one?

Something may be gained from allowing small traders rubble facilities at certain sites, but for local householders to be drawn into this and also penalised is excessive.

Cheshire East is a growing place and with the local plan for further residential development, these services need to be maintained as a necessity and not diminished.

I did see recently that the government were allowing you to increase your social care budget and include it in the forthcoming council tax increases. Hopefully this will ease some of the burden that you have to spread around?

You provide a good service at my centre in Poynton and throughout the borough and I would hope that you can continue to keep it this way?

Yours Faithfully, Poynton Resident.

---

**Email response 023**

**Date received:** 09/01/2017  
**To:** Cheshire East Council Customer Services  
**From:** A member of the public  

Re.: Poynton Waste Site.

The proposed closing makes no sense and I'd like to object in the strongest terms. It's a busy site all days of opening morning til night.

It encourages sustainable recycling and not just dumping things.

I'd love to see a business case that meets the same demands needed without considerable travel and inconvenience. Sadly the reality is people will fly tip if forced to troop miles with refuse.

Please be responsible as a council your aims are to promote recycling and sustainable living.

Best wishes, Poynton resident.

---

**Email response 024**

**Date received:** 09/01/2017  
**To:** Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

Dear Cheshire East Council,

I was very disappointed to read that the Waste and Recycling site on Anson Road, Poynton may be closing.

I, along with many other residents in Poynton, have gardens that back onto the Poynton inclines. We all have a huge amount of leaves to clear from our gardens every autumn.

Consider this picture. All these leaves being transported by carloads to either Bollington or Macclesfield. This is numerous car trips per household each year. And that is only leaves from the trees in the inclines (that blow into our gardens).

Email response 025

Date received: 09/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

The Poynton site is very well used not only by Poynton residents but also Wilmslow, Disley and Handforth residents. In the future there are plans to increase the number of houses in the Poynton area, which will undoubtedly lead to more waste in this area. As the nearest site will then be Bollington or Macclesfield this will lead to fly-tipping thereby costing the council far more to remove!

From Poynton resident.

Email response 026

Date received: 08/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

For the attention of Waste and Environmental Services,

I was surprised and disappointed to read recently in the Poynton Post (received Friday 6th January) your proposal to close the Poynton household waste and recycling site.

Considering the size of Poynton town, with a population double that of Bollington village, surely the Bollington site should be considered for closure first? After all, Bollington can then go to either Poynton or Macclesfield whilst Poynton residents would have to travel further.

If the household waste sites are losing money then surely reducing the opening hours is a more appropriate response - the hours currently on offer are far too generous, opening at
10.00 am for example or closing Mondays, which I presume after the weekend rush is a quiet day, are possible suggestions.

Another alternative is to consider selling licences to businesses to encourage profitable visits. When all said and done you already have to deal with metals, for example, which I presume is profitable, or green waste, or wood and timber?

Regards.

Email response 027

Date received: 08/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

Dear Sir,

Further to front page article in the Poynton Post, I am mailing to express my dismay about the possibility of the tip being closed.

As a Poynton resident, I use the tip about once per month. If closed, I would not know where to go, but I would expect that it would be a further distance to travel (more expense).

I hope the tip can remain open. Regards.

Email response 028

Date received: 08/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

Re.: Poynton sire. We would like to object to the above proposal as this site is extremely useful and always very busy when we go. The site is extremely well run and the staff are very efficient and helpful.

As new houses are going to be built in the area and are already under way on the old Woodford airfield the site can only become even busier with the prospect of flytipping, etc if it is not available. Having a local site also encourages everybody to recycle.

Please bear this in mind when considering this proposal.

Email response 029

Date received: 08/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

Sir:
We have just found out that Poynton waste site is being considered for closure. We wish to object to this on the grounds that we use it reasonably frequently (every 2 to 3 weeks in summer, less often in winter), and that its closure would necessitate our travelling to Bollington or Macclesfield or Hazel Grove. Whilst we would probably do this (at a cost to the environment in carbon emissions), it is highly probable that some would not, but merely ‘fly tip’ wherever convenient to them.

I have always found the staff at the site both courteous and helpful.

Regards

Poynton residents on Yew Tree Lane

Email response 030

Date received: 08/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

I wish to lodge my objections gearing the consideration to close the Anson road site.

This is a busy and well-used recycling and waste centre used by the increasing poynton population.

I envisage by closing this site you will inadvertently to encouraging increasing fly tipping. Many people will not want to travel to marple to get rid of their waste and recycling and I fear that fly tipping in higher poynton and middle wood will become a major issue.

The wood at middle wood...(middle wood road) is already used frequently to tip rubbish. Closing the anson road site will only serve to exacerbate the problem and ruin the natural countryside

A Middle wood resident.

Email response 031

Date received: 08/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

I, and my family, are residents of Poynton. I would like to register my families concerns at the possibility that you will close the local waste recycling facility.

My reasons for concern are as follows:

• Additional journey distance to alternative facilities bears an additional environmental impact of pollution
• Additional journey distance to alternative facilities bears an additional environmental impact of congestion.

• Additional vehicle miles use additional resources such as fuel.

• Additional load carrying vehicle journeys introduces additional risk to members of the public.

• Additional journey cost and time burden to all residents which may have the effect to encourage more people to stop recycling and use their household waste collections to dispose of recyclable materials as if they were recyclable.

• Reduced recycling effort by the residents of Poynton leading to more land fill.

• Potential for loss of this facility to lead to more fly tipping in the rural areas around the current waste facility post closure and surrounding greenbelt.

As a citizen, tax payer and as a person who cares about the area in which my family and i live I would like to be included in any official review of these facilities if at all possible.

With thanks and best regards.

Email response 032

Date received: 08/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

I understand that you are holding a public consultation on the future of waste and recycling sites and are considering closing the Poynton site on Anson Road.

I would like to register my strongest objections to this proposal. I have lived in Poynton for 25 years and use the site regularly. If it were closed I would have to travel to either Bollington or Macclesfield, which would not be practical. The waste site is always busy when I go and, with all the new homes that are proposed for the area it will get even busier.

I would ask you, therefore, not to close Poynton. Please register my objection.

Email response 033

Date received: 07/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

I am very surprised to learn that you are thinking of closing the Recycling site at Anson Road.

Considering all the new housing planned for Poynton, I think this would be a very short-sighted move, and will encourage more fly-tipping in the area.
It is a well-used site for all types of items, also we have no green bins emptied for nearly 3 months.

People just won't drive to sites outside the area.

Please think again.

A Poynton resident.

Email response 034

Date received: 07/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

To Whom it may concern: I have just read that Cheshire East Council is holding a public consultation on the future of its waste and recycling sites, and that they have considered closing the Poynton site on Anson Road. I would just like to add my concerns regarding any decision to close this site which is a valuable commodity not only for Poynton but for a large area surrounding the site. Having passed the site on many occasion whilst walking I have always found it to be busy with a flow of cars constantly going in and out to dispose of household rubbish (namely wood, old furniture, glass and broken furniture etc.). I myself have used the site on many occasions and would find it very difficult to go further afield to dispose of my household rubbish. Having walked around the area on a regular basis I have come across items of household rubbish not even reaching the tip and simply being dumped on vacant areas. If this is done when we have an available site, just imagine what will happen if we do not have the facilities of this very useful recycling site. More importantly is the fact that not only is the site serving the present population of Poynton and surrounding areas, but, as you are well aware, it has been estimated that over 900 new homes are to be built within this area. All of these homes will no doubt have household rubbish to dispose of and if they have to go further afield, if the Poynton site is closed, there is a great possibility that fly tipping will increase. Fly tippers are very difficult to catch unless of course you have a police force with the manpower to keep an eye on vacant areas, which we do not have. For these reason I would implore you to consider NOT closing the Poynton site.

Email response 035

Date received: 07/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

Dear Cheshire East Council,

Closure of the Poynton HWRC would be a major error by the Council, leading to:
- Increased fly tipping
- Additional traffic and pollution on the roads

Given the additional houses that are going to be built in the area, should the tip be closed now, it will build up a demand which will require a new tip to be opened at a later date, giving the council even more costs.

The way to approach cost savings is to limit the opening hours and make better use of the materials that can be recovered.

Yours etc.

**Email response 036**

**Date received:** 07/01/2017  
**To:** Cheshire East Council Customer Services  
**From:** A member of the public

Dear Cheshire East,

I wish to complain about the possibility of the closure of the site at Anson Road. In my experience of over forty years living in Poynton it has always been busy and it's closure would lead to damage to the environment in ways that I am sure that you will be familiar with, particularly traffic pollution which will place a further burden on the National Health Service. I would also stress that our bodies all come from the earth and continued contamination will lead to further ill health for future generations.

Kind Regards.

**Email response 037**

**Date received:** 07/01/2017  
**To:** Cheshire East Council Customer Services  
**From:** A member of the public

I am writing to express my concern at the possible closure of the waste management site in Poynton. I understand the consultation closes on 10 January.

The site is vital to the people of Poynton and the surrounding area. It would cause local people to travel further, which will increase pollution.

In addition, there could be an increase in fly tipping.

I As more homes are scheduled for building in the Poynton area, there will surely be a need for an increase in waste management facilities.

Please include this in the consultation feedback.
Dear Cheshire East Council,

As a resident of Poynton I am writing in support of the points put forward by the Poynton Post in respect of the proposed closure of the Anson Road recycling centre. The suggestion by the Council, however, that opening hours can be reduced to save money has validity and to that extent the facility could perhaps only be available say Friday, Saturday and Sunday, the busiest days. To close completely would be folly. We have recently been told by HMG that there are a number of ‘Garden Villages’ proposed throughout the UK, one of which will be alongside the A555 near Handforth Dean, this in addition to all the other development of 600 or so houses in Poynton itself and the 2000 at Woodford. How will these new properties be served, they will be contributing to the rates system the same as existing houses? This is an additional revenue stream that could be taken into account but appears to have been ignored.

For Poynton residents (and others) to travel to Macclesfield, a minimum 20 mile round journey, is totally prohibitive and in my view would encourage fly tipping at various out of sight places plus there would doubtless be a call for addition black and/or green bins to cater for waste that would otherwise be carried to Anson Road. Any reduction in the current 70% recycling rate (which could occur without the centre), would be ameliorated by an increase in the amount of waste which the Council had to collect on the two weekly rounds. My understanding is that there is an EU Directive concerning the recycling of waste which will increase the present percentage rates – surely this proposed closure will make it even more difficult for Cheshire East to meet new targets.

The site at Anson Road should be kept open with reduced hours and as proposed, a charge for rubble processing.

Yours sincerely.
The Poynton Post January edition informs me that there is a consultation open regarding closing the Anson Road, Higher Poynton site, and that residents will have to go to either Bollington or Macclesfield.

This seems a poorly thought out decision, as there are far more residents in Poynton than Bollington, and also serves Wilmslow and Handforth.

It would be an 8 mile return journey to Bollington, which would be the nearer of the two alternatives, but only a 6 mile return trip for Bollington residents to go to the Macclesfield facility.

I looked for the Consultation on the East Cheshire website, but could not find one.

Email response 040

Date received: 05/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

Re.: Poynton site. I regularly use this site and would find it difficult to travel to the alternatives suggested. This would also have the effect of increasing emissions of air pollution and carbon dioxide, not to mention extra petrol costs and wear and tear on vehicles. We are always being told to recycle but now you are proposing to close my local recycling point. Poynton has been allocated town status and the area is growing with new housing developments. Poynton needs its own recycling site, which is used on a regular basis by many residents. If this site is closed are Poynton residents getting extra grey and green bins to accommodate the extra waste that would be generated?

Email response 041

Date received: 05/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

Dear Sirs,

Following the announcement in the Poynton Post that Cheshire East Council is considering the closure of the above facility, I am writing to make my views known on this matter.

I consider this proposal to ill conceived and of no value to the residents of Poynton (I am a resident in the Village for in excess of 55 years) whatsoever.

This facility is much used and appreciated by the residents as a means of disposing of household waste and serves not only Poynton residents but also by those people of Disley, Wilmslow, Handforth and other close by villages and hamlets in the immediate vicinity.
The plans for development of building sites locally will result in additional use of the site in the future, which poses the question "where will these inhabitants dispose of their waste?"

One can see evidence of "fly-tipping" in and around the village and the closure of the "Tip" will only exacerbate this problem! Forcing the inhabitants of Poynton to travel further afield to dispose of household waste will only increase the effect of environmental pollution - emissions from vehicles, carbon dioxide, air pollution etc. all of which is contrary to the stated policy of Cheshire East Council pledge to reduce pollution [part of the manifesto for which the residents voted in the recent Council elections!!

My view and I am sure that of many of my fellow residents is that this proposal is ill considered, ill conceived and totally without merit, and I would therefore register my opposition to this proposal.

"Beware the sleeping Tiger" we [the inhabitants of Poynton] have long memories and the next round of Council elections will see a response which will be most unpopular with incumbents in office should this proposal proceed! I trust that you [the Council] will take due cognisance of this communication and remove this contentious piece of legislation from your Agenda.

Yours faithfully.

Email response 042

Date received: 05/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

I wish to protest at the proposed closure of Poynton Waste and recycling site on Anson Road, Poynton. Both my husband and I visit this site regularly, I would not like to have to drive to Bollington or Macclesfield to dispose of my waste as I live in Poynton. The staff there are always helpful and the site is the tidiest "tip" I have been to. It is always busy.

Regards, Mrs X.

We use this facility often, the staff are very helpful, it is always busy and always tidy. With the number of houses to be built in the Woodford area (600 in the next couple of years) this facility will be in great demand. The thought of clogging up the already overcrowded roads in the Bollington & Macclesfield area and the amount of air pollution of cars travelling from Hazel Grove, Disley (which have already lost their waste disposal facilities and rely on Poynton), the closing of the Poynton site would be a disaster for the area, both as an amenity, increasing road use, and increase in air pollution not to mention "fly tipping" etc. We very much want Poynton site to remain open as to close it would be a disaster.

Mr X.
Email response 043

Date received: 05/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

I strongly disagree with the proposal to close the Poynton Recycling Site.
Will cause difficulties for local residents and positively increase fly tipping.
More such sites should be opened not less.
Where is the common sense in local government!

Email response 044

Date received: 05/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

Dear Cheshire East Council,

Have just received Poynton Post newspaper I cannot for one minute believe that closing Poynton Waste and Recycling Site is a sensible idea. It is run so effeciently and pleasantly. There is no way I am travelling to Bollington or Macclesfield with a small car load of disposables. Quite right, the new housing estate at Poynton, Wilmslow and Handforth, residents will not put up with it.

We all do our bit now with wheelie bins and driving to Poynton. Unless of course you reduce the charge of Council Tax to reflect the fact that all have to do this ourselves.

You already have people abusing the wheelie bin system, you already have fly tippers, what do you think will happen if this Site closes. You are trying to take our facilities away from us, so it would seem to me that you will eventually receive the repercussions of such a silly idea.

Do you not think that recently Poynton has had enough upheavel, Shared Village works, that was a good idea and it works, then Mr O'Shea and his wagons on the Oil terminal on the SEMMS works, churns the roads up, we suffer burst tyres as a result of holes in the road and cannot make a claim-the round about at Southfield House is crumbling under this weight of traffic and road works are a nightmare.

We are willing to take are refuse to the Site at Poynton, but take it away and it will never get to where it should. I am willing to pay to have mine taken away, but as you have already mentioned, I will pay, it will end on the back of a flatback and fly tipped.

Where is the encouragement to be green and recycle?
Email response 045

Date received: 04/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

Sir/Madam,

I wish to place on record my objection to any plan that results in the closure of the Anson Road facility in Poynton. This site based on my experience is well used by local residents and closure will cause an increase in vehicle journeys on already overcrowded roads with the resultant increase in pollution. Closure could also increase the incidence of fly tipping in the area.

Email response 046

Date received: 04/01/2017
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

Hello,

As a resident of Poynton I am astounded at the proposal to close our waste and recycling site. We as a town our growing daily and as a consequence so will the need to retain Anson road recycling and waste site. To use Bollington seems ridiculous. Their tip is small and already very busy. It use will grow with the building of houses in process around the site, also many more houses that have evolved around Bollington. How can they possibly absorb all our waste, along with Disley, Wilmslow and Handforth's.

Our waste and recycling site is always busy, kept clean and efficiently run, who on earth suggested its closure?

I await your reply.

Regards.

Email response 047

Date received: 29/12/2016
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services
From: A member of the public

I understand that there is a consideration for the closing of the Poynton Refuse facility.

I wish to register my opinion that it would be a serious error for local residents to loose this facility and would generate mass fly tipping with the additional costs involved in trying to monitor it.
The site is a very efficient, tidy, useful and helpful operation and should be maintained "as is".

Local resident.

**Email response 048**

Date received: 29/12/2016  
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services  
From: A member of the public

I object to the proposed closure of the Poynton Recycling Centre

I live in Disley. I used to take recyclables that couldn't go in the grey bin to my nearest recycling centre in Hazel Grove but that closed.

So I accumulate them in the garage and when they are getting in the way, I take them to the Poynton centre e.g. metal objects, small and large electrical items, large batteries e.g. for golf trolley, wood.

I am certainly not going to drive to Macclesfield so I guess that they will have to go in the black bin. What other alternative will I have?

I also take gardening rubbish when there is more than will go in my green bin or when green bin collections have stopped like now.

**Email response 049**

Date received: 29/12/2016  
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services  
From: A member of the public

Dear Cheshire East Council,

I strongly oppose the closure of the Poynton Waste & Recycling Centre. It seems very strange to close such a much used site when there are proposals within Cheshire East particularly in the Poynton area to build a large number of houses. It will only encourage people to fly tip which will cost the Council money to remove also this will discourage people from recycling. It’s taken a long time to encourage people to dispose of their waste responsibly this is a backward step for recycling and the Council should think again at other ways to save money and not close a much needed resource.

Yours hopefully.

**Email response 050**

Date received: 28/12/2016
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services  
From: A member of the public  

Dear Cheshire East Council,

Please keep the Poynton tip open because you know as well as any sensible minded person IT MAKES SENSE!

Email response 051

Date received: 28/12/2016  
To: Cheshire East Council Customer Services  
From: A member of the public  

I am writing to express my complete disagreement to the suggestion that the waste and recycling point in Poynton should close. This is a very well used site and would cause immense problems to local residents if it were to close. The fact that it is used so well and is local ensures that we recycle responsibly in the area. Having to drive to Macclesfield etc is ridiculous as more petrol etc is used to get there and it could lead to people not bothering to recycle efficiently. It is important that we do this for the future.

Please do not close the tip in Poynton.
Appendix 3 – Consultation letter responses

The following letter response was received as part of the consultation from Alsager Town Council. The below image is an electronic version of the original letter.

ALSAGERS TOWN COUNCIL

5th January 2017
Waste and Environmental Commissioning
Floor 2 Municipal Buildings
Eagle Street
Crewe
CW1 2BJ

Re: Consultation on Household Waste Recycling Centre Pattern

At the meeting of the Town Council’s Planning, Environment and Community Committee held on Tuesday 13th December 2016, members considered the above consultation together with its closing date for responses of the 16th January 2017.

In consideration of the consultation members resolved the following

Minute 16/145

At the invitation of the Chairman the Acting Town Clerk referred to the ‘Consultation on Household Waste Recycling Centre Provision’ as received from Cheshire East Council Waste and Environmental Commissioning. The background to the consultation was outlined and the closing date for responses was noted as the 16th January 2017.

It was further explained that the consultation would also form part of the Cheshire East Council Pre-Budget Consultation 2017-20.

Members held the view that should the reduction of opening times and hours secure the necessary savings to keep the centre open then this is strongly preferred to closure.

Resolved: That, Cheshire East Council Waste and Environmental Commissioning be informed that Alsager Town Council expresses concerns at the reduction in opening times but acknowledges this course of action is strongly preferred to closure.

Yours sincerely,

D W Dingle
Acting Town Clerk

3 Lawton Road
Alsager
Cheshire
ST7 2AE

Tel: 01270 876440
Email: clerk@alsagertowncouncil.org.uk
Email: assistantclerk@alsagertowncouncil.org.uk
Email: admin@alsagertowncouncil.org.uk
Web: www.alsagertowncouncil.org.uk
Appendix 4 – Consultation social media posts

The following twitter posts were made regarding the consultation, up to the 16\textsuperscript{th} January 2017:

Patrick Ward @patrickwarduk · Jan 7
Consultation ends tomorrow on the closure of the Arclid Household Waste site. surveys.cheshireeast.gov.uk/s/HWRCConsulta... @SandbachChron @CongletonChron

Cheshire East Household Waste Recycling Centre C...
Please take the time to complete our survey. Your feedback is important.
surveys.cheshireeast.gov.uk

Northern Litterhouse @Litterhouse · 17h
Cheshire East Council is reviewing HWRCs. Consultants report gives the logic for making waste disposal harder.
cheshireeast.gov.uk/waste_and_recy...

Sandbach News @iSandbach · 22 Dec 2016
@Sandbach\_gov\_uk consider taking on responsibility for Arclid Tip, which @CheshireEast want to close. What exactly is @CheshireEast for?

Sandbach Chronicle @SandbachChron · Dec 15
#Sandbach Town Council to consider taking over under-threat #Arclid waste site
Disley Parish Counc. @DisleyPC - Dec 14
Cheshire East Council consultation on Household Waste Recycling Centres now open. Your views count. More info at:

Cheshire East Council Consultation on Waste Recy...
Consultation on Household Waste Recycling Centre provision Cheshire East Council has a full consultation of the borough’s household waste and recycling centres...
disleyparishcouncil.org.uk

Diane Noble @d1may - 13 Dec 2016
Have your say on the closure of Arclid Household waste site and reduced opening times cheshireeast.gov.uk/council_and_de...

Disley Parish Counc. @DisleyPC - Dec 6
Poynton Post @poyntonpost · 4 Dec 2016
Review of Household Waste and Recycling Centre provision by Cheshire East
poynton-post.co.uk/review-of-hous...

Sandbach News @iSandbach · Dec 4
@CheshireEast want to close Arclid Tip. Fight the proposed closure: respond to this consultation now! #Sandbach

Cheshire East Household Waste Recycling Centre C..
Please take the time to complete our survey. Your feedback is important.
surveys.cheshireeast.gov.uk

News and Views @BreretonLife · 25 Nov 2016
Arclid Household Waste Recycle Centre at risk of closure breretonlife.com/arclid-housheho...
And the following comments were made on Poynton Forum:

http://www.poyntonforum.co.uk/viewtopic.php?f=3&t=3410
## Appendix 5 – Respondent demographics

The following table gives numbers of survey respondents by various demographic types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responding as... Respondents could tick more than one</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Householder</td>
<td>2,227</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local business owner or small trader</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor / Clerk</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder who doesn't deposit waste</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total valid responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,246</strong></td>
<td><strong>103%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total valid responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,198</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 plus</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total valid responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,209</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White English / Welsh / Scottish / Northern Irish / Irish</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other white background</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: White and Black Caribbean / African / Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other mixed / Multiple background</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African / Caribbean / Black British</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnic group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total valid responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,152</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day to day activities limited</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day to day activities not limited</td>
<td>1,742</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total valid responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,161</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total valid responses</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual (straight)</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Lesbian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total valid responses</td>
<td>2,101</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of deprivation</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most deprived 20%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most deprived 20%</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid deprivation</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second least deprived 20%</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least deprived 20%</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total valid responses</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town or Rural Area</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alsager Town</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congleton Rural</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congleton Town</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe Rural</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe Town</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes Chapel Village</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutsford and Wilsmlow Rural</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutsford Town</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macclesfield Rural</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macclesfield Town and Bollington</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlewich Town</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nantwich Town</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poynton Rural</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poynton Town</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandbach Town</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmslow Town and Handforth</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total valid responses</td>
<td>2,029</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 6 – Survey results by respondent demographics**

The following table presents results for the consultation survey closed questions by different respondent demographics.

Please take care when interpreting these results, and treat any results based on less than 100 responses as indicative only. Results have been suppressed and replaced with asterisks (*) when less than 20 respondents of a particular demographic have answered any one question. Results given here may differ to results given elsewhere in the report due to rounding error.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Closure of Arclid site</th>
<th>Charging for disposal of rubble</th>
<th>Reduced opening hours at all sites</th>
<th>Opening sites to trade waste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. answering</td>
<td>% support</td>
<td>No. answering</td>
<td>% support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householders</td>
<td>2,122</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>2,173</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local business owner or small trader</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 plus</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White English / Welsh / Scottish / Northern Irish / Irish</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other white background</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: White and Black Caribbean / African / Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other mixed / Multiple background</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African / Caribbean / Black British</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnic group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day to day activities limited</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day to day activities not limited</td>
<td>1,664</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual (straight)</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Lesbian</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most deprived 20%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most deprived 20%</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid deprivation</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second least deprived 20%</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least deprived 20%</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alsager Town</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congleton Rural</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congleton Town</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe Rural</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe Town</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes Chapel Village</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutsford and Wilmslow Rural</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutsford Town</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macclesfield Rural</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macclesfield Town and Bollington</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlewich Town</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nantwich Town</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poynton Rural</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poynton Town</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandbach Town</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmslow Town and Handforth</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7 – A map of Towns and Rural Areas

The following map shows the boundaries of the Towns and Rural Areas in Cheshire East, as referred to within this report.