

Appendix 1: Public Consultation Results

High level analysis of consultation

Total number consultation responses	1318 (of which 57 received in hard copy)
Number of additional emailed responses	12
Total number free text responses (across each of the four questions 10a, 11a, 12a, 13)	2109
Percentage stating they do not support the proposal	94
Percentage stating Everleigh is the HRC they use	93
Percentage of respondents stating aged 65+	31
Percentage stating a disability	10
Percentage stating closure would constitute a minor rather than significant impact	65 (impacts were defined as 'minor' if 'It will cause an inconvenience as I will have to travel further to another site', or 'significant' if 'I will no longer be able to access an alternative site')
Percentage stating they visit an HRC weekly or more	27
Percentage stating they visit an HRC monthly or less frequently	73

In addition to members of the public, individual emailed responses outside of the consultation form were received from the following:

- Campaign for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE)
- Pewsey Parish council
- Alton Parish Council
- Amesbury Town Council
- Upavon Parish Council

Analysis of free text responses

The consultation questionnaire contained four such responses. These were:

- **10a** 'If you have said 'no' (to supporting the proposal), please state your reasons why'
- **11a** 'Do you have any comments to make on the other options included in the detailed background documents that the council currently considers not to be viable? If yes, what comments do you have?'
- **12a** 'If you have stated you will be significantly impacted by the closure of Everleigh, please explain why'
- **13** 'If you have stated you will be significantly impacted by the closure of Everleigh, do you have any suggestions the council could consider to reduce the impact on you?'

There has been no ranking of any responses. The results are presented objectively with no assumption that any one question is more important than another as each is asking something subtly different. Many respondents clearly elected to make the same comments across multiple questions which makes it potentially more useful to view total numbers across all four questions.

In addition there were several individual responses from organisations and individuals received outside of the consultation format, but included in this analysis.

Table showing split of responses by theme and question

Theme	Emailed responses	Q 10a	Q11a	Q12a	Q13	TOTALS
Fly-tipping	7	352	45	22	53	478
Environment/pollution	1	70	19	9	9	108
Council investment	4	64	58	25	203	354
Equality and access	0	25	5	29	12	71
Process and survey method	3	46	50	21	39	159
Convenience	3	378	49	262	30	721
Recycling not supported by council	2	34	11	2	19	68
Congestion	1	56	14	6	4	81
Miscellaneous	0	17	19	9	24	69

Consultation responses and council response

Theme	Number of comments (percentage of total)	Comment type	Council response
Fly-tipping	479 (23%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All responses highlight either a concern that fly tipping will increase should Everleigh close, or are comments that fly tipping has already increased since the range of materials able to be deposited at the site was reduced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fly tipping remains relatively low in Wiltshire with reports at a rate of 6.2 per thousand residents, compared with 15 nationally. There is little evidence that fly tipping is increasing in the Everleigh catchment area. Pewsey sees the fewest reports of all area boards in Wiltshire, with 13 between April and Aug 2018 (the latest month for which data is available at the time of drafting). Tidworth has the third fewest at 34. During 2018/19, to date, fly tip reports in Pewsey have dropped 55% or by 16 reports from 29 last year to 13 (April to end Aug). Reports in Tidworth are up marginally, 6% or 2 reports from 32 to 34, largely due to a high level of reports in August at 12 which represents 35% of this year's reports and is well above the previous 4 months average of 5.5. So, although data isn't yet available for a direct comparison with the period to October last year, the trend is suggestive of a drop in reported instances since the site was reconfigured to take a reduced range of materials.

<p>Environment and pollution</p>	<p>108 (5%)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern expressed that using more fuel to travel further to alternative sites, such as Marlborough or Devizes, will increase their carbon footprint and cause environmental harm. • Some limited concern that the soil at Everleigh is contaminated as a result of historical use, in particular the mass burial of cattle carcasses following the last BSE outbreak. Concerns are cited as evidence the land can't be used for any other purpose. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some impact here is acknowledged. The Council has to make difficult decisions in the face of continued financial pressures. The provision of HRCs will remain compliant with and in excess of both statutory requirements, as defined in Section 51 of the EPA, and WRAP Best Practice Guidance. Residents are encouraged to combine trips to the HRC with other journeys. • Whilst it is true there are carcasses buried under the site, these are not under the HRC, but in a separate part of the site away from publicly accessible areas under a segment of the former landfill site. The council does not have any proposals for alternative use of this site.
<p>Council investment</p>	<p>352 (17%)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local housing expansion, arising from, in particular, Army Rebasing, will require additional investment to keep pace with increased demand for such facilities and that now is not the right time to be making such decisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council remains confident that the alternative sites will be able to accommodate increased visitor numbers resulting from near-term housing growth. Army rebasing – the main pressure – is projected, for example, to add an additional 271 tonnes of materials annually. This will be spread over at least the three alternative sites, which are considered to have the necessary capacity to absorb this. This will of course be kept under review.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 35 responses stated closure would have a significant impact on personal finances with most stating they would be unable or unwilling to afford the additional fuel and associated wear and tear on their vehicles from travelling to one of the alternative sites.• Some 52 responses suggested the council should prioritise differently and manage its finances more efficiently. Suggestions included multiple references to member allowances, staff numbers, salaries and pensions.• The largest group of responses (in excess of 200) in this theme provided views on how the council should spend to fund waste disposal and recycling. There was little consensus here on what should be funded, and responses ranged from succinct 'invest more money and don't close the site' to more concrete proposals. These proposals fall into the following eight categories:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Whilst regrettable, the Council believes the alternative sites are within a reasonable travelling distance and that hardship should be minimal given that some 73% of respondents claim to visit an HRC only monthly or less frequently. These impacts would be further mitigated were residents to combine visits with other purposes such as shopping, for which travel to one of these towns may be required.• Noted. The Council's priorities are a function of the local and national democratic process with all such spend subject to transparency and scrutiny. This includes spend on staffing costs which are subject to periodic review.
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Just find the money to keep Everleigh open and restore former opening hours and the full range of recyclable materials. ○ Increase revenue by introducing a small charge per visit to help cover costs and allow the site to remain open (suggested fees ranged from £1 per visit to £3 per car and £6 per trailer) ○ Reintroduce mini recycling sites ○ Make skips available periodically in the local area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Council is required to make £22m savings in the current financial year. Increasing investment and ongoing operating costs are not viable options at this time. ● Currently waste legislation prohibits local authorities from making charges when residents wish to deposit household items at HRCs. The exception is in relation to a limited range of non-household items such as tyres and construction waste. The council plans to introduce charging for such items in the near future. ● The council ceased to provide these under the previous contract as the service was becoming non-viable and was also increasingly being provided by local supermarkets. There are no plans to reintroduce these. ● These were a feature of some parishes in the past under the previous two-tier system of local government in Wiltshire that ended in 2009. The risk is that non-household waste would be deposited leaving little benefit to households. Furthermore, there would be no sorting of materials hence no value could be extracted from recyclable materials deposited in this way. All the material would likely be deposited in landfill which would
--	--	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Open a local alternative site 7 days per week ○ Provide a council tax rebate for those impacted by the closure ○ Reduce opening hours at each of the other ten sites by one hour per day to fund Everleigh ○ Reduce fees for bulky items collected and/or garden waste collections 	<p>cost the council more money, and would have a more negative environmental impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There is currently at least one local alternative site (Amesbury, Marlborough, or Devizes) open every day. This isn't proposed to change. ● This is not considered practical or necessary given that this tax covers the provision of a wide range of public services. Despite having to travel a little further, all residents will still be able to access these facilities, regardless of where they live. ● It is acknowledged that these sites are busy currently. Reducing the opening hours will increase congestion and queueing times at these sites – a concern expressed by many completing this consultation. ● This is not considered practical or necessary. Were this implemented it would result in a need to find greater savings elsewhere and potentially risk other services given that the council budgets have been set and projected based upon certain levels of income from these services. It should be noted that the council only seeks to recover its reasonable costs of collection in the charges levied.
--	--	---	--

<p>Equality and Access</p>	<p>71 (3%)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main concern expressed in this theme is that the very elderly and those with disabilities and or medical conditions are unable to use an alternate site due to the need to climb a number of steps whilst carrying (often heavy) items. Of particular concern was garden waste where loads can be substantial. Here, Everleigh is contrasted with Amesbury, Marlborough, and Devizes, given that alternative sites require navigating steps where Everleigh has level access to this container. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wiltshire's HRCs (with the exception of the Salisbury and Everleigh sites) have always used steps in order to access some containers. However, the newly configured sites, now operated by FCC under contract to the council, also use steps to access containers provided for general waste and garden waste. The steps that have been installed are of an anti-slip design, and FCC have assured us they are successfully used elsewhere in the UK. They have also been fully risk assessed and are fitted with several key safety features including permanent handrails, fully enclosed sides on the upper platform and open grate floor plates which provide grip but allow water and debris to fall through to prevent puddles, ice and trip hazards. They are also subject to a daily inspection to ensure there are no faults or defects to the equipment. The face of the treads are solid with a high contrast (reflective) colour in order that each step can be clearly identified. Site staff are available in order to offer assistance to site users who need to get bulky or heavy items into the containers via the steps. The council will remind FCC as appropriate of the need to remind site staff to offer assistance proactively to users,
----------------------------	----------------	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some respondents have caring responsibilities and state they wouldn't be able to leave those in their care for the longer time periods entailed by use of an alternative site• Discrimination is claimed by a small number of respondents, against residents living in rural areas, given that the other sites are in urban and semi-urban locations.	<p>particularly anyone visibly struggling with heavy loads, and to provide further training where required. Members of the public are encouraged to ask for assistance if required, and if this isn't provided to inform the council who will raise the matter with the contractor on their behalf.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Residents in this position might consider exploring alternative arrangements such as combining journeys for different purposes so that, for example, when securing help to do the supermarket shop, they also visit the nearest HRC.• Economics dictate that the most economically viable sites are invariably going to be those that are well patronised. The rural location of the council's proposed closure is not a factor per se, but given the much lower surrounding population it is difficult to see how the current low usage rates – relative to other sites – could improve to any significant degree. This, coupled with the fact that further investment is need to restore this site so that it can receive the range of materials received by others, is the driver underpinning the proposal.
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A small minority (15) state that due to age or disability they are unable to drive long distances (or identify another means of travelling) meaning that none of the alternative sites would be reachable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even with the closure Wiltshire's site provision in relation to the population served will still compare favourably with a number of other councils in the south west of England, including, Hampshire, Cornwall, Swindon, and Bath & North East Somerset. Approximately 70% of respondents report travelling up to 5 miles now to their regular HRC (this being Everleigh for over 90% of those responding) whilst over half of those responding report a distance of 6-10 miles to their second choice site. This extra distance is not seen as excessive for a county the size of Wiltshire.
Process and survey method	157 (7%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of responses took issue with the lesser footfall as an argument for closing Everleigh, citing its rural nature and the expected lower number of visitors which simply reflects a difference between a rural site and an urban one. It was considered to be a spurious argument. • Question 12 was cited by some. It differentiates between 'minor' and 'significant' impacts on individuals of the proposed closure. Some respondents took issue with the label 'minor' in relation to the need to travel further stating it was 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The council notes this argument, but reaffirms its belief that site usage comparisons are a valid measure in seeking to reduce services in a way that impacts the least number of residents. • In its choice of wording the council did not mean to imply that travelling further (the definition of a minor impact) was in any way trivial for individuals so affected. The terminology was simply a way of attempting to differentiate between those who, despite the extra distance, could still access an

		<p>subjective and not a minor impact for them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consultation was stated to not be legally valid • Data and costings supplied by the council in the background information were stated to be inaccurate. Some stated they disbelieved all data supplied, others highlighted the rounding and noted they were 'convenient' and not suggestive of accurate quotations for the works cited. • It was suggested by many that the only reason visitor numbers have 	<p>alternative site, and those who would no longer be able.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This claim was made by Pewsey Community Area Partnership (PCAP), Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE), and Pewsey Parish Council (PPC) in a joint statement to the council's Cabinet on 12 June. The council's Monitoring Officer undertook to investigate, and has subsequently confirmed that the Council remains satisfied that the consultation process is lawful and does give the public the opportunity to comment properly on the proposal and that those comments will be taken into account before any final decision is made on the future of the Everleigh HRC. • Cost data provided is the most accurate available. In some cases budgetary estimates are provided where detailed costs are not available in advance of work commencing due to the nature of the works, for example, a drainage tank that is underground. Estimates have been provided by the council's contractor who has carried out the survey work. They are based on surveyor's recommendations and the council has no reason to doubt their validity. • This is not the case. The council only reduced the range of items that can be taken
--	--	---	--

		<p>declined is the council has, by design, reduced the range of items that can be accepted. Respondents have concluded the process is therefore biased as the council has worked to support a pre-determined outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some state that whilst visitors to Everleigh may be fewer in number, they do, on average, bring greater quantities and that this isn't reflected in the council supplied data. • De-commissioning costs are not included. Some state that if they had been the savings claimed from closing Everleigh would be less and weaken the case for closure. 	<p>to the site following a site condition survey prior to the handing over of the site from the outgoing contractor to the new one .This is a normal occurrence for sites such as this. In order to expressly avoid introducing bias and skewing the outcome the data presented on visitor numbers was all drawn from the period prior to the reduction in service, thereby creating a level playing field.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence that Everleigh has a higher than average total waste and diverted waste per visitor than average. However, this indicator of efficiency doesn't change the fundamental reality that without far greater footfall the economics are not going to support retaining this site at the expense of another. It's unlikely there is a sufficiently great local population base to grow usage to the same level as other sites. • If the decision is made to close Everleigh there will be minimal, if any, direct decommissioning costs. It is the case that the HRC is part of a larger site, including a closed landfill, and there is ongoing monitoring for hydrocarbons as part of the tests to establish water quality and the presence of any contaminants. This work is carried out in liaison with the Environment Agency who define the sampling required. This testing will need to be concluded as part
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number stated there was insufficient space against the free response questions for them to include all their comments. • Insufficient advertising of the consultation by the council to those residents not on-line. Parish 	<p>of the long-term decommissioning of the former landfill element. The HRC site will be made secure upon closure to the public.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was highlighted early in the process and the character limit increased to either 500 or 2000 (from 200 or 500), depending on the question, from 10 July – so, with nearly two months to run before the consultation close. Early analysis of those responses reaching character limits undertaken by the council showed that from 1,251 responses (the total received at that point) eight reached that limit for question 10a, while on Q11a seven from 1,251 reached that limit. • Respondents were also free to submit comments by other channels to the council at any time, with a number of people and parish and town councils electing to do so. Where submitted the comments have been added to the numbers reported and given equal weight to those recorded via the consultation portal. • The council has received one report that despite the number of characters being increased the respondent was not able to reply with more than four sentences. • This consultation was advertised in the same manner as previous consultations. The high response rate suggests a good level of awareness.
--	--	--	--

		<p>councils also not directly approached.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some confusion regarding comparative costs. In particular, whether the costs of renting space on trading estates is included in the running costs of sites. If not, given this cost doesn't apply to Everleigh it would skew the outcome. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This doesn't apply given that the sites are owned rather than rented – the majority by Wiltshire Council.
Convenience	721 (34%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This represents the most often cited reason for opposing the closure. To be included here the word 'convenient' was either mentioned directly (about half of responses) or was clearly implied due to the absence of any other reason eg 'it's my closest centre and I don't wish to use any others'. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst many expressed some frustration at the need to travel further, the council does provide three alternative sites within a ten mile radius (Marlborough, Devizes and Amesbury) thereby limiting the additional travel and journey time required.
Recycling not supported by council	65 (3%)	<p>Two types of response were recorded here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed closure demonstrates that the council is failing to support recycling, despite statements to the contrary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The council has supported and invested in recycling significantly in recent years. These investments include the provision of kerbside collections of plastic bottles and cardboard to all residents. This service has recently expanded with the commencement of new contracts to include a much wider range of mixed plastics that includes pots, tubs, and trays. However, in the face of reduced funding from central government council budgets are under pressure and difficult

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a consequence of closure I personally will recycle less. Some stated they will place more items in their residual bins, whilst several stated they will fly tip or consider doing so if the site is closed. 	<p>choices must be made. Services across the council are being prioritised to achieve a balanced budget whilst seeking to protect vital services, particularly those that protect vulnerable residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is considered low risk as residents will be limited in the quantity of recyclables that the residual bins can accommodate. It should also be noted that fly tipping is illegal and the council will adopt a zero tolerance approach to anyone caught disposing of waste in this way.
Congestion	81 (4%)	<p>Responses fell into 3 types here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is already too much road congestion when entering other sites, particularly Marlborough and Devizes. Closure of Everleigh will put added pressure on these sites Congestion will add more to travel times than simply looking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents are urged to plan journeys to avoid peak times where possible. Site opening hours span weekdays and weekends so this should be feasible. The council remains confident that the alternative sites will be able to accommodate increased visitor numbers resulting from closure of Everleigh which will be spread over at least the three alternative sites. These sites are considered to have the necessary capacity to absorb this. This will of course be kept under review. Residents are urged to consider the times they travel. Certain times would coincide

		at the difference in miles travelled would suggest.	with peak commuter traffic, whereas others would be much quieter.
Miscellaneous	70 (3%)	<p>Responses falling outside of the above themes included those set out below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff at other sites are less helpful than at Everleigh and not offering assistance to elderly people in particular when visibly struggling to navigate steps with heavy loads. Marlborough is singled out by a few respondents • A number were abusive in nature and included naming of individuals • Statements about disadvantaged hard working families paying council tax for ever diminishing services • Single word responses that cannot be interpreted or categorized • Calls to return the management of the site to the previous contractor, as, it is argued, the current situation clearly results from the change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contractor is regularly asked by the council to ensure reminders are issued to its staff and that training be made available as required. • Individual complaints are reported to the contractor for investigation. • The council is seeking to effectively manage diminishing funds for the benefit of those most in need of its services. • These merit no further comment • The proposal to close Everleigh is not a direct result of the change of contractor. The procurement process to select for a new contract when the original contract term ended was required to ensure compliance with procurement regulations. The need to make savings was identified before the survey work that identified the drainage and other issues. The survey outcomes simply added to the financial pressure the council is experiencing.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The belief that the drainage problems at Everleigh are a fabrication • Suggestion that volunteers are used in place of salaried staff to reduce operating costs – a comparison is made with the Library service. • ‘Hibernate’ the site rather than close so it can easily reopen when the funding situation improves • Council could seek an arrangement with Hampshire CC to enable those local residents impacted by a closure to use Andover HRC. • Cease the permit scheme as it’s encouraging more fly tipping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey results have been shared with the council who have no doubt as to their accuracy. • The situation here is a little different than with Libraries due to the clear health and safety risks associated with managing a range of materials and dealing with mechanical compaction equipment. Volunteers would have to be trained to the same standard as paid employees. This could prove costly if there was a large pool of such volunteers with a significant turnover. • It is unlikely that the financial situation will improve to allow this. However, it is possible that the site could be reactivated were circumstances to change. • Neighbouring councils were advised of the service changes, including the introduction of the proof of address checks to ensure the facilities operate for the benefit of Wiltshire council tax payers only. Whilst the council could pursue this, it would prove difficult to manage (for both councils) due to the difficulty in being able to identify those truly impacted and living within a pre-defined distance from the alternative site. It is unlikely that HCC would offer this without charge. • Fly tipping remains relatively low in Wiltshire with reports at a rate of 6.2 per thousand
--	--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proof of address checks are not working. The council needs to ensure that people with Wiltshire postcodes can enter even if 'Andover' is in the address line. 	<p>residents, compared with 15 nationally. Latest figures (April to August 2018) show that compared with the same period in 2017 the total number of reported fly tips in Wiltshire has fallen by 108 (from 1,336 to 1,228, or by 8%). It should also be noted that the majority of fly tipping is commercial waste in nature from illegal carriers which is not permitted at the HRCs in any event</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The council has provided details to the contractor of all residents with 'cross border' post codes that site staff can refer to if unsure in any given situation. Moreover, a copy of the Wiltshire Council Tax invoice will clearly demonstrate that the resident is a Wiltshire resident if there are issues with the 'Andover' address line.
--	--	---	---

Note: percentages have been rounded to nearest whole number.