



Local Service Delivery Committee (Macclesfield) Agenda

Date: Wednesday, 12th November, 2014
Time: 5.30 pm
Venue: The Tatton Room - Town Hall, Macclesfield SK10 1EA

1. **Appointment of Chairman**

To appoint a Chairman for the 2014/15 Municipal year.

2. **Appointment of Vice-chairman**

To appointment a Vice-chairman for the 2014/15 Municipal year.

3. **Apologies**

To receive apologies for absence.

4. **Declarations of Interest**

To provide an opportunity for Members and Officers to declare any disclosable pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests in any item on the agenda.

7. **Minutes of the Meeting Held on 23 January 2014** (Pages 1 - 4)

To approve the minutes as a correct record.

6. **Public Speaking Time/Open Session**

For requests for further information

Contact: Julie North
Tel: 01270 686460
Mail: julie.north@cheshireeast.gov.uk

In accordance with Procedure Rules Nos.11 and 35 a period of 10 minutes is allocated for members of the public to address the meeting on any matter relating to the work of the body in question. Individual members of the public may speak for up to 5 minutes but the Chairman or person presiding will decide how the period of time allocated for public speaking will be apportioned where there are a number of speakers. Members of the public are not required to give notice to use this facility. However, as a matter of courtesy, a period of 24 hours' notice is encouraged.

Members of the public wishing to ask a question at the meeting should provide at least three clear working days' notice in writing and should include the question with that notice. This will enable an informed answer to be given.

7. **Macclesfield Community Governance Review** (Pages 5 - 70)

The Community Governance Review Sub-Committee considered the attached report, at its meeting held on 7 October 2014 and agreed that the Macclesfield Local Service Delivery Committee be informally consulted on the outcome of the consultation for the Macclesfield Community Governance Review. The informal views of the Committee would then be reported to the next meeting of the Constitution Committee, to inform the decision making process.

The Committee's views are, therefore, sought on the attached report.

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the **Local Service Delivery Committee** **(Macclesfield)**

held on Thursday, 23rd January, 2014 at The Capesthorne Room - Town Hall,
Macclesfield SK10 1EA

PRESENT

Councillor L Jeuda (Chairman)

Councillors C Andrew, L Brown, S Carter, D Druce, K Edwards, M Hardy,
A Harewood, J Jackson, B Murphy and D Neilson

Apologies

Councillors L Roberts

36 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

37 PUBLIC SPEAKING TIME/OPEN SESSION

Mrs Liz Braithwaite sought clarification regarding what the Macclesfield Forum was, as referred to in the Proposed Role of an Enhanced Service Delivery Committee.

It was noted that this referred to the make it Macclesfield Forum, which was a local voluntary economic forum whose general principles were to look at the regeneration of the area. This would be clarified in the final documents relating to the proposed enhanced Service Delivery Committee and Assembly meetings.

38 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 26 NOVEMBER 2013

RESOLVED

That the minutes be approved as a correct record.

39 ALLOTMENTS

As agreed at the previous meeting of the Committee, consideration was given to the practical arrangements which might be made for the running of a local allotments service.

Agreed – That a small working group, comprising Cllrs K Edwards J Jackson and M Hardy, be established to work with officers to consider options for a more locally focused method of managing the allotments

service, to enable the Committee to consider any recommendations it wishes to make to Cabinet in respect of this matter.

40 ADDITIONAL ITEM OF URGENT BUSINESS - PROPOSED ROLE OF AN ENHANCED LOCAL SERVICE DELIVERY COMMITTEE

At the meeting of the Community Governance Review (Macclesfield) Sub-Committee (CGR Sub-Committee) on 16 January it had been resolved that this matter be referred to the Local Service Delivery Committee for consideration.

As the Local Service Delivery Committee meeting had already been convened, and in order to be able to report back to the CGR Sub-Committee at its next meeting, the Chairman had, in accordance with Section 100B (4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, agreed to allow consideration of this item as a matter of urgent business.

Consideration was given to a report requesting the Committee to give consideration to the proposed role of an Enhanced Local Service Delivery Committee and Assembly Meetings. In considering the report the Committee made the following comments and suggested amendments.

- Macclesfield Assembly – Amend to say no voting powers for non elected members, who should be invited to a general meeting and not be part of the decision making body. Suggested that the general meeting take place once a year, as an AGM.
- Consideration to be given to extending the period of notice for questions - 24 hours notice is not long enough.
- Add faith group representatives.
- make it clear that the forum is the “Make it Macclesfield – Macclesfield Economic Forum”

- Delete the word “principal “ from paragraph 3 of appendix A (page 4)
to reflect the legal advice

- Amend point 10 – appendix A (page 4) to reflect the legal advice re: management of assets.

- Amend point 1 – appendix A (page 4) to read “To investigate and monitor the delivery....”

- Consultation document – (page 14) – Under the paragraph on cost of SDC change the words “ ... may be met from part of the Council Tax ... to read “may be met from an additional tax ...”

- Make it clear in communication materials that a Town or Parish Council will not be the same as the former Macclesfield Borough Council

- Page 14 - Need to make the costs clear. Other areas of the Borough could claim that the cost of a Service Delivery Committee would be “double taxation” for Cheshire east residents outside of Macclesfield. The cost of the Service Delivery Committee may need to be met by a special expense levy. Financial advice would be sought on this point.
- Once the role of the Service Delivery Committee is clear, it will be necessary to explain the main differences between Parish Councils and a Service Delivery Committee – e.g. LSDC may just be advisory, whereas a Parish Council has powers to act. A mandate via a community governance review would be needed to proceed with establishing a Parish Council as it is a precepting body, whereas all the other options could be set up by a Council decision.
- In the draft leaflet , option 2 (page 13) – Take out the paragraph on the Local Area Partnership and change the order of the remaining paragraphs, so that “An Enhanced Service Delivery Committee” comes first, followed by the paragraph on the “Macclesfield Charter Trustees”.

Suggested additional powers and duties for an Enhanced Service Delivery Committee

- Traffic Management Issues (explore what is possible – e.g. comment on proposals / make recommendations) .
- To encourage the provision of leisure facilities (such as parks and play areas).
- Dealing with Grant Aid Applications.
- To consider formulation of schemes for progression utilising monies paid to the council as developer contributions under section 106 Town and Country planning Act 1990.
- To approve the allocation of street names for new developments or the alteration of existing names to avoid confusion.
- Liaise and consult with local people and the voluntary sector, in order to formulate a response to consultation exercises about strategic issues where the views of local communities are sought.
- To be responsible for making recommendations to the Council on matters that concern the local community and which have been referred to the area consultative group by the Council
- To investigate and then be responsible for making recommendations to cabinet in so far as they relate to the area on the following:
 - § Car parks
 - § Markets
 - § Community centres
 - § Leisure centres
 - § Parks

- § Allotments
- § Visitor centres
- § Toilets

- Receive presentations on key strategic initiatives likely to affect the district and local residents.
- Scope to hold an annual public forum on a topic chosen by the committee. Such a debate to include the suspension of formal council procedure rules to allow flexibility for extended public participation and comment.
- Representatives from relevant organisations be invited to attend committee meetings to provide updates on current performance / initiatives and to be questioned by the committee or members of the public.

RESOLVED

That the above comments be reported to the Community Governance Review Sub-committee, when considering this matter.

41 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

To be agreed.

The meeting commenced at 5.30 pm and concluded at 6.40 pm

Councillor L Jeuda (Chairman)

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

Community Governance Review Sub Committee

Date of Meeting: 7 October 2014
Report of: Head of Governance and Democratic Services
Subject/Title: Macclesfield Community Governance Review

1.0 Report Summary

- 1.1 The Macclesfield Community Governance Review commenced in June 2013 with the Community Governance Review Sub Committee leading the review under powers delegated to it by the Constitution Committee. This report provides Members with an outline of the process followed in respect of this Review. It is based upon statutory guidance: "Guidance on Community Governance Reviews" issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government and the Electoral Commission.
- 1.2 The first stage of consultation was conducted in June/ July 2013 and consisted of consultation with stakeholders and the public. The consultation focussed upon 7 different options (no change; Parish/ Town Council(s); Community Forums; Community Development Trusts; Neighbourhood Management; Residents' and Tenants' Organisations and Community Associations). Local organisations, (including businesses, political and religious organisations, and community groups) were contacted by letter and invited to express their views. 8 public meetings were held in each of the Borough wards, which were attended by 114 people out of a possible electorate of 39,750 (i.e. 0.3%). Publicity for the first stage of consultation included press releases to local press and media, a public notice in the Macclesfield Express, exhibition boards at the Town Hall and distribution of information on several days within the Grosvenor Centre. A consultation feedback form was made available in hard copy and electronic formats. Information was provided on the website and in various local newsletters. Flyers and public notices were widely distributed with assistance from local ward members, the Town Centre Manager and the Local Area Partnership Team.
- 1.3 92 responses to the stage 1 consultation were received (0.24% of the total electorate). Of these responses 68 expressed an opinion on the 7 proposed options. 44 people expressed a wish to see a Town Council; 10 people expressed a wish to see multiple parish councils; and 4 people wished to see no change.
- 1.4 On the basis of the feedback received from the Stage 1 consultation, the Sub Committee agreed that the second stage of consultation should be in respect of the options of Parishing, and an Enhanced Macclesfield Local Service Delivery Committee. The proposal for an Enhanced Local Service Delivery Committee stemmed from discussions at the various public meetings held

during the first stage of consultation. In terms of the option for Parishing, this was put forward for further consideration, as some level of support had been demonstrated for one or more parish councils to be created. The Sub Committee considered the communities and interests in Macclesfield, and subsequently agreed that electors in each ward should be given the opportunity to consider whether they wished to see a Single Parish / Town council created for the whole of Macclesfield, or a parish council based on their Borough Ward boundary; in addition to the option for an Enhanced Local Service Delivery Committee. This approach was endorsed by the Constitution Committee on 1 May 2014.

- 1.5 The second stage of consultation took place from 2 June to 28 July 2014.
- 1.6 A public notice was issued in the press at the start of the consultation period, and information about the Review was provided on the Council's website with a direct link from the front page. Copies of a more detailed 15 paged explanatory leaflet were also made available at Macclesfield Town Hall and at Macclesfield Library. A telephone point of contact was provided in the literature posted to all electors to assist with any queries. A4 notices to publicise the next stage of the Review were distributed locally with the assistance from the Town Centre Manager and copies were sent to local ward Councillors for their information.
- 1.7 All local government electors in the area, and all 16 and 17 year olds on the electoral register were sent a postal voting paper, and a four paged summary leaflet. Electors, and any person with an interest in the Review, were also able to submit written representations, by post or email during this period.
- 1.8 The results of the voting and representations received during this second stage of consultation are attached to this report (**Appendices A and B**). 6448 electors responded by returning their voting papers (16.15% of the electorate). 35 written representations were received.
- 1.9 The representations and feedback received from the Stage 1 Consultation were previously considered by the Sub Committee at meetings held on 15 August and 16 October 2013. A summary is attached (**Appendix C**). Copies of the individual representations received during the Stage 1 consultation are available for public inspection upon request. Copies are also deposited in the Members' Rooms at Westfields, Sandbach and at the Town Hall, Macclesfield.

2.0 Recommendation

- 2.1 The Sub Committee is requested to consider the feedback received from the consultation and to make a recommendation to the Constitution Committee regarding the next steps of the Review.

3.0 Reasons for Recommendations

3.1.1 The Review has now concluded two stages of public consultation and consideration now needs to be given to the next steps of the Review.

4.0 Wards Affected

4.1 Wards covering the unparished area of Macclesfield.

5.0 Local Ward Members

5.1 As Above.

6.0 Policy Implications

6.1 None identified.

7.0 Financial Implications

6.1 The cost associated with conducting the Community Governance Review will be required to be met from existing budgetary resources within Governance and Democratic Services.

7.0 Legal Implications

7.1 The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 ('the Act') devolves the power to take decisions about matters such as the creation of parishes and their electoral arrangements to local government and local communities.

7.2 The Act provides for a principal council (in this case, Cheshire East Council) to carry out a community governance review at any time, as well as providing for certain circumstances in which a review must be carried out. The Act further allows principal councils to determine the terms of reference of a community governance review.

7.3 The Act requires consultation with local government electors in the area under review and others whom appear to the principal council to have an interest in the review.

7.4 Statutory Guidance is available on community governance reviews and must be followed by principal councils.

7.5 Consultation has been undertaken in respect of this proposal. The general principles that must be followed when consulting are well established:

- The consultation must be at a time when proposals are still at a formative stage.
- Consultation documents must give sufficient reasons for any proposal to enable intelligent consideration and response.

- Adequate time must be given for consideration and response.
- The product of consultation must be conscientiously taken into account in finalising any proposals

8.2 Whilst the Committee will only make recommendations and is therefore not the decision maker it is nevertheless important that the Committee is aware of the consultation results and takes them into account when considering this matter.

8.0 Risk Management

8.1 The review has been conducted with due regard to the Government's Guidance on the conduct of Community Governance Reviews.

9.0 Background and Options

9.1.1 There is a statutory requirement to consult local government electors in the area under review as part of any Community Government Review conducted, together with others with an interest in the Review. The Sub Committee therefore agreed to consult all electors in the unparished area of Macclesfield, for the second stage of consultation, by sending out a voting paper, based upon the options explained above. As emphasised in the report to the Constitution Committee on 1 May, the results of the consultation with electors should be treated as an advisory poll. This is purely a means of consultation, which should be considered along side other views and opinions received and evidence collected, having regard to the statutory key criteria:

- that community governance in the area will be "reflective of the identities;

and

- that interests of the community in the area" and will be "effective and convenient".

9.2 Key considerations in meeting the criteria as part of the Community Governance Review include:

- The impact of community governance arrangements on community cohesion
- The size, population and boundaries of a local community Parishes should reflect distinctive and recognisable communities of interest with their own sense of identity
- The degree to which the proposals offer a sense of place and identity for all residents
- The ability to deliver quality services economically and efficiently providing users with a democratic voice
- The degree to which proposals would be viable in terms of a unit of local government providing at least some local services that are convenient, easy to reach and accessible to local people.

10.0 Access to Information

The background papers relating to this report can be inspected by contacting the report writer:

Name: Mrs Lindsey Parton

Designation: Registration Service and Business Manager

Tel No: 01270 686477

Email: lindsey.parton@cheshireeast.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Ward Name	Total Number of electors	Total Number Voting	Total % voting
Broken Cross and Upton	6,932	1156	16.68%
Central	6,529	853	13.06%
East	3,582	594	16.58%
Hurdsfield	3,487	478	13.71%
South	5,891	848	14.39%
Tytherington	7,149	1473	20.60%
West and Ivy	6,355	1046	16.46%
Total	39,925	6448	16.15%

Number Voted for LSD	% Voted for LSD
320	4.62%
185	2.83%
93	2.60%
94	2.70%
194	3.29%
329	4.60%
234	3.68%
1449	3.63%

Number Voted for Parishing	% Voted for Parishing
821	11.84%
658	10.08%
492	13.74%
376	10.78%
634	10.76%
1122	15.69%
804	12.65%
4907	12.29%

Number Voting for Town Council	% Voting for Town Council
578	8.34%
490	7.50%
380	10.61%
208	5.97%
503	8.54%
664	9.29%
606	9.54%
3429	8.59%

Number Voting for Parish by Ward	% Voting for Parish by Ward
243	3.51%
168	2.57%
112	3.13%
168	4.82%
131	2.22%
458	6.41%
198	3.12%
1478	3.70%

Number of Invalids (including Spoils)	% Invalids (including Spoils)
15	0.22%
10	0.15%
9	0.25%
8	0.23%
20	0.34%
22	0.31%
8	0.13%
92	0.23%

This page is intentionally left blank

MACCLESFIELD COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW Appendix B

STAGE 2 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

	Name	Comments on Options	No Change/ Maintain Status Quo	Single Town Council	Parish by Ward	Enhanced Local Service Delivery Committee
1	Andrew Wilson			✓		
2	John Knight			✓		
3	Peter Mannion	No view expressed				
4	Chris Differing		✓			
5	Tim Andrew		✓			
6	Richard Gamwell		✓			
7	Robert Hanson	Should seek to save costs				
8	David Hamer	No view expressed				
9	Liz Braithwaite	No view expressed				
10	Liz Braithwaite	No view expressed				
11	Liz Braithwaite	Complaint				
12	Liz Braithwaite	No View expressed				
13	Margaret Stone	General comments				
14	David Woolliscroft	Would support Town Council option as second preference but not an ELSDC			✓	
15	Jonathan Wilkinson		✓			
16	Peter Nash			✓		
17	Harry Hodgkinson		✓			
18	John Goodsall		✓			

	Name	Comments on Options	No Change/ Maintain Status Quo	Single Town Council	Parish by Ward	Enhanced Local Service Delivery Committee
19	Chris Foster		✓			
20	Ray Perry			✓		
21	Laura Jones	Supports a Town Council including "greater Macclesfield" e.g. Sutton / Langleley etc		✓		
22	Graham Childs			✓		
23	Macclesfield Civic Society			✓		
24	Rita Ledger		✓			
25	David Wood	General comments				
26	Louise Congdon	Opposes the creation of parish councils				
27	Richard Watson			✓		
28	Carol Bowers	Outcome should achieve efficient services				
29	B Denerly		✓			
30	S Walmsley		✓			
31	D Collorick		✓			
32	Calvin Beck	Macclesfield would benefit from Parishing			Parishing supported (Note: No hard copy attached)	✓
33	Denis Ridyard					
34	Letter to D Rutley MP from John Perkins		✓			
35	Letter to D Rutley MP from Malcolm Wright		✓			

Summary of 35 Responses received:

No Change/ Maintain Status Quo	-	13
Single Town Council	-	8
Parish by Ward	-	1
Parishing Supported	-	1
Creation of Parishes opposed	-	1
Enhanced LSDC	-	1
No view expressed on Options	-	10

PARTON, Lindsey

From: Andrew Wilson
Sent: 20 May 2014 21:30
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Macclesfield Governance

I look forward to your proposals and urge you to recommend "Parishing" with a single town council to cover the unparished area. Not only will this make us consistent with the rest of the county, it is undoubtedly what the vast majority of people want. "Surely it's obvious" they say.

yours
Andrew Wilson, Macclesfield

PARTON, Lindsey

From: John Knight
Sent: 23 June 2014 10:45
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Re: Macclesfield Community Governance Review

Sorry - I omitted my address earlier;

A Town Council for Macclesfield or a parish council for each ward?

Macclesfield is a recognised community - an ancient Cheshire borough, in fact. Residents by and large identify with the town itself, rather than with a local district - in fact, many areas of the town are not known by any name other than "Macclesfield".

While the town has a clear identity, with a recognised boundary, the same can not be said of its component wards. While Hurdsfield ward may largely correspond to a clearly-identified community, Tytherington ward includes large areas on the other side of the River Bollin, Broken Cross & Upton and West & Ivy each encompass at least two very disparate communities, while the rest (Central, South and East) are merely geographical divisions of the town itself.

Furthermore, wards change whenever a boundary review is needed to make allowances for shifting populations. So ward-based parishes would need to be reformed with every boundary review, which could mean some drastic changes if all the new housebuilding envisioned in the Local Plan goes ahead.

The town of Macclesfield needs a voice, which it has not had since 1974 (councillors from the town comprised only a minority on Macclesfield Borough Council, which also included Bollington, Poynton, Prestbury, Wilmslow & Knutsford, as well as many smaller communities). Matters such as town centre development and preserving the green belt concern the town as a whole.

The argument that smaller parish councils would mean a smaller precept (additional Council Tax) does not hold water; across Cheshire East, there is no correlation between population & precept. Crewe (with 36,000 electors) charges £28.86 and Wilmslow (19,088) charges £21.45, while Nantwich (11,453) charges a whopping £89.74, and Alderley Edge charges each of its 3693 electors £46.27.

Alternatively, Cheshire East Council is offering Macclesfield a "Enhanced Service Delivery Committee". When every other community in the borough has an elected local council to make decisions locally, and to represent them on important matters such as planning applications and highways, why should Macclesfield settle for less? Is our town not worthy of democracy? Could it be that Cheshire East Conservatives are worried that - like Crewe - Macclesfield may not give their party a majority?

John Knight
Convenor, Cheshire East Green Party
20 Fountain Street, Macclesfield SK10 1JN

PARTON, Lindsey

From: peter mannion
Sent: 07 July 2014 13:40
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: parish councils

I have just received a voting slip re the above. I once rang the town hall saying I would like to stand for mayor, oh only current councillors can stand i was told. Well would not the parish council just be the same people as are already councillors. why not say you can only sit on ONE council. and the Macclesfield Mayor can be one of the people of Macc not a councillor who might be from crewe.

Pete Mannion.

PARTON, Lindsey

From: chris differing
Sent: 07 July 2014 13:50
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: MACCLESFIELD COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

196 Oxford Road
Macclesfield
01625 43340

7th July 2014

Dear Sir/Madam,
RE : MACCLESFIELD COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

Whilst a fragmented (more parish councils) might, on the face of it, give more detailed representation to the various 'pockets' of Macclesfield, I would not be in favour of such a proposal.

1. Having lived in France for 12 years, it was apparent that the many 'communes' were constantly fighting for representation, and funding, resulting in, largely, in-fighting and subsequent inaction...
2. In light of 1. (above) the financial implications may not justify the generosity of the offer.
3. Macclesfield is hardly Greater London, so fragmenting feedback to Cheshire East Council would, in my opinion, only serve 'NIMBY' interests...and, not least, too many individual opinions/preferences at odds with mainstream views.

Please continue to maintain an overall, generalised, pragmatic view on Council matters, and reject any proposals for change for change's sake.

By the same token, you are to be congratulated on the current general appearance and integrated operations within Macclesfield as a whole; which also seems to negate the need for a single Parish Council to be introduced.

In light of all the above - please maintain the status quo.

Yours faithfully,

Chris Differing.

PARTON, Lindsey

From: Tim Andrew
Sent: 07 July 2014 17:45
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Macclesfield Community Governance Review

Dear Sirs,

I have today received and returned my voting form for the Macclesfield Community Governance Review. I did so with a complete lack of enthusiasm, as none of the three options reflected my wishes. This is sadly typical of the state of democracy in Britain at a local and national level: we are offered a limited range of options, none of which seem at all likely to address satisfactorily our main concerns. This has, in turn, led to the sense of detachment from the political process that is reflected in very low polling figures in local and national elections.

The three options offered in your Review will each cost more than current arrangements, but none will provide significantly increased local democracy in the most important areas. For me, as for many in Macclesfield, the major areas of concern are planning, traffic congestion and dangerously neglected roads, and the decline of the town centre. It is difficult to believe that any of the options in the Review would have significant impact in these areas: instead, we would be left at the mercy of Cheshire East, which has so far signally failed to impress.

Yours faithfully,

Timothy Andrew

278, Peter Street,
Macclesfield, SK11 8EX

PARTON, Lindsey

From: Richard Gamwell
Sent: 07 July 2014 21:09
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Macclesfield Community Governance Review - Voting paper for electors

Hi there!

Where's the "NO" or "NO CHANGE" vote option(s)??

As it is there is no choice, we get unwanted extra governance, in one form or other, at extra cost.

As I see it, if we do not vote it will not be counted, if we mark the paper No - it will not be counted - not very democratic.

Seems like only a few years ago we had a Borough of Macclesfield which was disbanded to form part of Cheshire East - based on this being the answer to all our local authority governance requirements and big was cost effective!

Why does an "existing" Macclesfield Local Service Delivery Committee need more money for the so called "enhanced" list of functions it "could" deliver - if it's not doing these now, what is it doing?

Or is this a cover for an increase in council tax by the back door to side step national government rules on council tax increases?

Looks like your out to wangle about a 5% council tax increase for no benefit to the locals.

You need to be reducing council tax not increasing it!

In your VOTE NOW! leaflet you ask three key questions:

It's NO, NO, NO, in my opinion, but no opportunity to say so!!!

What a waste - it all goes in the bin - contents of which presently get collected fortnightly - but for how much longer?

Regards.

PARTON, Lindsey

From: R Hanson
Sent: 08 July 2014 17:29
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Macclesfield Community Review

Sirs,

I have read with some interest the pamphlet on the above topic and would ask you to be a little clearer on the question of cost:

Under the two options put forward you advise of possible costs to residents of £5.52, £89.74, £25 or £19 plus £1.42 per year dependent of where the service was being performed and which of the two options was chosen.

What you do not clarify is the multiple of these sums. Is the charge per PTC, per household or per individual in the community?

As a retired qualified accountant with wide practical experience in the private sector both here and overseas I recommend that rather than entertaining schemes which will impose a greater financial burden on the ratepayer you should seek to save costs.

I await your reply.

Robert Hanson 01625 615691

Sent from my iPad

PARTON, Lindsey

From: PARTON, Lindsey
Sent: 09 July 2014 10:38
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: FW: Vote Now! ...What?

From: David Hamer
Sent: 08 July 2014 13:40
To: PARTON, Lindsey
Subject: Vote Now! ...What?

I spoke with one of your helpdesk operators this morning.

I was working at a client's house in Macclesfield yesterday, she showed me the mailing that she had had through and asked me if I knew anything about it? I scan read it and said no. She read it, said she couldn't make head nor tail of it, and put it to one side.

This morning I got the same mailing. I sat down, read it and came to a similar conclusion.

Can you advise me what previous presentation of information there has been on the subject of governance review, directly as an elector or otherwise in the press.

I am bemused that I should receive a complex leaflet with in some cases detailed information and jargon and in some areas vague 'arguments' without being aware of the governance issue previously.

Kind regards,

David Hamer
Managing Director
LNE Electrical and Plumbing Ltd

NAPIT Certified
Heat pump design and installation

<http://www.lneservices.co.uk>

tel 01625 261122 | mob 0788 1786278



PARTON, Lindsey

From: PARTON, Lindsey
Sent: 09 July 2014 10:38
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: FW: CHALC meetings

From: !
Sent: 08 July 2014 19:24
To: PARTON, Lindsey
Subject: CHALC meetings

Hi Lindsey,

Councillor Jackson advised me, when I contacted her about the Macclesfield Governance review, that there are open meetings on Wednesday 16th run by CHALC. I can't find any reference to these meetings on the Cheshire East website as of 19:00 on July 8th 2014, could you please advise as to where it is located? Also, given the short timescale before 'Stage 2 consultation' ends, could you give some prominence to these meetings, preferably on the 'Home' page but at the very least on the 'Consultation' page where the info about the faux vote is displayed.

Could you also treat this as feedback for the purposes of the review.

Regards, Liz Braithwaite 3 Drummers Keep SK11 8HH

PARTON, Lindsey

From: [redacted]
Sent: 09 July 2014 15:55
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Cc: JACKSON, Janet (Councillor)
Subject: Lack of information on open meetings for Local Governance

I wish to register three issues with the CHALC meetings that are to be held as part of Stage 2 consultation process for the Macclesfield Local Governance review.

1. There is no reference to the open meetings to be run by CHALC on July 16th on the Cheshire East website. This is not acceptable.
2. Of even more concern is that the desk staff at the council office do not have this information (I went in this morning)
3. The timing of the meetings is after the 'ballot' papers have been sent out, when all information/questions should be available before this in order that people can make an informed choice. I accept that the meetings are mentioned in today's Macc Express, again this is well after people have received 'ballot' papers, as I have said in previous feedback the paper has a relatively low circulation.

I will provide further feedback after the MiM meeting on Friday.

Regards, Liz Braithwaite (3 Drummers Keep SK11 8HH)

RECEIVED

18 JUL 2014

Customer Feedback Form

Name: LIZ BRATHWAITE

Address: 3 DRUMMERS KEEP
BARRACKS SQUARE
MACCLESFIELD SK11 8HH

Telephone Number:

Email Address:

Subject: LOCAL GOVERNANCE REVIEW

Is this a : Compliment Suggestion Complaint (Tick box)

Please give details of your compliment, suggestion or complaint:

CEC HAS NOT PUBLISHED DETAILS OF THE OPEN MEETINGS TO BE HELD ON JULY 16TH 2014 AS PART OF THE STAGE 2 CONSULTATION ON THE WEBSITE, NOR HAS IT PROVIDED MACCLESFIELD TOWN HALL STAFF (FRONT DESK) WITH THIS INFORMATION. THIS IS CONTRARY TO THE AIM OF ENCOURAGING FEEDBACK.
(CONTINUED ON SEPARATE SHEET)


How would you prefer to be contacted in relation to this matter:

Telephone Email In writing (Tick box)

Have you contacted the Council before on this matter: Yes No (Tick box)

Signature: *L Brathwaite*

Date: 16/7/2014



CUSTOMER COMPLAINT (CONTINUED)

Although the details have been published in the Macclesfield Express this is not an efficient or accurate way of communicating with those directly affected by the review. I.E. The Macclesfield Express has a weekly circulation of @10,000 (official figures from the abc Regional Publications circulation certificate)

The stated target area for sales extends beyond the areas directly affected by the review e.g. Bollington, Poynton, Prestbury etc. etc.

Using CEC's figures on electors per ward I estimate that the number of electors in the Macclesfield Express target area is

@ 71,400 (@ 31,000 of whom are outside the review area).

Therefore the chances of an elector buying a Macclesfield Express are < 1 in 7, with no way of knowing whether they live in ~~an~~ the area affected by the review.

I have raised this also by reviewing the ^{community governance} web page and had an email dated 10th July 2014 stating that the Web Team (Nikebi) would contact Lindsey (Panton) to ask for the information so that they could add it to the website. As of today this hasn't happened. I ~~also~~ also telephoned CHALC on Friday 11th July to ask why the meetings were not publicised on the CEC website, they were also going to contact CEC. There is nothing on CHALC's own website on this issue either.

The only time I have heard the meetings publicised was at the Mill business breakfast, again a small, untargetted audience.

In summary I feel that this is an unacceptable way to run a consultation, at best it is shoddy and at worst a deliberate attempt to withhold information.

I will be providing feedback on the review separately, this issue is about the open meetings.

Signed - E.Abrahamson 16th July 2014

PARTON, Lindsey

From:
Sent: 22 July 2014 23:12
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Feedback on Macclesfield Community Governance Review
Attachments: Feedback for Stage 2 Macclesfield Community Governance Review.docx

Please find attached feedback on the latest stage of the review. I also wish my complaint dated 16/7/2014, deposited at Macclesfield Town Hall, to be included as feedback.

Regards, Liz Braithwaite (3 Drummers Keep SK11 8HH)

Views on Stage 2 of the Macclesfield Community Governance Review.

From Liz Braithwaite 3 Drummers Keep Macclesfield SK11 8HH.

Please note that I have provided some email feedback already. I have also registered a complaint in writing, dated 16/7/2014 on a Customer Feedback Form, on the lack of publicity surrounding the CHALC open meetings and the failure of the review team to put the details on CEC's website despite requests from myself and CHALC. I wish this complaint to be included as feedback to the consultation.

Some of the views require an answer please.

So, where to start? I guess with the voting paper that to all intents and purposes looked like a vote on the final outcome. The accompanying literature did not mention anywhere that it was part of Stage 2 of the consultation. The summary of 'main differences between a Single Parish/Town council and 7 smaller parish councils' is biased in the extreme, particularly the last section on precepts that states that those of us living in the Town centre may effectively subsidise other areas. In my view this is an attempt to influence the outcome without concrete information to back up the statements made. In fact the whole leaflet is littered with 'it is likely', 'may', 'would most likely', 'could', 'potential to be able'. How can anyone make an informed decision on this basis?

Re. Option 2, the leaflet description of the role of the LSDC does not match that on CEC's website i.e.

To make representations to Cabinet and Council about the delivery of local services in the area and to monitor local services where a town or parish council acting under local devolution arrangements would have been expected to do so (but not otherwise).

Saying that you can enhance a committee that has only met once this year and has no further meetings scheduled is disingenuous. Also, as it cannot have assets transferred to it where will they be transferred to? (ref. the option on advising on preparatory measures for the devolution and transfer of assets). Minutes from the 26 Nov 2013 meeting show that unless the terms of reference for an ELSDC are guaranteed then being a council consultee on planning is impossible:

"30 PUBLIC SPEAKING TIME/OPEN SESSION

The Head of Governance and Democratic Services reported to the meeting that he had been informed of the intention of a member of the public to address the Committee upon concerns relating to the Local Plan.

In anticipation of this, he advised the Committee, and members of the public present at the meeting, that the terms of reference of the Committee did not permit it to formally deal with Local Plan matters.

He further advised that, whilst members of the public may have attended the meeting in anticipation of being able to speak about Local Plan issues, and whilst the Committee might be interested to hear what they might have to say, such

representations would not be formally recorded, nor would they be regarded as being submitted or made as part of the Local Plan process.”

Without any terms of reference for an ELSDC it is impossible to make an informed decision.

The voting papers arrived before any publicity and well before the aforementioned CHALC open meetings. The timing of the open meetings was at the request of CEC, according to the CHALC presenter. The lack of publicity (even the Town Hall staff knew nothing about them) is not conducive to an effective consultation and could be viewed as an attempt to discourage participation. Compare this to the presentation that CEC officers gave to the Make it Macclesfield business breakfast, where the attendees were given a less than complete version of Stage 1 of the consultation, and were positively encouraged to give feedback. Given that CEC has a relationship with MiM I question whether this is ethical?

The voting paper itself was confusing, you ignored previous feedback on how to simplify it into a single question vote.

I

PARTON, Lindsey

From: Margaret Stone
Sent: 13 July 2014 11:21
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Review 2014

Hello

I have lived in Macclesfield for two years only so am still a newcomer but I am interested in what happens here.

In my view there are two main issues, 1 cars and parking and 2 street cleaning, bins etc.

I really approve of the double yellow lines on Prestbury Road near the Crematorium as there was always a blockage there and the traffic now flows freely but the whole issue of parking needs to be addressed especially with so much on road parking. The terrace house is a good unit but has the draw back of parking. In Abram, Wigan, they have "lost" a couple of houses in a row and created off road parking for residents and limited visitor access and it works really well. I realise that this may not be possible but does show some lateral thinking.

Parking for the town's employees needs to be considered and kept away from residential streets eg. the streets around the MADS theatre where there is adequate space at weekends for residents so the week time chaos must be working people parking there.

The Macclesfield system of waste management is really good and the recycling levels are high and something to be proud of, but the sight of rows of bins on the pavement is not. It is difficult to get pushchairs or wheelchairs past these bins, it can mean going out onto the road. Along with the bins is the issue of street cleaning, leaf clearing and hedge cutting, all important for pedestrian safety and the look of the place.

If these issues could be addressed it would make Macclesfield an even more attractive place to live.

Thank you

Margaret Stone (Mrs)
14 Barracks Square
SK11 8HF

PARTON, Lindsey

From: David Woolliscroft]
Sent: 13 July 2014 14:29
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Parishing Macclesfield

I have reviewed your options for a second tier of local government. Whilst voting for small parish council (Broken Cross/Upton) I would be content with a single Macclesfield wide Council. What is entirely inappropriate is a sub-set of CEC - unelected, unaccountable and unacceptable.

Since the behemoth of CEC was formed, tiny villages have had second tier representation – Henbury, Marton, North Rode etc and yet the large population of Macclesfield has had to rely on remote, elected representative who are largely far too busy on important CEC things to pay real attention to local issues in Macc.

It really isn't rocket science and I have always been surprised that there has been little visible effort to introduce a Macc Town Council – no doubt somebody has been busy but the overall effect has not been very visible.

Of course there is a cost – but there are central requirements (such as insurance) which really should be carried centrally – there is surely no need for parish councils to carry expensive insurance cover; admin costs could be kept to a minimum by using a volunteer clerk – too much of the cost of a parish council is the clerk salary;

Over to you

David Woolliscroft
116 Prestbury Road
Macclesfield
SK10 3BN

01625 420142

PARTON, Lindsey

From: JONATHAN WILKINSON
Sent: 14 July 2014 15:58
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Macclesfield Community Governance Review

Dear Sir,

I have recently received a voting paper in connection with the above but as the only options provided involve spending more taxpayers' money I am unable to vote. To allow for a democratic choice the Council should have given me the chance to vote for the status quo.

When the merger of Macclesfield with other authorities to form Cheshire East was "sold" to residents it was to be more cost effective without loss of democracy. Why should ratepayers now have to contribute upwards of £25 per year to be properly represented when I have a Councillor who should already be doing that?

Then there is the proposal that Macclesfield should pay for services that principally benefit Macclesfield Town residents. Again, the formation of Cheshire East was supposed to be about pooling of resources and at the time any suggestions that any part of the Council area would receive a different level of service were strongly refuted. What has changed?

All in all this appears to me to be a way for the Council to increase Council Tax by stealth whilst claiming that the "headline" payment has not changed.

Please accept this as my vote for "none of the above".

Yours faithfully,
Jonathan Wilkinson

PARTON, Lindsey

From: Peter Nash
Sent: 21 July 2014 18:25
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Community Governance Review - Macclesfield

Sir

Having read your leaflet "Do you want more say in Macclesfield?" and having given the matter much thought I have come to the conclusion that Macclesfield should have a Town Council.

The enhanced local service delivery committee (ELSDC) might have more powers than the existing local service delivery committee (LSDC) but these are unspecified and I am told that although a cross-party group of LSDC members did propose some terms of reference and more powers for such a body a while ago, the proposal they tabled was rejected by Cheshire East Council's Governance Committee. This option is therefore shrouded in doubt. Aside from this uncertainty, CEBC would remain legally responsible for any acts or omissions committed by an enhanced LSDC and good governance would dictate that it retained close oversight and a potential veto, resulting in more costly and more bureaucratic administration. There would also inevitably be times when the ELSDC might propose a particular course of action which would not find favour with CEBC given the latter's wider brief for the whole Borough and its need to programme its activities for the greater good of the whole Borough. I further understand that the LSDC has not met for over six months, suggesting that it is currently an ineffective body.

The proposal for 7 parishes in Macclesfield makes no sense at all given the homogeneous nature of the town and the fact that many of the facilities/services which might be provided locally are only situated in one of the 7 wards - and particularly Macclesfield Central which includes the town centre. Aside from the additional expense of having to employ 7 parish clerks, it would be necessary for the Parish Councils to continually meet together to discuss what should happen to, and who should fund, any given initiative or service. This is a recipe for delay, inefficiency and potential conflict. The number of councillors needed would also be excessive under this option. Nor is it clear whether there would be one Mayor or seven (or indeed 1 Mayor for Macclesfield Central and 6 Chairmen for the other parishes).

So far as I can judge, there would be a cost to the residents, whichever option is taken - since Macclesfield gains currently at the expense of the rest of Cheshire East which is parished. The 7 parish option is likely to be most expensive given its duplicated administration and the ELSDC option would appear to be the next most expensive, given it will be dependent on (and have to pay for) the Cheshire East procurement regime. Further, for the reasons stated above, the ELSDC would have to be carefully monitored by CEBC and this duplication will inevitably both create cost and implementation delay. A properly and efficiently run Town Council on the other hand should be able to act in the most cost effective manner - and should it not do so, then its electors can replace it through the ballot box if they so chose.

A Town Council therefore appears to be the best, most democratic and most efficient option. It would be a body with which all Macclesfield residents could identify and it could act on behalf of the whole town in those matters for which it had responsibility. It would also be able to express clear views on behalf of the whole town to Cheshire East Borough Council and other agencies which might have responsibilities for matters or services which might directly affect the town. In short, one Town Council would enable the

town to act with one voice and channel its energies into those matters which the town's residents regard to be a priority.

I hope my views can be added to those which are being expressed in this consultation.

--

Regards

Peter Nash

T/F: 01625 612564

M: 0758 369 2889

PARTON, Lindsey

From: Harry Hodkinson
Sent: 23 July 2014 00:17
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Re: Vote options for Governance review

The Only 2 options available will cost the rate payers extra money at a time when this can be ill afforded.

There should have been an option offering no change. We already pay for one council in Crewe, there is no justification for raising a levy on the ratepayers for an additional layer of local government. Sums suggested are not backed up by any facts, they are examples that bear no relevance as to what will eventually happen. This is not offering options

The options offered are unfair to Macclesfield rate payers, your options are pay for this one or pay for that one, how can this be right?

Harry Hodkinson

On Tuesday, 22 July 2014, 12:45, COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
<CommunityGovernance@cheshireeast.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Mr Hodkinson

I will be able to accept an email from you expressing your views.

It would be helpful if you could explain why you do not agree with the options on the ballot paper, and to explain what alternative you would prefer.

Kind Regards
Lindsey

Lindsey Parton
Registration Service and Business Manager

Cheshire East Council
Governance and Democratic Services / Ground Floor (Westfields)
C/O Municipal Buildings
Earle Street
CREWE
CW1 2BJ

Email: lindsey.parton@cheshireeast.gov.uk
Tel : 01270 686477

From: Harry Hodkinson
Sent: 21 July 2014 14:49
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Vote options for Governance review

PARTON, Lindsey

From: GRAHAM, Gemma
Sent: 23 July 2014 08:51
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Customer Query

Hi,

I received a call from someone on the elections line on Monday at 17:00 asking about the community governance voting form. He was reluctant to send an e-mail, so I said I would send one for him. I have been unable to send this e-mail till now as I was annual leave yesterday. The customer wanted to know that if he wants to 'keep the status quo' and not spend any more money, not make any change to the current system, which box on the voting form does he have to tick?

Can you please reply to him on his e-mail address: johngoodsall@gmail.com

Many Thanks,

Gemma Graham
Customer Service Advisor

Customer Services | Cheshire East Council
Macclesfield Town Hall | Cheshire | SK10 1EA

 www.cheshireeast.gov.uk

 [Essential Telephone Numbers](#)



CERTIFIED MEMBER 2013

I don't agree with either option 1 or option 2, how do I indicate this on the voting form? Your help will be appreciated

Harry Hodkinson

Confidentiality: This email and its contents and any attachments are intended only for the above named. As the email may contain confidential or legally privileged information, if you are not the above named person or responsible for delivery to the above named, or suspect that you are not an intended recipient please delete or destroy the email and any attachments immediately.

Security and Viruses: This note confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses. We cannot accept any responsibility for any damage or loss caused by software viruses.

Monitoring: The Council undertakes monitoring of both incoming and outgoing emails. You should therefore be aware that if you send an email to a person within the Council it may be subject to any monitoring deemed necessary by the organisation from time to time. The views of the author may not necessarily reflect those of the Council.

Access as a public body: The Council may be required to disclose this email (or any response to it) under the Freedom of Information Act, 2000, unless the information in it is covered by one of the exemptions in the Act.

Legal documents: The Council does not accept service of legal documents by email.

PARTON, Lindsey

From: Chris Foster
Sent: 24 July 2014 17:17
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Re: Macclesfield local governance - response to consultation

Dear Ms. Parton,

Thank you for the additional information, and for your prompt reply. As far as this consultation exercise is concerned, I would make the following comments to the Council:

- 1 - It seems to be poor practice to represent a consultation exercise as an election, as the "voting paper" circulated in Macclesfield does.
- 2 - It also seems to be poor practice to identify 3 options as preferred over all others on the basis of a preliminary consultation which elicited responses from some 60 - 70 respondents, as was apparently done in this case. Not only is it impossible to believe that such a group could constitute a representative sample of Macclesfield residents, it could conceivably not extend beyond the Council's own employees.
- 3- On the substantive issue of what structure should be put in place, I would prefer for there to be no change at all. In general, local government in the UK is pretty much a misnomer for local administration, because local authorities do little other than administer central government policy within a remit that allows very little scope for interpretation and none for local policy-making. In that circumstance, there is no case for multiple tiers of authorities to be created, especially given that these inevitably introduce additional costs into the system; Cheshire East's presentation of 3 options each involving extra charges for Macclesfield citizens underlines the inevitability of such additional costs arising. In other words, having created a unitary authority in Cheshire East, there is no benefit to be gained in the current system of UK governance from creating any lower tier of formal entities, whether named an "extended committee" or a town council, that would justify the cost associated with their administration, so I am opposed to any such development.

Kind regards,
C.J.Foster,
387 Park Lane,
Macclesfield,
Cheshire

On 17/07/2014 17:18, COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW wrote:

Dear Mr Foster

Thank you for your email.

The consultation is open to anyone to submit their views. This does not need to be restricted to the three options. I think in point 1 of your email, this would in effect be a case for maintaining the status quo/ no change. The information provided tries to portray the possibility that even if the status quo is maintained, that in the future a Special Expense Levy could be raised – this would be charged to, and be for, services provided solely for the benefit of Macclesfield residents. However, no decision to this effect has been taken at this stage.

If you would like to submit a view which is different to the options set out on the voting paper, you can do this by email (or by letter if you prefer) – and I will ensure that your views are put forward to the Council for consideration. It would add weight to your representations if you could explain the reasons for your views.

I have attached a leaflet which you might find of interest, which explains in the appendices what statutory powers are available to parish councils, and gives some examples of the functions undertaken by some parish councils locally. Although all of these powers are available (under various Statutes) – it does vary greater from parish council to parish council as to what services they choose to deliver in practice. This is why the costs passed onto residents, as a Parish Council Tax, also vary considerably.

I hope this information is of help, but please get in touch if you require more details.

Kind Regards
Lindsey

Lindsey Parton
Registration Service and Business Manager

Cheshire East Council

Governance and Democratic Services / Ground Floor (Westfields)
C/O Municipal Buildings
Earle Street
CREWE
CW1 2BJ

Email: lindsey.parton@cheshireeast.gov.uk
Tel : 01270 686477

From: Chris Foster
Sent: 16 July 2014 21:51
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Macclesfield local governance

Dear Sir/Madam,

I received the leaflet publicising the consultation about Macclesfield governance. Please can you clarify some points for me:

1 - If the current arrangement - which may involve a dedicated committee for the town but does not involve a charge beyond the Charter Trustees charge - is legal, why is it not being offered as an option?

2 - If this is no more than a consultation, is Cheshire East within its rights to restrict respondents to 3 options only? As I understand it these 3 are in any case derived from the opinions of some 100 citizens, hardly a substantial sample. How do we submit different views?

3 - The leaflet is careful to state what powers a Town/Parish Council would not have. Exactly what powers, apart from owning assets, would it have were it to come into being? In other words, what could it DO in practice, apart from lobbying Cheshire East?

Thank you in advance for your guidance,

C.J.Foster,
387 Park Lane,

Do you want more say in Macclesfield?

I have read the latest publication using the above title. I believe that devolving services from the Cheshire East Council to the most appropriate Macclesfield local government is the right thing to do. I know that what is currently in place for Macclesfield is a group of Charter Trustees and a Local Service Delivery Committee. I do not believe this is right for Macclesfield. Macclesfield is a town and therefore should – indeed, must have a town council. All other towns in the Cheshire East area have town councils. All villages have parish councils. Disgracefully Macclesfield has no elected local government. Macclesfield has councillors elected specifically to serve on the Cheshire East Borough Council. We also have an imposed Local Service Delivery Committee made up of Cheshire East – Macclesfield councillors. This committee was unknown to us until about a year ago thus we, the electors, thought we were just governed by Cheshire East Council for all things!

The Enhanced Macclesfield Local Service Delivery Committee: The basic committee exists but enhancement has not been described. I believe this committee was created in 2009. I attended one of its meetings earlier this year as an observer from the public. Nothing was achieved, one councillor left early in disgust and two councillors said they did not know why they were present. Several years down the line this situation, to put it mildly, is DISTURBING! The Local Service Delivery Committee has no legal powers and is thus toothless!

Macclesfield Charter Trustees: This is a ceremonial group, with no powers, thus hardly of use to the town. If a town council, representing the whole of the Macclesfield area, was put in place then the Chairman of this council would have the title of Mayor thus allowing for continuity.

Splitting the town into 7 small parishes: This would be a nightmare! Why do it? More councillors overall will be required and common interests for the whole town would mean **more** meetings involving representatives from each **parish/ward** council.

Town council: This is the only sensible and fair solution. At nearly 40,000 electors make it the largest town in the Cheshire East area. All other towns, although smaller, have town councils, which seem to have been running smoothly for years. Take Macclesfield's neighbouring town of Congleton, with nearly 22,000 electors. They recently issued the Congleton Town Council report for the year 2013. It's very impressive and shows quite clearly what a town council can do. Mayoral duties are performed successfully through this council. I believe it to be a blueprint for the Macclesfield community.

Parish councils for villages do work but have been in existence for generations. One of Macclesfield's neighbouring villages, Gawsorth, has had a civil parish council since **1866!**

Why should Macclesfield Town suffer from inferior solutions? In the past there was a borough council embracing the town and outlying villages. O.K., those days have gone but there is no reason why Macclesfield should not run its own affairs. If there is a precept, I do NOT think this will put electors off the idea of a town council. Examples of precepts given in the latest documents are rather similar BUT these town councils exist and seem to run smoothly.

And so to sum up: Macclesfield Town should have a town council. Nothing else will work in the best interests of its residents. Having a town council will make it similar to other Cheshire East town councils. It is a mystery to Macclesfield Town residents why discussions as to its governance future has only been done in the last 12 months. Other towns and indeed village parish councils have been operating efficiently and successfully for years. Election of a town council will be both DEMOCRATIC & very efficient, if Congleton is anything to go by!

Ray J Perry

31 Thirlmere, Macclesfield, SK11 7XY

24th July 2014

PARTON, Lindsey

From: laura donington
Sent: 25 July 2014 13:14
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: re governance of Macclesfield

I wish to vote for a single town council to cover Macclesfield, including 'greater Macclesfield'.

Laura Jones
6 Clarke Lane
Langley
Macclesfield
SK11 0NE

PARTON, Lindsey

From: laura donington
Sent: 25 July 2014 15:57
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Re: voting for governance of Macclesfield

Thank you very much for your reply. I guess my feeling is that the whole area of greater Macclesfield needs a stronger voice in its own future. There is a lot of political apathy, and from the responses I have got when I have asked people, it is at least partly because people don't feel they have a voice that will be heard. 'What's the point. They will do what they want, whatever.'

I have sent an email stating my preference.

Many thanks

Laura Jones

On 25 Jul 2014, at 15:23, COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW wrote:

> Dear Ms Jones
>
> Thank you for your email and for taking the time to respond with your views.
>
> The review being undertaken covers the currently unparished area of Macclesfield and there is a statutory requirement for local government electors in the area under review to be consulted. This is reason why a voting paper, seeking the views from electors in the unparished area, has been sent out.
>
> Having said that, the consultation itself is open to anyone with an interest in the review to make representations and these will be considered along side any voting papers returned.
>
> I will present your views to the Council and these will be taken into account in formulating a draft outcome for the review.
>
> Kind Regards
> Lindsey
>
>
> Lindsey Parton
> Registration Service and Business Manager
>
> Cheshire East Council
> Governance and Democratic Services / Ground Floor (Westfields) C/O
> Municipal Buildings Earle Street CREWE
> CW1 2BJ
>
> Email: lindsey.parton@cheshireeast.gov.uk
> Tel : 01270 686477
>
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: laura donington
> Sent: 25 July 2014 13:14
> To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

> Subject: voting for governance of Macclesfield
>
> Dear Cheshire East Council and Elections Office
>
> I want to complain about what seems to be a serious error in the way you have handled your consultation about Macclesfield Community Governance. In fact I can't quite believe what I have been told, which is that since I live in Langley, I am already in a Parish, and therefore my views are not being sought.
>
> If this is true then you are pre-empting the outcome of the consultation by assuming the result will be based on existing Parishes and ward boundaries. If there were to be a preference for a whole town governance structure (a Town Council) presumably its remit would cover the wider Macclesfield town area including villages such as Langley and Sutton and their parish councils. We should therefore be included in any consultation. Certainly there are many of us who live in these parts of greater Macclesfield who have a view about the need for greater powers and say for Macclesfield as an entity, especially given the way that planning decisions can be made with little or no reference to the community of Macclesfield**.
>
> I would appreciate an explanation as to why we haven't been included in the consultation if this is actually true.
>
> Yours sincerely
>
> Laura Jones
>
> 6 Clarke Lane
> Langley
> Macclesfield
> SK11 0NE
>
> **(How many Macclesfield councillors are on the Planning Panel that
> decided to go ahead with the decision to destroy the heart of
> Macclesfield by giving permission for a hideous shopping mall which
> will take the heart out of the town and probably be a white
> elephant??)
>
>
> *****
> **
> Confidentiality: This email and its contents and any attachments are intended only for the above named. As the email may contain confidential or legally privileged information, if you are not the above named person or responsible for delivery to the above named, or suspect that you are not an intended recipient please delete or destroy the email and any attachments immediately.
>
> Security and Viruses: This note confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses. We cannot accept any responsibility for any damage or loss caused by software viruses.
>
> Monitoring: The Council undertakes monitoring of both incoming and outgoing emails. You should therefore be aware that if you send an email to a person within the Council it may be subject to any monitoring deemed necessary by the organisation from time to time. The views of the author may not necessarily reflect those of the Council.
>
> Access as a public body: The Council may be required to disclose this email (or any response to it) under the Freedom of Information Act, 2000, unless the information in it is covered by one of the exemptions in the Act.
>
> Legal documents: The Council does not accept service of legal documents by email.
> *****

PARTON, Lindsey

From: GRAHAM CHILDS
Sent: 25 July 2014 17:43
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Community Governance review of Macclesfield

Dear Sir/Madam

I support the formation of a single Town Council for Macclesfield.

It is one of the occasions when Macclesfield should not be different from the rest; It should be like other towns in Cheshire East and have a Town Council.

The town Council would give us a better voice and ought to be more sensitive in running local services.

Thank you for consulting local residents ,

Graham Childs
36 Lime Grove
Macclesfield
SK10 1LX

Macclesfield Civic Society
Working for a town to be proud of

Keith Smith – 57 Orme Crescent – Tytherington – Macclesfield – SK10 2HU – 01625 424101

Ms Lindsey Parton, Registration Service and Business Manager

Governance and Democratic Services, Cheshire East Council.

Dear Ms Parton

GOVERNANCE REVIEW FOR MACCLESFIELD

Further to the recent consultation exercise and issue of ballot papers to Macclesfield residents I am writing with some further representations on behalf of the Civic Society.

Our position is clear in that we favour a single town council but acknowledge that others have a different point of view. Almost concurrently with the consultation exercise we sponsored and distributed a leaflet to the electors of Macclesfield outlining the advantages of a single town council. I enclose a copy of the leaflet for the information of the Constitution Committee though I am sure you have already obtained a copy.

One issue that has been downplayed is that of democratic equity. If all other parts of Cheshire East have a town or parish council why is it that Macclesfield may be denied the same on the grounds of (it is alleged by opponents) being an extra layer of bureaucracy – surely it is only giving to Macclesfield what applies elsewhere? With regard to the allegation that a town council would lead to additional expense and suffer from a lack of powers to influence events, surely only time will tell. It would be for the elected town council to decide how active it wished to be and what level of precept to levy in support of its aspirations. What cannot be denied is that it would have democratic legitimacy and access to extensive powers and opportunities. The allegation of unnecessary expense is not an absolute choice between a precept and no additional charges as the double taxation issue would mean, in the end, a special expenses levy for Macclesfield residents – the argument should therefore be seen as one about levels of charge and not absolute positions of charge or no charge.

Our concern over multiple parishing is that splitting the town into 7 parishes would mean that the whole would be considerably less than the sum of its parts. Residents of outlying parishes would in essence “free-ride” on the centre of the town in terms of using services and facilities yet would contribute little in terms of resources. For example a town centre parish might want to provide extensive Christmas decorations or events which would be enjoyed by all residents of the town yet primarily financed by a small number. Such an outcome would lack cohesion and inclusivity.

Set against this concern we do accept that whatever parish option is selected it would help address a democratic deficit and enable wider participation by the election of locally based councillors acting in the best interest of their respective parish (as is the case elsewhere in Cheshire East).

Although it cannot be insisted upon we consider that prospective parish/town councillors should not be selected from existing Cheshire East Members but rather from the general population. Elected Members of a parish/town and Cheshire East could be faced with dilemmas regarding issues and policies – where would their primary loyalty lie? The result could be unwelcome conflicts of interest.

Macclesfield Civic Society

Working for a town to be proud of

Keith Smith – 57 Orme Crescent – Tytherington – Macclesfield – SK10 2HU – 01625 424101

Turning to the alternative option of an enhanced Local Service Delivery Committee for Macclesfield [LSDC] we have listened to the discussion and examined the written material presented to the public. We remain unconvinced that this option offers any advantage over the current (unsatisfactory) situation in terms of democratic deficit quite apart from the legal and administrative uncertainties that could result from its adoption. The legal opinions given seem to indicate that this option would not allow provision of services or management of assets by the LSDC as it would remain a sub-committee of Cheshire East Council – in effect councillors could end up negotiating or arguing with themselves (wearing in effect two hats) by attempting to promote local interests against their primary loyalty to Cheshire East Council as a corporate body. Similarly the financial and resourcing issues remain sketchy – all we heard was a remark made, as an aside, that the special levy on Macclesfield residents would be bound to be less than any town council precept because all the fixed overheads would be borne by Cheshire East – really? If this is such an advantage why does it not seem to apply elsewhere? If the LSDC is such a good solution why has it not been brought forward earlier so it could be judged by its results?

With best wishes I remain

Yours sincerely

Keith Smith

Chairman, Macclesfield Civic Society


23 July 2014

What's this all about?

For the last 750 years, Macclesfield has had some form of local government based in the town, making local decisions for local people. That all changed in 2009 when Cheshire East was created.

We are proud of
our town and
we want it to be
better for everyone

We believe we need one independent body which can make a difference in the town and speak up for Macclesfield's 52,000 residents.



Your vote counts


The decision as to whether or not Macclesfield should have a Town Council is now down to you and the town's other electors.

We hope you agree with the merits of having such a body, as highlighted in this leaflet, and that it is the best way to represent Macclesfield's local interests.

You should receive a ballot paper through the post.

Please find the time to cast your vote – even if you don't agree with us.


Vote
YES



One Town Council
for
MACCLESFIELD

Designed, produced and printed in Macclesfield.
www.lovegraphics.com www.sphere-uk.co.uk

WHY WE NEED A
TOWN COUNCIL
IN MACCLESFIELD



What would a Town Council do?

Town Councils can provide local services which are not otherwise provided by Cheshire East Council. They may include things like markets, local events, allotments, public toilets, tourist information, street cleaning and planters.


Many Town Councils elect a Mayor and some, like Bollington and Congleton, actively market their towns to attract tourists and boost local trade. Most also provide grants to local community groups to enable them to fulfil their objectives.

The successful Town Councils are those which work closely in Partnership with others including their business communities. The services a Macclesfield Town Council might provide would be a matter for it and Cheshire East to agree in due course.

Equally important, is the opportunity for a Town Council to voice its views on important local issues – and Cheshire East Council and others would have to listen to it.

Example Wilmslow Town Council has been able to persuade Cheshire East to make some important changes to its forthcoming Local Plan that will affect Wilmslow residents.

With a major town centre redevelopment to be implemented and important planning issues surrounding new housing, we believe that a Town Council for Macclesfield cannot come soon enough.




And what will it cost?

Most Town Councils have between 12 and 16 councillors, elected by their residents. All the local Town Councillors in East Cheshire are unpaid and they don't receive any expenses for attending Council meetings. Local precepts vary between Councils, depending on the services they provide. For example, in Wilmslow the Band D precept is £21.45 per annum, in Bollington it is £57 per annum and in Congleton £70.10 per annum. For most households this amounts to less than £1.50 per week. The precepts are added to

the annual Council Tax bill and paid with the other charges Cheshire East makes each year.

If you live here this vote affects you



PARTON, Lindsey

From: e-mail r.ledgar2006
Sent: 27 July 2014 11:08
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Macclesfield community governance review

Hi

I am far from well informed on this subject, but would like to ask how this review is different from the last one when Macclesfield Borough Council was painfully disbanded (for those staff who went through the process and feared for their jobs and livelihood) and became Cheshire East, is this not going to cost money to make yet further changes to how our services are provided? I thought it had been decided how this was best done.

Could the finance that this review will involve not go into supplying the community services without you all having to have new titles?

I hope this doesn't sound negative, but it sounds like it will involve a lot of work to change things and there are existing organisations in the community which work very well yet have no funding to enable them to continue, I would rather they were supported instead of a council review being funded.

Thank you

Rita Ledgar, resident in Macclesfield

PARTON, Lindsey

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 July 2014 14:22
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: MACCLESFIELXD COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

Dear Sir/Madam,

My self and my partner have voted and sent our papers off hoping that the Second Class pre-paid envelopes reach the destination on time. We feel a little pesimistic about this so we hope there is some leeway in administrating the final count.

I wanted to tell you that several of our friends and neighbours (including several of us who have worked for local governments) have struggled to understand the wording of the explanatory leaflet that accompanied the voting paper.

I took the trouble to go into Macclesfield Library and get some copies of the fuller explanation and we did find this much more helpful. It does worry me that many people relying on the leaflet will remain rather confused about the options.

Yours sincerely,

David Wood
29 Brynton Road,
Macclesfield, SK10 3AF

Tel: 01625 429156

PARTON, Lindsey

From: Louise Congdon
Sent: 27 July 2014 14:40
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Governance review

To who it may concern,

I oppose the creation of Parish Councils for Macclesfield.

Best Regards,

Louise Congdon
8 Ripon Close
Macclesfield
SK10 2WQ

Sent from my iPad

CHESHIRE EAST BOROUGH COUNCIL
MACCLESFIELD TOWN GOVERNANCE CONSULTATION

In addition to voting on the Governance options, which I have already done, I also wish to record my views about the options on the table at the present time.

I have now been to both presentations and committee meetings during the Cheshire East Council review of the arrangements for the governance of Macclesfield. I have also read the documentation you have produced with interest and visited the displays at the Visitor Information Centre. It is interesting to note the relative lack of coverage in the media re articles and letters. What however was striking were the views of those present in the audience. Quite a number of members of the public that I talked to at meetings were well informed about the issues. The impression I was left with was that many felt that the various views presented were enthusiastic, the word passionate was even used, but people seemed to be expecting a lead but not finding one. In fact they found the information supplied and the voting paper far from clear.

Of the three options the ward-based parish council choice has least to offer from my viewpoint. It should be remembered that the Boundary Commission in warding the Town would have tried to avoid boundaries which split communities. This does not mean of course that each ward comprises a single community. In fact several of the CEBC wards comprise areas of quite different character – one example being West and Ivy which includes the Weston estate and the quite different old Macclesfield Borough Council Ivy ward. These two areas have absolutely nothing in common with each other. Tytherington ward is another example including as it does the area around Westminster road and Coare Street, which feels like part of the Town centre rather than Tytherington.

Seven parish councils each with their own clerk represent both duplication and waste. Importantly Central ward could well finish up with higher precept because of the greater number of facilities it would have to support. Since the whole Town would use these facilities this would be quite inequitable.

The enhanced local service delivery committee has been described in most detail in the voting papers for no apparent reason, unless perhaps because it may be thought of as an unknown quantity. Certainly some strong claims have been made for this solution. I have however a number of concerns with the proposal. The committee would exist primarily to concern itself with the usual area-based statutory functions of Cheshire East Council as well as the additional role outlined in the voting paper. One can imagine difficulties for members trying to pursue issues outside this remit. Would the supporting officers feel their time was not being properly used and rule the issue out of order? It is difficult to see how for example an ELSDC could apply or assist others to apply for a lottery grant within the presently proposed remit. The lack of any direct control of local services and the additional workload falling on already busy councillors are frequently-voiced criticisms for which there does not seem to be a response, and the present LSDC hardly ever meets. More significantly there is no ability within the ELSDC remit that accompanied the voting paper giving the Committee the power to prepare a neighbourhood plan. This is a major shortcoming in my view.

Having considered all of the above together with the list of powers vested in Town councils I conclude that what Macclesfield needs at the present time is a single council for the whole Town. This would give Macclesfield its own distinctive voice able not only to articulate concerns but also to respond constructively to planning applications, seek lottery funding for improvements, monitor and comment on the Town Centre development as further design proposals appear, and organise the production of a neighbourhood plan.


Thank you for the opportunity to express an opinion on these issues. I hope that what will come out of this process will be a stronger democratic voice for Macclesfield Town.

Richard Watson
24 Stapleton Road
Macclesfield SK10 3NP

27th July 2014

VOTE NOW!

Please use your vote to have your say!



A **Macclesfield Community Governance Review** is currently being conducted to consider options for improved community engagement.

We would like to know your views on what arrangements would work best for Macclesfield.

The best way of deciding what's best for Macclesfield is to consider three key questions:

- Will it improve community engagement?
- Will it deliver better local democracy?
- Can it deliver local services in a more effective and convenient way?

As well as returning the enclosed voting paper, you can also respond in writing to:
Registration Service and Business Manager, Cheshire East Council, Governance and Democratic Services/ Ground Floor (Westfields), C/O Municipal Buildings, Earle Street, Crewe, CW1 2BJ

Or by email to communitygovernance@cheshireeast.gov.uk

To request more information please visit our website
www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/maccgovreview

or contact us by :

Email: communitygovernance@cheshireeast.gov.uk

Telephone: **0300 123 5016**

Leaflets can also be collected from Macclesfield Town Hall and Macclesfield Library.

The outcome should achieve efficient services in a cost effective manner for the area. Evidence of this not happening is in the reorganisation of the Register Service (only @ Crewe) & the Tax Office moving

Please see house of Leasford

ant.



What are the options for Macclesfield?

Option 1 - Parishing

You may see the words Parish / Town Council(s) (PCTs) used separately but they mean the same thing). PTCs are the most local form of government and can represent areas ranging from around 100 to 40,000+ people. They are based on an area which has real community identity and residents are represented by elected local parish councillors. If they choose to do so PTCs can deliver services to improve the area (e.g. public toilets, allotments, Christmas lighting, floral arrangements, bus shelters, burial grounds, litter bins, tourism, traffic calming and public transport schemes). The Localism Act 2011 gives greater powers to Parish / Town Councils including the preparation of a neighbourhood development plan which becomes part of the local development plan for the area.

A single Parish / Town Council could be established to cover the whole of the unparished area of Macclesfield; or a number of Parish Councils, of smaller geographical area, could be formed. It is suggested that 7 of these could be created, based upon the existing Borough Ward Boundaries (i.e. for the areas of Broken Cross and Upton; Macclesfield Central; Macclesfield East; Macclesfield Hurdsfield; Macclesfield South; Macclesfield Tytherington and Macclesfield West and Ivy).

If Parish / Town Council(s) were formed, Cheshire East Council would remain responsible for major services such as social care, highways, education admissions, children’s services, environmental protection, planning decisions etc. and Cheshire East Councillors would continue to represent their wards. The formation of a Parish / Town Council(s) would not replicate the former arrangements in place (prior to 2009) of a Macclesfield Borough Council. If Parish / Town Council(s) were created which covered the whole of the unparished area of Macclesfield, then the existing Charter Trustees (which carry out civic and ceremonial functions and the mayoralty) would be dissolved.

In summary the main differences between a Single Parish / Town Council and 7 smaller parish Councils are:

Single Parish / Town Council	7 x smaller Parish Councils
39,750 electors	Ranging from 3,470 electors to 7,107 electors
Area would be warded – and you would vote for Parish Councillors to be elected for your ward, to sit on the Parish / Town Council	You would vote for Parish Councillors to be elected for all the seats available for your Parish Council
A decision would need to be made as to how many Parish / Town Councillors should be elected. It is likely that the number of Councillors would either be 12 or upto 24.	Each Parish Council is required to have a minimum of 5 Parish Councillors. If for example each of the 7 Parish Councils had 8 Parish Council seats, there would then be 56 Parish Councillors in total for the whole of Macclesfield.

Single Parish / Town Council	7 x smaller Parish Councils
<p>May benefit from economies of scale e.g. ability to run services for a larger area; possibly a stronger voice to make representations etc.</p>	<p>Can develop an in depth knowledge of the needs of the area. May be easier to secure a shared vision for continual improvement for a small specific area.</p>
<p>A larger precept would most likely be raised; which could lead to a higher amount of tax per band D property – but the Parish / Town Council would have the potential to be able to deliver a wider range of services for a larger area. The cost of delivering services and facilities would be spread evenly across all electors in the Macclesfield area.</p>	<p>A smaller precept would most likely be raised, and the amount of tax per band D property could be smaller – but the capacity for smaller Parish Councils to run services would be reduced. Those living in the town centre Parish Council area may pay for (and effectively subsidise) services and facilities used by residents from the surrounding Macclesfield Parish Councils.</p>

Cost: Costs would be met by setting a council tax. Costs vary depending on the size of PTCs and services they deliver. The costs to residents for PTCs in Cheshire East range from £5.52 for Aston by Budworth Parish; to £89.74 for Nantwich Town Council. The tax for newly created Crewe Town Council for example, which is of comparable size to Macclesfield is £28.96.

Option 2 - An Enhanced Macclesfield Local Service Delivery Committee

This option is to continue with current arrangements, which includes working with all the existing organisations and the Macclesfield Charter Trustees (which carry out ceremonial functions, such as visits by the Mayor), and to enhance the role of the Macclesfield Local Service Delivery Committee.

The existing Macclesfield Service Delivery Committee was set up by the Council as Macclesfield currently has no Parish / Town Council(s). It is run by 12 Cheshire East Councillors who were elected to serve Macclesfield's town wards. The Committee doesn't currently represent the interests of the local community on things such as planning applications and highways matters. It has been set up in its current form to consider and advise the Council on the quality, quantity and cost of service provision in Macclesfield.

This option proposes that the role of the existing Macclesfield Local Service Delivery Committee be enhanced. Examples of the functions it could deliver are:

- To investigate and monitor Services and to make recommendations to Cabinet on the level of service provision
- To provide advice and recommend to Cabinet on issues and needs of Macclesfield
- To be a Council consultee on matters and decisions relating to the area of Macclesfield such as planning and traffic management
- To liaise and cooperate with local organisations to pursue the wellbeing of the unparished area
- To nominate representatives from its membership to serve on local bodies
- To advise and liaise with Cheshire East Council on preparatory measures for the devolution and transfer of assets
- To consider the cost implications of the development and transfer of services to the unparished area.
- To encourage provision of leisure facilities
- To make recommendations with regard to local grant aid applications
- To formulate schemes to utilise developer contributions under section 106 of the Town and country Planning Act
- To approve street names serving new developments
- To investigate and make recommendations to cabinet in relation to local car parks, markets, community centres, parks, allotments, visitor centres and toilets
- To receive presentations on key strategic initiatives; and to invite representatives from relevant organisations to provide updates on current performance / initiatives and to answer questions by the committee or members of the public.

Cost: In the future, the cost of some services provided principally for the benefit of Macclesfield Town residents may be met from an additional tax, as part of the Council Tax set for Macclesfield residents, (called a Special Expense) rather than through the Cheshire East Council Tax. The cost of running the Enhanced Macclesfield Service Delivery Committee would be included in this tax. Based on providing a particular range of services, council tax for a town council could be in the order of £25 per year. Alternatively, if the same services were managed by a Macclesfield Local Service Delivery Committee and a special expense was calculated, this would be in the order of £19 per year (in addition to the Charter Trustee charge of £1.42 per band D Property). The actual council tax for a Parish/ Town council, or Special Expense Levy for a Macclesfield Local Service Delivery Committee, would be dependent on the costs of the service levels provided.

(NOTE: An Enhanced Service Delivery Committee would be a committee of Cheshire East Council, rather than being a separate legal entity as is the case for Parish / Town Councils. This means that no assets can be transferred to this Committee)

1) Reorganisation of the Register Service for the area means that Cheshire East is no longer active (only Cheshire West ie Crewe). How is it cost effective to have an employee travel to Crewe to register a ceremony @ Hollin Hall for example? What about the clients using the service?

Carole M Baines.

8 Ryebank Way, Macclesfield. SK10 2LJ.

17, 2014

62 Amberley Road
Macclesfield
Cheshire SK11 8LX

Telephone : 01625 426851

Dear Sir,

Your Macclesfield Community Governance Review pamphlets, we in Amberley Road consider to be an attempt to create more handsomely rewarded positions within Council, and increased rate costs with an excuse to introduce outside town Planners. We do not want our attractive town-centre replaced with these hideous 21st century concrete structures. Noting U.K. Enrage in Stockport as recipients of our completed forms, a stealthy intro, how much have their wasteful services cost the Council? This town is jammed with traffic. A better light is urgently required for junction of Joy Lane Park Lane Congleton Rd traffic cannot proceed and prevents onward traffic proceeding to Park Lane. Whoever is responsible, Wakeny Wakeny!

Sincerely, J. E. Seales

- B. DENNERLY 64 AMBERLEY RD - Bob Dennerly
- S. WALMSLEY 47 AMBERLEY RD - Elizabeth Walmsley
- D. COLHORICK 41 AMBERLEY RD - Dan Colhorick

PARTON, Lindsey

From: Denis Ridyard
Sent: 24 July 2014 11:07
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Vote now

My vote is 1a

DAVID RUTLEY MP



HOUSE OF COMMONS

LONDON SW1A 0AA

Mr Mike Suarez
Chief Executive
Cheshire East Council
Westfields
Middlewich Road
Sandbach
Cheshire CW11 1HZ

21 JUL 2014

15th July 2014

X. Anthe.

Re: Mr John Perkins of 9 Fern Lea Drive, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK11 8PQ

Please find enclosed an email I have received from the above constituent regarding the Macclesfield Community Governance Review.

I should be most grateful for your comments on the issues raised.

Thank you for your help with this matter. I look forward to hearing from you.

With best wishes,

David Rutley

DR

David Rutley MP

Enc

From: John A Perkin
Sent: 09 July 2014 18:20
To: communitygovernance@cheshireeast.gov.uk
Cc: RUTLEY, David
Subject: RE: MACCLESFIELD COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Importance: High
Sensitivity: Private

From

John Perkins
9 Fern Lea Drive
Macclesfield
Cheshire
SK11 8PQ

01625 612081

To

Registration Service & Business Manager
Cheshire East Council - Governance & Democratic Services
Ground Floor (Westfields)
C/O Municipal Buildings
Earle Street
Crewe
CW1 2BJ

CC David Rutley - Member of Parliament for Macclesfield
(davidrutley.mp@parliament.uk)

RE MACCLESFIELD COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

Is this a must have?

Having just received the Voting Papers for "The Local Governance Review" and every member of my family also getting individual copies I wonder if someone can put the Blurb into every day language that can be understood?

I get the jist that Macclesfield appears to be the only community in the Cheshire East area that does not have its own unique unit that sits to talk about and maybe run local facilities.

From what I can see from the Paper work provided there are a number of options to change this and each one comes with an **increased** cost to the **Council Tax Payer!!**

Sample costs quoted seem to indicate an increased cash flow to someone of between £99,000 and £115.000 a year (or even more) and this seems extortionate!

There does not appear to be a NO COST option or a Do Nothing Option

Which I believe should also be offered.

Currently we supposedly have representatives (Councillors) sitting on the Cheshire East Council who should be doing what I feel is the main work described in the paperwork but I do feel that these Councillors are not truly representing the people in their Wards.

Their communication with the Population of the Ward is minimal to say the least and as such I do wonder what they know about the Feelings, Thoughts, and Requirements of their Wards?

Maybe they only relate to the people that they know that vote for them and that is not necessarily an inclusive view of what the Ward is needing and experiencing.

So from the Paper work I cannot see how any of the proposals will in reality change anything in that what is really needed is for the PEOPLE to be able to voice their Feelings and requirements and have representatives that can take those points forward with some strength and ensure that these requirements and feelings are fairly presented to the Powers That Be.

To enable this maybe we do need a group of people from across the local communities that are not politically motivated who can sit regularly within open forums taking the Views, Worries, Needs, etc of the local community. This can then be translated into action plans and hopefully implemented in a way that sees the Plans being presented to Full Council for consideration.

If this cannot be provided then I do not see any point in having yet another layer of administration that is going to cost us more just for the sake of matching other Towns etc.

Maybe I am seeing this all wrong but nowhere in the Voting Documentation does it mention better communication with the population and how that will be achieved.

Perhaps some one could explain it better as none of my family understand what has been sent out!

Yours sincerely

John Perkins

DAVID RUTLEY MP



HOUSE OF COMMONS

LONDON SW1A 0AA

Mr Mike Suarez
Chief Executive
Cheshire East Council
Westfields
Middlewich Road
Sandbach
Cheshire CW11 1HZ

21 JUL 2014

21 JUL 2014

15th July 2014

L. Rutley

Re: Mr Malcolm Wright of 44 Hamble Way, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK10 3RN

Please find enclosed an email I have received from the above constituent regarding the Macclesfield Governance Review.

I should be most grateful for your comments on the issues raised.

Thank you for your help with this matter. I look forward to hearing from you.

With best wishes,

David Rutley

DR

David Rutley MP

Enc

From: malcolm wright
Sent: 09 July 2014 14:06
To: RUTLEY, David
Subject: macclesfield community governance review

Dear David,

Recently I have received a voting pack regarding the Macclesfield Governance Review.

It sets out 2 options for Local Governance each with a cost associated with it.

option 1 – parishes cost £28
option 2 – Enhanced Local Service Delivery £25

It seems to me that there should be a Option 3 Leave the system alone and save yourself £25-£28 per year.

From the voting form i have to choose between option 1 and 2 and end up paying either way.

Please can you look in to this for me as when I phoned the help line they couldn't tell me who to write to to clarify the situation.

Kind Regards,

Malcolm Wright
44 hamble way
Macclesfield
SK10 3RN

MACCLESFIELD COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
STAGE 1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

92 responses were received to the stage 1 consultation, of which 68 expressed a view on the options as detailed below.

Name	Comments on Options	No Change/ Maintain Status Quo	Single Town Council	Multiple Parishes	Other
Individual representations received by email / letter		x1	x8	x1	x2 no views expressed on the options
Summary of Responses from the on line / hand copy feedback forms		x2	x36	x8	1x community forum 3x Community Development Trust 2x community associations 2x other
2x late representations reported to CGR Sub Committee on 16 Oct 2013		x1		x1	
TOTALS		x4	x44	x10	x10

This page is intentionally left blank