

Shaping Surrey's Community Recycling Centres - Consultation Feedback Analysis

Summary report
January 2019

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

Contents

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1. Purpose of the report..... | 3 |
| 2. Executive summary..... | 3 |
| 3. Introduction..... | 6 |
| 4. Consultation summary..... | 6 |
| Appendix A: Consultation approach and overview..... | 9 |
| Appendix B: Quantitative analysis - responses to the consultation questionnaire..... | 10 |
| Appendix C: Qualitative analysis - feedback received to the consultation | 25 |
| Appendix D: Summary of feedback at Farnham drop in event..... | 33 |

1. Purpose of the report

- 1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the feedback submitted to the consultation, but not to make any recommendations as to how the council should make use of the results. Whilst this report brings together a wide range of information for the Council to consider, the report does not provide a single, public point of view on the proposed changes.
- 1.2. It is important to note that the responses to this consultation do not represent a statistically representative sample of the population of Surrey and consequently, findings should not be extrapolated and used to represent the wider population. Typically, consultations are not intended to be statistically representative of a population. Instead, they are a vehicle for those with a desire to contribute and voice their opinion to influence findings and contribute to the future direction of policy.
- 1.3. A consultation should be used to assist decision making so that the council can be informed of any issues, viewpoints, implications or options that might have been overlooked; re-evaluate matters already known; and review priorities. Nevertheless, a consultation is not a vote.

2. Executive summary

- 2.1. Surrey County Council (SCC) needs to find significant savings in 2019/20 to ensure that it's financially robust. This has meant the council has had to review the services that it does provide, and faces some difficult decisions on changes that it needs to make. One of these areas is the provision of community recycling centres (CRCs). With this in mind the Environment Service has been asked to propose measures, which would reduce the annual costs of managing waste at its CRCs. A programme of cost saving initiatives at CRCs have been introduced since 2015/16 which has so far delivered around £2.5 million of savings.
- 2.2. It has been identified that a further £1 million could be saved from the operation of the CRCs by introducing a number of proposed service changes. The project associated with these changes forms part of the council's wider transformation programme.
- 2.3. SCC have sought the views of residents and other stakeholders on these proposals via a public consultation that ran from Tuesday 30 October 2018 to Friday 4 January 2019. Consultation respondents were asked for their views on the following four proposals:
 - **Proposal one:** Permanently closing a number of smaller, less effective CRCs, whilst increasing the opening hours at some CRCs. The sites under consideration for closure were: Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking, Farnham, Lyne (Chertsey) and Warlingham.
 - **Proposal two:** Introducing a charge to dispose of construction wood and roofing felt.
 - **Proposal three:** Increasing the cost of disposing of items we already charge for.
 - **Proposal four:** Charging an annual application fee for van, pickup and trailer permits.
- 2.4. The consultation received a total of 12,132 responses including 12,097 from residents, and 35 responses from organisations/groups such as district & borough and parish & town councils.
- 2.5. Seven petitions were received concerning the proposed closure of Cranleigh, Dorking, Farnham, Lyne (Chertsey) and Warlingham CRCs. The details of these can be found in paragraph 4.3.
- 2.6. The results of the consultation can be found in **sections 4, appendix B, C and D** of this report. The headline results can be found in **Table 1** below:

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

Table 1 Headline results to the consultation

| Consultation subject | Result |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| CRC visits in the last 12 months | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two-thirds of respondents (66%) said they had used a CRC monthly or more in the last 12 months. |
| CRC sites used in the last 12 months | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than seven-tenths of respondents (72%) said they used one of the six CRCs that are proposed for closure in the last 12 months. One in four respondents (26%) said they used the CRC in Farnham. |
| Respondent location | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Almost one in four respondents (24%) said they were from the postcode areas GU9/GU10 – Farnham and surrounding areas. |
| <p>Proposal one: Permanently closing a number of smaller, less effective CRCs, whilst increasing the opening hours at some CRCs. The sites under consideration for closure are: Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking, Farnham, Lyne (Chertsey) and Warlingham.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than half of the respondents (54%) said they did not support option 1 to close the four smaller CRCs located at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking and Warlingham while increasing the opening hours at Camberley, Caterham and Leatherhead. When looking at just the respondents who told us they use or will use one of the CRCs proposed for closure in option 1 the percentage that did not support this proposal increased to 93% More than four-fifths of respondents (81%) said they did not support option 2 to close the six CRCs located at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking, Farnham, Lyne (Chertsey) and Warlingham while increasing the opening hours at the remaining nine CRCs. When looking at just the respondents who told us they use or will use one of the CRCs proposed for closure in option 2 the percentage that did not support this proposal increased to 95% Almost nine-tenths of respondents (88%) said they did not support option 3 to close the six CRCs located at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking, Farnham, Lyne (Chertsey) and Warlingham, and reduce the service at the remaining nine CRCs to five days a week during the winter period but increase their opening hours over the summer. When looking at just the respondents who told us they use or will use one of the CRCs proposed for closure in option 3 the percentage that did not support this proposal increased to 97%. |
| <p>Proposal two: Introducing a charge to dispose of construction wood and roofing felt.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than half of respondents (55%) said they either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal to charge for construction wood. When looking at just the respondents who told us they use or will use the charging scheme service the percentage that either disagreed or strongly disagreed increased to 65%. More than two-fifths of respondents (41%) said they either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal to charge for roofing felt. When looking at just the respondents who told us they use or will use the charging scheme service the percentage that either disagreed or strongly disagreed increased to 48%. |

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Proposal three: Increasing the cost of disposing of items we already charge for.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than half of respondents (51%) said they either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal to increase the cost of disposing items we already charge for in the charging waste scheme. When looking at just the respondents who told us they use or will use the charging scheme service the percentage that either disagreed or strongly disagreed increased to 59%. |
| <p>Proposal four: Charging an annual application fee for van, pickup and trailer permits.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exactly half of respondents (50%) said they either agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal to charge an annual application fee for a van permit. However, when looking at just the respondents who told us they use or will use the van permit scheme two-thirds of respondents (66%) told us that they either disagreed or strongly disagreed with this proposal. |
| <p>Suitability for making savings</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than seven-tenths of respondents (71%) felt that CRCs were not an appropriate area for the council to make savings by changing the service. • More than half of respondents (52%) felt savings should instead be made from other council services |
| <p>Key comments received via the questionnaire or by email and letter on the proposals.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A significant number of respondents in particular highlighted that any reduction to a CRC service especially permanently closing CRCs could increase journey times to the nearest alternative CRCs, increase traffic/congestion and have a negative impact on the environment including an increase in CO2 emissions, more bonfires, noise pollution and an increase in fly-tipping at an additional cost to council's and private landowners. • There is concern the proposals will make it difficult for residents to dispose of waste especially those with mobility issues, financial difficulties and/or not transport. It's also feared that the proposals could have a negative impact on recycling with more recyclable waste being thrown away in the kerbside black bin. • It's also felt that proposals to permanently close CRCs don't take into account future demand with projected population growth and new dwellings that are set to be built in Surrey the next 10 – 15 years. • A number of concerns were raised about the suitability and safety of roads to alternative CRCs should their site close. • Some current van permit users felt they were being unfairly treated because they didn't own a car. • Urged to fully consider the impact of DEFRA's recently published resources and waste strategy before a decision is made on closures. |

3. Introduction

- 3.1. Since 2015/16 the environment service have been delivering a programme of measures at Surrey's CRCs. Some of these changes have resulted in significant change at Surrey's CRCs, which has required the service to consult with the public and other stakeholders before plans were finalised.
- A public consultation was held from 15 July 2015 to 30 September 2015 in which 4,581 people responded to give their views. The council's Cabinet on 24 November 2015 agreed to a number of changes at CRCs, which were then implemented in April and September 2016
 - A second public consultation on further proposals to change the service was held from 23 June 2017 to 7 August 2017, in which 13,637 people responded to give their views. The council's Cabinet on 26 September 2017 agreed to a number of further changes at CRCs, which were then implemented in December 2017 and January 2018.
- 3.2. This programme of cost saving initiatives at CRCs has so far delivered around £2.5 million of savings. However, Surrey County Council (SCC) needs to save £85 million in 2019/20 to ensure that it's financially robust and can continue to deliver the best possible service to people that need them the most. This has meant the council has had to review the services that it does provide, and faces some difficult decisions on changes that it needs to make. One of these areas is the provision of community recycling centres (CRCs).
- 3.3. With this in mind the Environment Service has been asked to propose measures, which would reduce the annual costs of managing waste at its CRCs. It has been identified that a further £1 million could be saved from the operation of the CRCs by introducing a number of proposed service changes. The project associated with these changes forms part of the council's wider transformation programme.
- 3.4. SCC have sought the views of residents and other stakeholders on these proposals via a public consultation that ran from Tuesday 30 October 2018 to Friday 4 January 2019. Consultation respondents were asked for their views on the following four proposals:
- **Proposal one:** Permanently closing a number of smaller, less effective CRCs, whilst increasing the opening hours at some CRCs. The sites under consideration for closure were: Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking, Farnham, Lyne (Chertsey) and Warlingham.
 - **Proposal two:** Introducing a charge to dispose of construction wood and roofing felt.
 - **Proposal three:** Increasing the cost of disposing of items we already charge for.
 - **Proposal four:** Charging an annual application fee for van, pickup and trailer permits
- 3.5. The approach taken to prepare and deliver the consultation can be found in **Appendix A**.
- 3.6. The views submitted in the consultation will help inform the final recommendations that are put forward to the council's Cabinet for decision at the end of January 2019. Advance notice will be given to residents and stakeholders if there are any service changes as a result of the decisions made.

4. Consultation summary

- 4.1. The consultation received a total of 12,132 responses including 12,097 from residents, and 35 responses from organisations/groups such as district/borough and parish/town councils. **Table 2** below shows a breakdown of how responses were received.

Table 2: Responses to the consultation by format

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| Response type | Number of responses | Percentage of response |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| Online questionnaire | 11,895 | 98.05% |
| Paper questionnaire | 164 | 1.35% |
| Emails and letters from residents | 38 | 0.31% |
| Emails and letters from organisations/groups | 35 | 0.29% |
| Total | 12,132 | 100.00% |

- 4.2. The key findings from these consultation responses are summarised in **Table 1** in paragraph 2.6. The responses to consultation questionnaire can be found in **Appendix B**. The analysis of emails/letters from residents and other stakeholders can be found in **Appendix C** including the type of organisations/groups that have responded.
- 4.3. Seven petitions were received concerning the proposed closure of Cranleigh, Dorking, Farnham, Lyne (Chertsey) and Warlingham CRCs. These are summarised in **Table 3** below:

Table 3: Petitions summary

| Date petition closed | Petition statement | Lead petitioner | Number of signatures |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 07-Jan-19 | Save Lyne Recycling Centre | Sylvia Whyte | 8206 |
| 04-Jan-19 | Keep Cranleigh Community Recycling Centre open | Hannah Nicholson | 2147 |
| 06-Jan-19 | Keep open the Warlingham Community Recycling Centre | Charles Lister | 795 |
| 09-Jan-19 | Don't Dump the Dump (Farnham CRC) | Daniel Gee (Farnham Herald) | 424 |
| 04-Jan-19 | Oppose the proposed closure of Dorking Community Recycling Centre | Hazel Watson | 308 |
| 04-Jan-19 | Save Cranleigh Rubbish Dump | Annie Green | 101 |
| 04-Jan-19 | Oppose the proposed closure of Farnham Community recycling centre, | David Uffindell (St Andrews Church, Farnham) | 46 |

- 4.4. The six petitions in the table above that attracted 100 or more signatures will be heard alongside the final plan at Cabinet on Tuesday 29 January 2019. The petition from St Andrews Church did not receive the required number of signatures for it to be considered at Cabinet. The council is also aware of another petition on change.org concerning the closure of Farnham CRC, but at the time of writing this report it had not been formally submitted to the council.
- 4.5. The service attended drop in events in Surrey's district and borough offices where site closures were proposed. The purpose of these were to allow residents to come and pick up a copy of the questionnaire, fill out online using a laptop provided by the service and ask any questions that they didn't understand about the process which may have been preventing them from submitting a response. **Appendix A** gives the details of where these were held and an estimate of the number of people that were served. The drop in session in Farnham unintentionally turned into a public event due to the volume of people that attended. The intention was to never hold a public meeting and capture resident feedback. However, the service have provided a summary of feedback submitted at this drop in event in **Appendix D**.

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

4.6. During the consultation the contact centre received **130** telephone calls from residents.

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

Appendix A: Consultation approach and overview

This consultation was run under the “Have Your Say” campaign which joined up several different service consultations under one uniform approach. This campaign was developed and managed by corporate communication with input from a number of different departments within the council. Each consultation within the campaign was led specifically by the relevant service. The “Shaping Surrey’s Community Recycling Centres (CRCs)” consultation was led by the environment service and more specifically the waste team. Each consultation had its own questionnaire. The questionnaire for the CRC consultation contained an overview of the process, and asked respondents to give their view on the proposed changes as referred to in paragraph 2.3. The questionnaire also contained additional sections including free box section where respondents could give further comments, and monitoring data on respondents’ demographic information.

A dedicated webpage was setup for the “Have Your Say” campaign and with that there was a link to the all consultations including the CRC consultation. On this page consultation participants could find out more information and complete the online questionnaire. Paper copies of the questionnaire were also made available at CRCs, libraries, council offices and by calling SCC’s contact centre for one to be sent out direct to a resident’s address. The questionnaire was also made available in large print. The contact centre also offered mediated access to complete the questionnaire on someone’s behalf for those respondents that might require it, and if the questionnaire was required in any other format such as braille, a request could be put into the contact centre for consideration. Residents and stakeholders could also respond to the consultation by emailing wasteconsultation@surreycc.gov.uk or writing to the council.

Advance warning of the consultation was given to Suez staff and key stakeholders (organisations/groups/individuals who represent the interests of Surrey residents) such as Surrey members of parliament, county councillors, Surrey Waste Partnership (SWP), Joint Waste Solutions, and district and borough councils. A press release was also put out by SCC on the day of launch. The consultation was also promoted with banners, posters and leaflets at CRC sites, libraries and local council offices, on the SCC website, via social media posts from SCC accounts, other digital advertising, e-newsletters (Communicate, Issues Monitor and Surrey Matters) and via editorial copy which could be used in district and borough/parish newsletters. Local media outlets also ran stories on the consultation following the press release.

During the consultation a series of external or public facing stakeholders meetings were attended to discuss and promote the CRC consultation including:

- Local/Joint Committee Chairmen (29 October 2018), Mole Valley Local Committee (6 December) and Waverley Local Committee (14 December 2018)
- SWP Members Group (31 October 2018), SALC Autumn Conference (15 November 2018)
- Runnymede Borough Council (20 November 2018) and Waverley Borough Council (13 December 2018)
- Environment Select Committee (5 December 2018)
- Public drop ins: Camberley (21 November 2018), Staines (23 November), Leatherhead (30 November 2018), Caterham (10 December 2018), Godalming (12 December 2018) and Farnham (17 December 2018)

Each local committee and district and borough council potentially effected by proposals to close CRCs were asked if they wanted to meet with the environment service. As described above, the team attended drop in events, which were held in Surrey’s district and borough where site closures were proposed. The purpose of these were to allow residents to come and pick up a copy of the questionnaire, fill out online using a laptop provided by the service and ask any questions that they didn’t understand about the process which may have been preventing them from submitting a response. The sessions held in Camberley, Staines, Leatherhead and Caterham had very low attendance with roughly five people attending each one for the CRC consultation. The session held in Godalming attracted a few more people with about ten in attendance. The session held in Farnham unintentionally turned into a public event due to the volume of people that attended with roughly up to

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

100 people in attendance. The intention was to never hold a public meeting and capture resident feedback in this way. However, the service have provided a summary of feedback submitted at this drop in event in **Appendix D**.

Appendix B: Quantitative analysis - responses to the consultation questionnaire

This section of the report gives the quantitative analysis of the responses submitted to the consultation questionnaire. The comments submitted to other comments question 5c has been coded into themes and tallied. This analysis can be found in **Appendix C**.

The number of responses recorded for each question is reported throughout. As not all respondents answered every question, and some of the questions allow more than one answer, the numbers of responses to each question varies.

Where appropriate analysis has also been provided specifically to show a respondents who use a service and what their views are.

Question 1 a: Please estimate how often you have visited a CRC in the last 12 months.

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-------------------------------------|-------|---------|
| More than once a week | 411 | 3.41% |
| Weekly | 1575 | 13.06% |
| Fortnightly | 2341 | 19.41% |
| Monthly | 3640 | 30.18% |
| Every other month | 1781 | 14.77% |
| 3-4 times a year | 1747 | 14.49% |
| Twice a year | 334 | 2.77% |
| Once a year | 113 | 0.94% |
| I haven't used a CRC in that period | 113 | 0.94% |
| Not Answered | 4 | 0.03% |

Question 1 b: Which CRCs have you used in the last 12 months? (tick all that apply)

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-------------------|-------|---------|
| Bagshot | 791 | 6.56% |
| Camberley | 704 | 5.84% |
| Caterham | 359 | 2.98% |
| Cranleigh | 1085 | 9.00% |
| Dorking | 1514 | 12.55% |
| Earlswood | 500 | 4.15% |
| Epsom | 488 | 4.05% |
| Farnham | 3100 | 25.71% |
| Guildford | 766 | 6.35% |
| Leatherhead | 995 | 8.25% |
| Lyne (Chertsey) | 1551 | 12.86% |
| Shepperton | 728 | 6.04% |
| Warlingham | 592 | 4.91% |
| Witley | 800 | 6.63% |
| Woking | 785 | 6.51% |
| Don't know | 8 | 0.07% |
| Prefer not to say | 30 | 0.25% |
| Other | 261 | 2.16% |
| Not Answered | 110 | 0.91% |

Question 1 c: Do you plan to use any CRCs in Surrey in the next 12 months?

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-------------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 11629 | 96.43% |
| No | 166 | 1.38% |
| Don't Know | 251 | 2.08% |
| Prefer not to say | 9 | 0.07% |
| Not Answered | 4 | 0.03% |

Question 1 d: Which CRCs do you plan to use in the next 12 months? (tick all that apply)

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-------------------|-------|---------|
| Bagshot | 787 | 6.53% |
| Camberley | 601 | 4.98% |
| Caterham | 307 | 2.55% |
| Cranleigh | 1076 | 8.92% |
| Dorking | 1521 | 12.61% |
| Earlswood | 501 | 4.15% |
| Epsom | 491 | 4.07% |
| Farnham | 3099 | 25.70% |
| Guildford | 695 | 5.76% |
| Leatherhead | 873 | 7.24% |
| Lyne (Chertsey) | 1551 | 12.86% |
| Shepperton | 701 | 5.81% |
| Warlingham | 598 | 4.96% |
| Witley | 706 | 5.85% |
| Woking | 707 | 5.86% |
| Don't know | 54 | 0.45% |
| Prefer not to say | 20 | 0.17% |
| Other | 115 | 0.95% |
| Not Answered | 159 | 1.32% |

Question 2 a: Do you support option one to close the four smaller CRCs located at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking and Warlingham while increasing the opening hours at Camberley, Caterham and Leatherhead?

Answers from all respondents

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-------------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 4070 | 33.75% |
| No | 6548 | 54.30% |
| Don't know | 1255 | 10.41% |
| Prefer not to say | 182 | 1.51% |
| Not Answered | 4 | 0.03% |

Answers from just respondents who told us they have or will use one of the four CRCs proposed for closure

| Option | Total | Percent |
|--------|-------|---------|
|--------|-------|---------|

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|
| Yes | 219 | 5.50% |
| No | 3707 | 93.09% |
| Don't Know | 44 | 1.10% |
| Prefer not to say | 12 | 0.30% |

Question 2 b: Do you support option two where the council proposes to close the six CRCs located at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking, Farnham, Lyne (Chertsey) and Warlingham while increasing the opening hours at the remaining nine CRCs?

Answers from all respondents

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-------------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 1734 | 14.38% |
| No | 9731 | 80.69% |
| Don't know | 515 | 4.27% |
| Prefer not to say | 75 | 0.62% |
| Not Answered | 4 | 0.03% |

Answers from just respondents who told us they have or will use one of the six CRCs proposed for closure

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-------------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 295 | 3.42% |
| No | 8228 | 95.31% |
| Don't Know | 84 | 0.97% |
| Prefer not to say | 26 | 0.30% |

Question 2 c: Do you support option three where the council proposes to close the six CRCs located at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking, Farnham, Lyne (Chertsey) and Warlingham, and reduce the service at the remaining nine CRCs to five days a week during the winter period but increase their opening hours over the summer?

Answers from all respondents

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-------------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 943 | 7.82% |
| No | 10633 | 88.17% |
| Don't know | 405 | 3.36% |
| Prefer not to say | 74 | 0.61% |
| Not Answered | 4 | 0.03% |

Answers from just respondents who told us they have or will use one of the six CRCs proposed for closure

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-------------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 193 | 2.25% |
| No | 8321 | 96.85% |
| Don't Know | 52 | 0.61% |
| Prefer not to say | 26 | 0.30% |

Question 2 d: Considering options one, two and three outlined above, which involve the closure of specific CRCs, would you support the closure of any of these sites if it resulted in an enhancement of service (e.g. extended opening days / hours, extra staff, new facilities /

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis
 technology to speed up waiting times) at one of the nearest alternative sites? (please select a response for each CRC listed in the table below)

Bagshot (nearby CRCs that can still be used are Camberley or Woking)

Answers from all respondents

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| I would support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 3060 | 25.38% |
| I would not support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 3959 | 32.83% |
| Don't know | 1450 | 12.02% |
| Prefer not to say | 172 | 1.43% |
| No opinion | 3414 | 28.31% |
| Not Answered | 4 | 0.03% |

Answers from just respondents who told us they have or will use Bagshot CRC

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| I would support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 99 | 12.52% |
| I would not support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 676 | 85.46% |
| Don't know | 7 | 0.88% |
| Prefer not to say | 3 | 0.38% |
| No opinion | 6 | 0.76% |

Cranleigh (nearby CRCs that can still be used are Witley or Guildford)

Answers from all respondents

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| I would support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 2708 | 22.46% |
| I would not support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 4167 | 34.56% |
| Don't know | 1458 | 12.09% |
| Prefer not to say | 177 | 1.47% |
| No opinion | 3545 | 29.40% |
| Not Answered | 4 | 0.03% |

Answers from just respondents who told us they have or will use Cranleigh CRC

| Option | Total | Percent |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|
|---------------|--------------|----------------|

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|------|--------|
| I would support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 48 | 4.42% |
| I would not support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 1021 | 94.10% |
| Don't know | 5 | 0.46% |
| Prefer not to say | 6 | 0.55% |
| No opinion | 5 | 0.46% |

Dorking (nearby CRCs that can still be used are Earlswood or Leatherhead)

Answers from all respondents

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| I would support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 2715 | 22.51% |
| I would not support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 4357 | 36.13% |
| Don't know | 1474 | 12.22% |
| Prefer not to say | 160 | 1.33% |
| No opinion | 3349 | 27.77% |
| Not Answered | 4 | 0.03% |

Answers from just respondents who told us they have or will use Dorking CRC

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| I would support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 101 | 6.67% |
| I would not support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 1388 | 91.68% |
| Don't know | 11 | 0.73% |
| Prefer not to say | 3 | 0.20% |
| No opinion | 11 | 0.73% |

Farnham (nearby CRCs that can still be used are Camberley, Guildford or Witley)

Answers from all respondents

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| I would support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 1928 | 15.99% |
| I would not support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 5769 | 47.84% |
| Don't know | 1121 | 9.30% |
| Prefer not to say | 115 | 0.95% |
| No opinion | 3122 | 25.89% |
| Not Answered | 4 | 0.03% |

Answers from just respondents who told us they have or will use Farnham CRC

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| I would support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 72 | 2.32% |

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|------|--------|
| I would not support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 2989 | 96.42% |
| Don't know | 18 | 0.58% |
| Prefer not to say | 7 | 0.23% |
| No opinion | 14 | 0.45% |

Lyne (Chertsey) (nearby CRCs that can still be used are Shepperton or Woking)

Answers from all respondents

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------|---------|
| I would support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 2259 | 18.73% |
| I would not support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 4517 | 37.46% |
| Don't know | 1522 | 12.62% |
| Prefer not to say | 164 | 1.36% |
| No opinion | 3593 | 29.80% |
| Not Answered | 4 | 0.03% |

Answers from just respondents who told us they have or will use Lyne (Chertsey) CRC

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------|---------|
| I would support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 72 | 4.64% |
| I would not support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 1455 | 93.81% |
| Don't know | 8 | 0.52% |
| Prefer not to say | 8 | 0.52% |
| No opinion | 8 | 0.52% |

Warlingham (nearby CRC that can still be used Caterham and Earlswood)

Answers from all respondents

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------|---------|
| I would support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 2772 | 22.99% |
| I would not support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 3541 | 29.36% |
| Don't know | 1730 | 14.35% |
| Prefer not to say | 181 | 1.50% |
| No opinion | 3831 | 31.77% |
| Not Answered | 4 | 0.03% |

Answers from just respondents who told us they have or will use Warlingham CRC

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------|---------|
| I would support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 37 | 6.25% |

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----|--------|
| I would not support the closure of this CRC on this basis | 545 | 92.06% |
| Don't know | 3 | 0.51% |
| Prefer not to say | 2 | 0.34% |
| No opinion | 5 | 0.84% |

Question 3 a: Please estimate how often you have taken chargeable waste to a CRC in Surrey in the last 12 months.

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-----------------------|-------|---------|
| More than once a week | 22 | 0.18% |
| Weekly | 28 | 0.23% |
| Fortnightly | 49 | 0.41% |
| Monthly | 187 | 1.55% |
| Every other month | 190 | 1.58% |
| 3-4 times a year | 710 | 5.89% |
| Twice a year | 1054 | 8.74% |
| Once a year | 2167 | 17.97% |
| Never | 7648 | 63.42% |
| Not Answered | 4 | 0.03% |

Question 3 b: Please estimate how often you expect to take chargeable waste to a CRC in Surrey in the next 12 months.

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-----------------------|-------|---------|
| More than once a week | 15 | 0.12% |
| Weekly | 28 | 0.23% |
| Fortnightly | 43 | 0.36% |
| Monthly | 183 | 1.52% |
| Every other month | 204 | 1.69% |
| 3-4 times a year | 846 | 7.02% |
| Twice a year | 1407 | 11.67% |
| Once a year | 3444 | 28.56% |
| Never | 5885 | 48.80% |
| Not Answered | 4 | 0.03% |

Question 3 c: Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to increase the charges for all materials in the scheme?

Answers from all respondents

| Option | Total | Percent |
|----------------------------|-------|---------|
| Strongly agree | 559 | 4.64% |
| Agree | 2849 | 23.63% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 2518 | 20.88% |
| Disagree | 2388 | 19.80% |
| Strongly disagree | 3420 | 28.36% |
| Don't know | 321 | 2.66% |
| Not Answered | 4 | 0.03% |

Answers from just respondents who told us they have or will use the charging waste scheme service

| Option | Total | Percent |
|--------|-------|---------|
|--------|-------|---------|

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| | | |
|----------------------------|------|--------|
| Strongly agree | 161 | 3.65% |
| Agree | 926 | 21.01% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 699 | 15.86% |
| Disagree | 925 | 20.99% |
| Strongly disagree | 1666 | 37.80% |
| Don't know | 30 | 0.68% |

Question 3 d: Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to introduce a charge for construction wood?

Answers from all respondents

| Option | Total | Percent |
|----------------------------|-------|---------|
| Strongly agree | 480 | 3.98% |
| Agree | 2491 | 20.66% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 2128 | 17.65% |
| Disagree | 3152 | 26.14% |
| Strongly disagree | 3479 | 28.85% |
| Don't know | 325 | 2.70% |
| Not Answered | 4 | 0.03% |

Answers from just respondents who told us they have or will use the charging waste scheme service

| Option | Total | Percent |
|----------------------------|-------|---------|
| Strongly agree | 142 | 3.22% |
| Agree | 787 | 17.85% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 580 | 13.15% |
| Disagree | 1199 | 27.19% |
| Strongly disagree | 1659 | 37.62% |
| Don't know | 43 | 0.98% |

Question 3 e: Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to introduce a charge for roofing felt?

Answers from all respondents

| Option | Total | Percent |
|----------------------------|-------|---------|
| Strongly agree | 691 | 5.73% |
| Agree | 3596 | 29.82% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 2451 | 20.33% |
| Disagree | 2338 | 19.39% |
| Strongly disagree | 2581 | 21.40% |
| Don't know | 398 | 3.30% |
| Not Answered | 4 | 0.03% |

Answers from just respondents who told us they have or will use the charging waste scheme service

| Option | Total | Percent |
|----------------|-------|---------|
| Strongly agree | 220 | 4.99% |

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| | | |
|----------------------------|------|--------|
| Agree | 1247 | 28.30% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 767 | 17.40% |
| Disagree | 880 | 19.97% |
| Strongly disagree | 1221 | 27.71% |
| Don't know | 72 | 1.63% |

Question 4 a: Have you used a van, pickup or trailer to take materials to a CRC in Surrey in the last 12 months?

| Option | Total | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 1748 | 14.50% |
| No | 10248 | 84.98% |
| Don't know | 60 | 0.50% |
| Not Answered | 3 | 0.02% |

Question 4 b: Do you plan to use a van, pickup or trailer to take materials to a CRC in Surrey in the next 12 months?

| Option | Total | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 1648 | 13.67% |
| No | 9318 | 77.27% |
| Don't know | 1090 | 9.04% |
| Not Answered | 3 | 0.02% |

Question 4 c: Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to introduce an annual charge for van, pickup and trailer permits?

Answers from all respondents

| Option | Total | Percent |
|----------------------------|-------|---------|
| Strongly agree | 1439 | 11.93% |
| Agree | 4654 | 38.59% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 2432 | 20.17% |
| Disagree | 1404 | 11.64% |
| Strongly disagree | 1724 | 14.30% |
| Don't know | 403 | 3.34% |
| Not Answered | 3 | 0.02% |

Answers from just respondents who told us they have or will use the van permit scheme

| Option | Total | Percent |
|----------------------------|-------|---------|
| Strongly agree | 82 | 4.69% |
| Agree | 335 | 19.14% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 155 | 8.86% |

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| | | |
|-------------------|-----|--------|
| Disagree | 295 | 16.86% |
| Strongly disagree | 863 | 49.31% |
| Don't know | 20 | 1.14% |

Question 5 a: To what extent do you agree or disagree that this is an appropriate area for the county council to make savings?

| Option | Total | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Agree | 2577 | 21.37% |
| Disagree | 8539 | 70.81% |
| Don't know | 940 | 7.80% |
| Not Answered | 3 | 0.02% |

Question 5 b: To what extent do you agree or disagree that the savings should be made from other council services?

| Option | Total | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Agree | 6276 | 52.04% |
| Disagree | 2805 | 23.26% |
| Don't know | 2975 | 24.67% |
| Not Answered | 3 | 0.02% |

Question 5 c: Please give any other comments you have about the possible changes to CRCs. You may use this box to discuss any of the questions or topics in this consultation.

Please refer to **Appendix C** for a summary of the responses to this question.

Question 6 a : To better understand how you use CRCs it's useful for us to know the town or area you live in. To help us with this, please enter the first part of your postcode. For example, if your postcode is KT20 2EE please enter KT20. Or if your postcode is GU3 5LF please enter GU3.

| Post Code Area | Total | Percent | Post Code Area Description |
|----------------|-------|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| GU9 | 1774 | 15.65% | Farnham, Badshot Lea, Runfold |
| GU10 | 959 | 8.46% | Farnham, Churt, Frensham, Tilford, Tongham, Crondall, Wrecclesham, Rowledge, Ewshot, Runfold, Bucks Horn Oak, Dippenhall, Spreakley, Shortfield Common, Batt's Corner, Bentley, Charleshill, The Sands, Millbridge, Headley, Holt Pound, Rushmoor, Surrey, Dockenfield, Seale |
| GU6 | 664 | 5.86% | Cranleigh, Ewhurst, Alfold, Alfold Crossways, Ewhurst Green, |
| RH4 | 654 | 5.77% | Dorking, Brockham, Wotton, Westcott |
| TW20 | 628 | 5.54% | Egham, Englefield Green, Staines, Chertsey, Thorpe |
| RH5 | 376 | 3.32% | Capel, Ockley, Okewood, Walliswood, Forest Green, Newdigate |
| KT16 | 322 | 2.84% | Chertsey, Ottershaw, Addlestone, Chobham, Longcross, Lyne |
| CR6 | 302 | 2.66% | Warlingham, Farleigh, Hamsey Green, Chelsham |

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| | | | |
|------|-----|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| GU15 | 275 | 2.43% | Camberley |
| GU8 | 268 | 2.36% | Chiddingfold, Milford, Elstead, Dunsfold, Witley, Plaistow and Ifold, Shackelford, Hydestile, Hambledon, Hambledon, Pitch Place, Thursley, Bowlhead Green, Enton, Loxhill, Busbridge, Wormley, Sandhills, Brook, Peper Harow, Highstreet Green, Enton Green, Hascombe |
| TW18 | 206 | 1.82% | Staines-upon-Thames, Hythe End, Weybridge, Laleham, Stanwell |
| GU19 | 189 | 1.67% | Bagshot |
| GU7 | 180 | 1.59% | Godalming, Shalford, Eashing, Hurtmore |
| GU21 | 179 | 1.58% | Woking, Bisley, Brookwood, Chobham, Weybridge, Horsell, Knaphill, Sheerwater |
| CR3 | 179 | 1.58% | Woldingham, Woldingham Garden Village, Caterham, Whyteleafe, Kenley, Chaldon |
| GU25 | 179 | 1.58% | Virginia Water, Chobham, Lyne, Surrey, Stroude |
| KT15 | 176 | 1.55% | Addlestone, Woking, Weybridge, Chertsey, Ottershaw |
| RH3 | 174 | 1.53% | Brockham, Betchworth, Buckland |
| KT22 | 166 | 1.46% | Cobham, Oxshott, Fetcham, Leatherhead, Fetcham, Ashtead, Great Bookham |
| RH1 | 165 | 1.46% | Redhill, Merstham, Nutfield, Bletchingley, Salfords, South Nutfield, Whitebushes, Outwood |
| GU5 | 163 | 1.44% | Shere, Bramley, Gomshall, Shalford, Peaslake, Albury, Shamley Green, Wonersh, Farley Green, Stroud Common, Thorncombe Street, Palmers Cross, Grafham, Burrows Cross |
| GU20 | 163 | 1.44% | Windlesham, Bagshot, Chobham, Sunningdale, Winkfield Row |
| GU18 | 158 | 1.39% | Lightwater |
| GU24 | 133 | 1.17% | Woking, Chobham, Bisley, Pirbright, Brookwood, Donkey Town, Surrey, West End, Normandy, West End |
| GU16 | 132 | 1.16% | Aldershot, Deepcut, Lightwater, Frimley |
| GU22 | 127 | 1.12% | Woking, West Byfleet, Brookwood, Pyrford, Send, Mayford, Ripley |
| TW15 | 124 | 1.09% | Ashford, Weybridge |
| KT23 | 120 | 1.06% | Little Bookham, Great Bookham, Effingham |
| RH8 | 115 | 1.01% | Oxted, Limpsfield, Crowhurst Lane End, Tandridge, Titsey, Chart |
| GU12 | 109 | 0.96% | Aldershot, Ash Vale, Tongham, Ash, Normandy |
| TW16 | 101 | 0.89% | Sunbury-on-Thames, Feltham, Walton-on-Thames, Hampton, London |
| RH2 | 100 | 0.88% | Reigate, Reigate Heath, Sidlow, Buckland, Irons Bottom, Leigh |
| GU2 | 97 | 0.86% | Guildford |
| GU27 | 93 | 0.82% | Haslemere, Chiddingfold, Fernhurst, Easebourne, Grayswood, Linchmere, Kingsley Green, Henley, Easebourne |

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| | | | |
|---------|----|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| KT24 | 91 | 0.80% | Shere, East Horsley, Effingham, West Horsley, Ripley |
| Invalid | 86 | 0.77% | Invalid postcode entered |
| KT12 | 86 | 0.76% | Walton-on-Thames, Hersham, Weybridge, West Molesey, Molesey |
| GU1 | 81 | 0.71% | Guildford |
| KT10 | 81 | 0.71% | Esher, Claygate, Oxshott |
| KT19 | 81 | 0.71% | Epsom, Ewell |
| KT20 | 72 | 0.64% | Epsom, Banstead, Tadworth, Walton-on-the-Hill, Buckland, Pebble Coombe, Lower Kingswood, Box Hill, Mogador, The Hermitage |
| GU4 | 72 | 0.64% | Guildford, Woking, Shalford, West Clandon, Chilworth, Albury, West Horsley, East Clandon, Sutton Green, Jacobs Well, Blackheath |
| RH6 | 70 | 0.62% | Burstow, Charlwood, Horley, Crawley, Horne, Lowfield Heath, Norwood Hill, Hookwood, Tinsley Green, Shipley Bridge, Smallfield |
| KT21 | 68 | 0.60% | Ashtead, Epsom |
| KT18 | 66 | 0.58% | Headley, Epsom, Leatherhead, Ashtead, Langley Vale |
| KT17 | 65 | 0.57% | Epsom, Ewell, Banstead, Sutton |
| TW17 | 64 | 0.56% | Shepperton, Upper Halliford, Littleton, Spelthorne, Lower Halliford |
| KT11 | 59 | 0.52% | Cobham, Oxshott, Hersham, East Horsley, Great Bookham, Fetcham, Stoke d'Abernon, Downside, Martyr's Green, Ockham |
| KT13 | 56 | 0.49% | Weybridge, Addlestone |
| GU3 | 50 | 0.44% | Guildford, Normandy, Compton, Woking, Pirbright, Worplesdon, Puttenham, Fairlands, Wood Street Village, Wanborough, Artington |
| KT14 | 49 | 0.43% | West Byfleet, Byfleet, Woking, Weybridge |
| KT7 | 47 | 0.41% | Thames Ditton, Molesey, Esher, Long Ditton, Molesey |
| SM7 | 40 | 0.35% | Banstead |
| GU26 | 35 | 0.31% | Hindhead, Grayshott, Beacon Hill, Headley, Bramshott Common |
| RH9 | 32 | 0.28% | Godstone, South Godstone |
| KT8 | 28 | 0.25% | Molesey |
| KT4 | 23 | 0.20% | Worcester Park, London |
| GU23 | 21 | 0.19% | Guildford, Farnham, Cranleigh, Aldershot, Woking, Haslemere, Camberley |
| TW19 | 21 | 0.19% | Wraysbury, Horton, Stanwell, Old Windsor, Slough, London |
| TN16 | 19 | 0.17% | Biggin Hill, Tatsfield, Westerham, Toys Hill, Brasted, Berry's Green, Hawley's Corner, Hosey Hill, Brasted Chart, Force Green |
| SL5 | 18 | 0.16% | Ascot, Sunningdale, Windlesham, Chobham, Sunninghill, Winkfield Row, Chavey Down, South Ascot, Cheapside |
| RH7 | 13 | 0.11% | Dormansland, South Godstone, Lingfield, Felbridge, Newchapel, Felcourt, Crowhurst |

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| | | | |
|------|----|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| SM2 | 11 | 0.10% | Sutton, Belmont |
| KT6 | 11 | 0.10% | Surbiton, Tolworth, London |
| RH12 | 10 | 0.09% | Horsham, Rudgwick, Broadbridge Heath, Rusper, Faygate, Warnham, Ellen's Green, Clemsfold, Rowhook, Strood Green, Kingsfold, Holmbush, Lambs Green, Colgate |
| GU11 | 10 | 0.09% | Guildford, Aldershot, Farnham, Haslemere, Godalming, Woking |
| CR5 | 9 | 0.08% | Coulsdon, Chipstead, Banstead, Old Coulsdon, Hooley, Mugswell |
| GU17 | 7 | 0.06% | Guildford, Farnham, Cranleigh, Aldershot, Woking |
| CR2 | 4 | 0.04% | Croydon, Caterham, Mitcham, Warlingham |
| RH19 | 4 | 0.04% | East Grinstead |
| KT1 | 4 | 0.04% | Kingston upon Thames, Molesey, Hampton Wick, Molesey |
| GU52 | 4 | 0.04% | Church Crookham, Crookham Park |
| GU14 | 3 | 0.03% | Farnborough |
| KT2 | 2 | 0.02% | Kingston upon Thames, Coombe |
| RG4 | 1 | 0.01% | Caversham, Sonning, Sonning Common, Kidmore End, Sonning Eye, Dunsden Green, Mapledurham, Chazey Heath, Tokers Green, Chalkhouse Green, Cane End |
| GU34 | 1 | 0.01% | Guildford, Haslemere, Godalming |
| SW19 | 1 | 0.01% | Wimbledon, Mitcham |
| TW1 | 1 | 0.01% | Twickenham, St. Margarets, Strawberry Hill east |
| TN8 | 1 | 0.01% | Edenbridge, Hever, Chiddingstone, Dormansland, Cowden, Bough Beech, Crockham Hill, Four Elms, Chiddingstone Hoath, Holtye, Markbeece, Marsh Green, Cowden Pound, Chequers Hill, How Green, Horseshoe Green, Claydene |
| GU35 | 1 | 0.01% | Bordon, Headley, Headley Down, Lindford, Oakhanger, Kingsley, Arford, Whitehill |
| CR8 | 1 | 0.01% | Croydon, Caterham, Mitcham, Warlingham |
| KT9 | 1 | 0.01% | Chessington, Malden Rushett, Hook, Long Ditton |
| RM6 | 1 | 0.01% | Romford |
| SL4 | 1 | 0.01% | Windsor, Old Windsor, Eton, Eton Wick, Clewer, Dedworth, Cranbourne, Winkfield, Dorney, Spital, Oakley Green, Woodside, Boveney, part of Fifield |

Question 6 b: What is your gender?

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-------------------|-------|---------|
| Male | 6064 | 50.29% |
| Female | 5147 | 42.68% |
| Prefer not to say | 724 | 6.00% |
| Not Answered | 124 | 1.03% |

Question 6 c: What age group are you?

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-------------------|-------|---------|
| Under 18 | 5 | 0.04% |
| 18-24 | 55 | 0.46% |
| 25-44 | 2155 | 17.87% |
| 45-64 | 5431 | 45.04% |
| 65-74 | 2685 | 22.27% |
| Over 75 | 897 | 7.44% |
| Prefer not to say | 746 | 6.19% |
| Not Answered | 85 | 0.70% |

Question 6 d: Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted or is expected to last at least 12 months?

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-----------------------|-------|---------|
| Yes- limited a lot | 278 | 2.31% |
| Yes- limited a little | 1161 | 9.63% |
| No | 9648 | 80.01% |
| Prefer not to say | 854 | 7.08% |
| Not Answered | 118 | 0.98% |

Question 6 e: Do you look after, or give help or support to family members, friends, neighbours or others because of either: long- term physical or mental ill health/disability and/or problems related to old age?

| Option | Total | Percent |
|-----------------------------|-------|---------|
| No | 7996 | 66.31% |
| Yes 1-19 hours a week | 2102 | 17.43% |
| Yes 20-49 hours a week | 262 | 2.17% |
| Yes 50 or more hours a week | 332 | 2.75% |
| Prefer not to say | 1234 | 10.23% |
| Not Answered | 133 | 1.10% |

Question 6 f: Which of the following categories do you feel best describes your employment status?

| Option | Total | Percent |
|----------------------------------------------------|-------|---------|
| Full-time employment (30 hours or more per week) | 4248 | 35.23% |
| Part-time employment (less than 30 hours per week) | 1322 | 10.96% |
| Self-employed (full-time or part-time) | 1398 | 11.59% |
| Voluntary employment | 249 | 2.06% |

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|------|--------|
| Not employed | 169 | 1.40% |
| In full-time education (school college or university) | 36 | 0.30% |
| In part-time education (school college or university) | 13 | 0.11% |
| Homemaker | 477 | 3.96% |
| Not required to work due to a disability or illness | 85 | 0.70% |
| Retired | 3821 | 31.69% |
| Not Answered | 241 | 2.00% |

Question 6 g: Which of the following categories best describes your ethnicity

| Option | Total | Percent |
|----------------------------|-------|---------|
| White British | 9833 | 81.54% |
| White any other background | 447 | 3.71% |
| Black or Black British | 22 | 0.18% |
| Asian or Asian British | 92 | 0.76% |
| Mixed race | 45 | 0.37% |
| Gypsy Roma Traveller | 6 | 0.05% |
| Prefer not to say | 1262 | 10.47% |
| Other backgrounds | 97 | 0.80% |
| Not Answered | 255 | 2.11% |

Question 6 h: What is your religion?

| Option | Total | Percent |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------|---------|
| Christian (including all Christian denominations) | 5891 | 48.85% |
| Sikh | 17 | 0.14% |
| Buddhist | 27 | 0.22% |
| Hindu | 32 | 0.27% |
| Jewish | 36 | 0.30% |
| Muslim | 21 | 0.17% |
| No religion | 3237 | 26.84% |
| Prefer not to say | 2368 | 19.64% |
| Any other religion | 111 | 0.92% |
| Not Answered | 319 | 2.65% |

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

Appendix C: Qualitative analysis - feedback received to the consultation

Feedback received to question 5c in the consultation questionnaire, and the 38 responses received by letter or email from residents have been analysed together. Each comment received has been coded, tallied and grouped to the most appropriate theme of either “people”, “place” or “council” to provide a link to Surrey’s 2030 vision. Please see below:

| Coded comment | Count | Example comment | Grouped theme |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Any reduction to service especially closing a CRC will lead to an increase in fly-tipping | 6745 | If you close any CRCs, you must realize that there will be an increase in fly tipping. | Place |
| Proposals will cost the council and/or landowners more money win clearing up fly-tipping | 3589 | My biggest concern is that, whatever you say, any closures WILL lead to a big increase in fly tipping which is, in turn, cleared by the local authority at huge costs. | Council |
| Any reduction to service especially the proposal to close CRCs will have a negative impact on the environment e.g. increase air pollution/reduction in air quality from increased traffic movements, increase in bonfires, increase in noise etc. | 2955 | Burning some of the items in the garden may have to be our alternative also with the impact that has on the neighborhood. | Place |
| Proposal to close a CRC would have a negative impact on recycling rates/concerned about SCC's strategy with recycling | 2407 | I can understand that there is the potential for abuse of this system, however feel strongly that recycling should be encouraged rather than penalised. | Council |
| Disagrees with proposals to close CRCs | 1928 | I strongly disagree with the proposed closure of the Farnham CRC. | People |
| Proposal to close a CRC will increase journey times and distance, and make it more difficult for residents to reach alternative CRC | 1645 | The alternative is a 20 mile journey across Guildford (the traffic through which is a nightmare at the best of times!) which would take approximately 1.5 hours to complete. | People |
| Proposal to close a CRC would have a negative impact on local traffic and congestion levels | 1153 | Closing local facilities forces more traffic onto the roads, bigger queues at already busy alternative sites. | Place |
| Comments not directly relevant to this consultation | 637 | I think you should stop paying golden hellos and golden handshakes to senior staff, stop giving index linked over inflated pensions to retiring staff, and stop paying for ridiculous surveys like this | Council |

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| | | and just get on with your jobs like the rest of us. Being a council worker, spending OUR tax payers money like Labour did isn't the best use of these funds. You really need a proper business orientated management team who'll get rid of the dead wood and run a much leaner organisation properly. | |
| Proposals will make it more difficult for householders to dispose of waste | 624 | It is idiotic to make it more difficult / expensive to dispose of waste. | People |
| Proposal to close a CRC would make it difficult for residents who currently access their site on foot and/or have no means of transport to reach an alternative site. This will especially have a greater impact on older or disabled persons | 430 | Elderly people use the tip a lot and will find it difficult to travel to tips further away. | People |
| Reduce the opening hours of CRCs instead of permanently closing CRCs | 413 | I would prefer a solution where all of the CRCs remained open, but potentially with further reduced opening hours - especially in winter or weekdays. | Council |
| Consider different proposal not listed in the consultation | 389 | Can furniture be donated to charities who restore e.g. Meath, Epilepsy/furniture store Guildford Can staff work on improving dumped items for sale in quiet periods | Council |
| Proposal to close a CRC will lead to an increase in queues at nearby CRC which could raise health and safety concerns | 326 | We have been to the Camberley recycling centre near to closing time on a weekend day and the queue was practically to the mini roundabout on the main road. If surrounding centres are closed this will increase the queue and could have a knock on impact on traffic in the area. | Place |
| Requested that the recycling centre or facilities in the area be enhanced/improved | 323 | Improve recycling facilities, Improve way materials are sorted, Reduce the number of steps to climb to dispose of waste, The easier the CRCs are to use the more residents will use them | Council |
| Concern that proposals to change the charging waste scheme will lead to residents placing non domestic waste into residual waste stream via the kerbside collection | 316 | It is also probably self-defeating as instead of bringing waste for recycling people will now simply add this waste to the normal bin collection material and it will go to landfill. | Council |

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Proposal to close CRC doesn't consider new/proposed dwellings/projected population growth in the county | 314 | With Cranleigh bearing a huge increase in housing stock, now seems a ludicrous time to be considering closing the CRC as more families move in which in itself will bring vast quantities of rubbish as well as an increase in an ongoing need for recycling facilities. | Place |
| Disagrees with proposal to add more materials (wood and roofing felt) to the charging waste scheme | 291 | I do not believe that individual householders should be charged for taking small amounts of wood or roofing felt to a CRC | People |
| Disagrees with proposal to introduce an annual charge for the van permit scheme | 277 | I have one vehicle at my household and it is a pickup so not right to charge me a fee for a permit to get rid of household items. | People |
| Disagree with current van permit policy/unfairly penalises residents for having a van | 232 | I have a pick-up truck which is not a commercial vehicle. I am very disappointed that you will not allow me into my local centres, Cranleigh and Dorking, to dispose of household waste/recycling. | People |
| Disagrees with proposal to introduce a price increase for materials in the charging waste scheme | 173 | I therefore have a few doubts about the wisdom of increasing charges for various categories of waste from household building materials | People |
| Current CRC service is inadequate | 160 | The occasions that I have used the Amenity tip in Farnham have not been a good experience due to the amount of time spent queueing, the problem of carrying items across the car park and up the steps to the skips and the attitude of the staff. | Council |
| Introduce a charge for using a CRC | 159 | The obvious answer is to make a charge for all visits to the dump. If the alternative is to pay £75-100 to a private waste removal company then paying £5-10 to visit the dump makes sense. | Council |
| Consider changing another council run service | 139 | Surely savings could be made in leisure areas that would have less impact on the planet? | Council |
| Consider increasing council tax to keep CRC operations at current level | 118 | Remove all on site fees and add a general increase on council tax. | Council |
| Complaint about the consultation questionnaire or process | 105 | It is impossible to agree or disagree whether savings should be made from other council services without understanding what the detrimental effects would be. This question 5b is therefore asking people to give an opinion without having the facts, and should not be asked. | Council |

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Consider a different level of charge (charging waste and/or van permit scheme proposals) | 87 | Permits issued at various levels and cost ie from free upwards should be considered. | Council |
| Concerned about the safety or suitability of roads to alternative CRC should their site close e.g. potential to increase road accidents | 79 | Given the huge increase in housing planned for the Cranleigh and Dunsfold area, closing the Cranleigh CRC would be short-sighted and the logical road route to Witley is along single-tracked, poorly maintained roads | Place |
| Consider improving staff customer service at the CRCs | 66 | Maybe if the staff were more pleasant more people would use the recycling centres in Surrey more often. | Council |
| Asked to maintain current service as this is acceptable | 56 | Bagshot is our local CRC. It is well organised and meets all our needs. The staff are efficient and helpful. | Council |
| Introduce a trade waste service | 52 | More effort should be made to up-cycle materials. Timber, hardcore, useable plasterboard etc. could be sold from the site. | Council |
| Disagree with current charges for non-household waste | 50 | Charging those using vans with non-construction waste is a poor decision. | People |
| Agrees with proposal to introduce an annual charge for the van permit scheme | 47 | I think a small charge for vans/trailers would be reasonable: I looked into a van permit earlier in the year (which I actually never used) and was surprised to learn it was free. I would have been happy to pay | People |
| Agrees with proposal to close CRCs | 46 | If the CRCs named are not being used as much, close them. | People |
| Consider making changes to the reuse shop service including adding more shops | 45 | all CRCs should like Witley be able to sell articles on to the public. | Council |
| Agrees with proposal to add more materials (wood and roofing felt) to the charging waste scheme | 30 | I do feel that charging for certain types of material is the way forward | People |
| Kerbside collection service is poor/inadequate | 25 | the only reason i have to use a crc is because the collection does not collect everything on recycling day, even though the bags are clearly recycling, and the regular bin men, trawl through my rubbish looking for any excuse not to empty the bins. | Council |
| Agrees with proposal to introduce a price increase for materials in the charging waste scheme | 23 | Charging more for commercial waste is sensible. | People |

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| | | | |
| Concern that money has already been spent on upgrading/maintaining a CRC | 21 | SCC has wasted £millions on the unproven facility at Shepperton while making the site well nigh impossible to use in reasonable time to residents. | Council |
| Question how CRC staff will be used in the future if a CRC closes | 20 | If sites are closed, what will happen to the workers at these sites? | Council |
| Proposal to increase prices/charge for materials/charge for a van permit will have a financial impact on CRC users | 19 | I am one of the lucky ones that can drive (At the moment) even though I am disabled, but I do object extremely to travel any further than I have too due to cost of petrol being that I am also a pensioner. Quite often, when I am gardening weather permitting I take my gardening waste to Lyne as I cannot afford the garden waste collection, as that too should be a free collection scheme. | People |
| Requested that any decision regarding closures not be made until the full impact of the Government's resources and waste strategy is understood/ concern that closures may go against the strategy/ strategy should provide alternative options to closure | 18 | The government has just released a new waste and resource strategy for England. This should provide options for positive alternatives, rather than closing community recycling centres. | Council |
| Consider closing a different CRC than those listed in the consultation | 16 | You say close Bagshot for a better experience at another sit , better experience it's a tip , what a silly comment to make , again it's taking away something which people want. Why not close Camberly ? | Council |
| Expand non-Surrey resident enforcement to other CRCs | 13 | Hampshire are now charging for visits from outside the county. Surrey should do the same, particularly for those sites near county borders. | Council |
| What can or cannot be recycled is unclear | 6 | If you want to reduce fly tipping and encourage more recycling, then making it more difficult for people to dispose of rubbish is unlikely to help. You also need a more easily understood recycling policy. | Council |

The consultation received 33 responses from organisations, groups and elected members in the form of an email or letter. The type of organisations/groups who responded are summarised below.

| Type of group or organisation | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------|
| Village, Parish or Town Council | 18 |
| District and Borough Council | 9 |
| Resident group or association | 1 |

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----------|
| Conservation and amenity society | 1 |
| Faith group | 1 |
| Member of Parliament | 1 |
| County Council | 1 |
| Waste services organisation | 1 |
| Total | 33 |

The feedback received from organisations and groups has been coded, tallied and grouped to the most appropriate theme of either “people”, “place” or “council” to provide a link to Surrey’s 2030 vision. Please see below:

| Coded comment | Count | Grouped theme |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Any reduction to service especially closing a CRC will lead to an increase in fly-tipping | 27 | Place |
| Opposes the permanent closure of CRCs | 16 | People |
| Proposal to close a CRC would have a negative impact on local traffic an area that already suffers from congestion | 16 | Place |
| Any reduction to service especially the proposal to close CRCs will have a negative impact on the environment e.g. increase air pollution/reduction in air quality from increased traffic movements, increases in bonfires, increase in noise etc. | 12 | Place |
| Proposals will cost the council and/or landowners more money in clearing up fly-tipping | 10 | Council |
| Proposal to close a CRC will increase journey times and distance, and make it more difficult for residents to reach alternative CRC | 10 | People |
| Concerned about the safety or suitability of roads to alternative CRC e.g. potential to increase road accidents | 9 | Place |
| Complaint about the consultation questionnaire or process | 7 | Council |
| Concern that proposal to close CRC doesn’t consider new/proposed dwellings/projected population growth in the county | 5 | Place |
| CRC should not be closed until an alternative site is found | 4 | Council |
| Opposes proposal to increase prices or add further materials to the charging waste scheme | 4 | People |
| Proposal to close a CRC may only deliver a short term saving/ full costs of waste management need to be understood before a decision is made | 4 | Council |
| Proposal to close a CRC would have a negative impact on recycling rates/concerned about SCC's strategy with recycling | 4 | Council |
| Requested that any decision regarding closures not be made until the full impact of the Government's resources and waste strategy is understood/concern that closures may go against the strategy | 4 | Council |

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|---------|
| Concern that nearby CRC is an unsuitable alternative should a CRC close e.g. won't cope with additional demand, already a congested site, needs to close the public whilst containers are exchanged etc. | 3 | Place |
| Concern that proposals to change the charging waste scheme will lead to residents placing non domestic waste into residual waste stream via the kerbside collection | 3 | Council |
| Concern that residents won't be able to use CRC sites in neighbouring local authorities/ requested need for sensible discussions to maintain existing offer | 3 | People |
| Proposal to close a CRC will lead to an increase in queues at nearby CRC which could raise health and safety concerns | 3 | Place |
| Already working with the County Council to find a new CRC site | 2 | Council |
| A plan needs to be developed and more funding from SCC is required to tackle fly-tipping | 2 | Council |
| Comments not directly relevant to this consultation | 2 | Council |
| Opposes the proposal to introduce a charge in the van permit scheme | 2 | People |
| Proposal to close a CRC will increase heavy lorry movements on local roads i.e. more waste being transported from transfer station | 2 | Place |
| Requested that any changes are well communicated to residents and make use of lessons learned and provide residents with additional information on how they might dispose of their waste | 2 | Council |
| Requested that the recycling centre or facilities in the area be enhanced | 2 | Council |
| Requested that road safety assessment carried out to alternative CRC before a decision is made | 2 | Council |
| Suggestion to reduce opening days instead of permanently closing sites | 2 | Council |
| Supports introducing a fee for the administration of the van permit scheme | 2 | People |
| Waste collection services will be negatively impacted - increase in wait times to transfer station | 2 | Council |
| Additional charges in the charging waste scheme should only be setup to recover cost only | 1 | Council |
| Asked to maintain current service as this is working | 1 | Council |
| Concern about the future use of land/ need for a comprehensive plan | 1 | Council |
| Concern that money has already been spent on upgrading/maintaining a CRC | 1 | Council |
| Concern that there may be a reluctance to sign upto the van permit charge | 1 | People |
| Concerned about knock on effect to them if SCC charge for materials in the charging waste scheme | 1 | People |

Community Recycling Centres Consultation Feedback Analysis

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---------|
| District/Borough would be left with no CRC should site close | 1 | Place |
| Doesn't feel that its suitably placed to comment on the consultation proposals | 1 | Council |
| Introduce longer opening hours at the site to mitigate against additional demand | 1 | Council |
| Opposes proposal to reduce opening hours in the winter | 1 | People |
| Proposals breach the duty of the council to dispose of household waste | 1 | Council |
| Proposal to close a CRC would make it difficult for residents who currently access their site on foot/and or have no means of transport to reach an alternative site. This will especially have a greater impact on older or disabled persons | 1 | People |
| Proposal to close a CRC won't comply with WRAP 2012 good guidance | 1 | Council |
| Proposal to close a site may not give resident an option to adapt i.e. no suitable alternative | 1 | People |
| Proposal to introduce an administration charge for van permit users is unfair | 1 | People |
| Requested improvements to nearby CRC access should a site close | 1 | Council |
| Should consider closing only one local CRC in the options presented | 1 | Council |
| Supports increase to prices and adding materials to the charging waste scheme | 1 | People |
| Supports the proposal to close CRC as unlikely to have an impact on them | 1 | People |

Appendix D: Summary of feedback at Farnham drop in event

The main points raised by residents at the drop in event have been summarised below.

- Alternative sites at Witley, Guildford and Camberley are too far away and not convenient.
- Farnham as a major town should have its own CRC and demand will increase with additional homes planned.
- Many residents currently use sites in Hampshire and the demand on Surrey sites will increase when Hampshire start to charge Surrey residents. In fact the reduction in use of the Farnham CRC is because residents are using Hampshire sites in Aldershot and Bordon which offer a better customer experience.
- Fly tipping will increase if the Farnham site is closed and the cost of clearing up fly-tipping needs to be factored in to the cost analysis. There was concern about shunting the cost of clearing up fly tipping to Waverley BC and private landowners.
- There would be increased journey times, additional traffic on the road and increased pollution and CO2 emissions if residents have to travel to the alternative sites.
- The consultation has not been widely advertised.
- Closure of a valuable recycling facility gave the wrong message to people with regard to encouraging recycling, particularly school children.
- Closure of the CRC would lead to more bonfires with residents burning waste instead of visiting an alternative CRC.
- Kerbside collection service not adequate enough to fulfil residents waste disposal needs, and therefore still need a CRC in Farnham.
- SCC should look at other county council services including SCC staffing for savings.
- Concern about those on a low income and how they will dispose of their waste should Farnham CRC close.

There was a general feeling that SCC should be looking to improve or relocate the existing CRC to create a modern split-level site and dispense with the steps which are considered inconvenient and outdated.

There was a mixed view on the attitude of staff at the Farnham site, with some residents saying they were rude and unhelpful with others saying how helpful and nice they were.

There were some complaints about the organisation of the drop-in sessions, with some residents saying that they should have been held during evenings or weekends and set up as a public meeting.

A number of people said that the only visible services that they got from the council were waste collection and the recycling centre and couldn't see what else they got for their money.