

**PARTON, Lindsey**

---

**From:** Harry Hodkinson ~~h.hodkinson@eastcheshire.gov.uk~~  
**Sent:** 15 December 2014 16:20  
**To:** COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW  
**Subject:** Formation of Macclesfield Parish Council

Please be advised that I do not consider the above good use of locally raised taxes, and that should this go ahead, it will be of detriment to the voters of Macclesfield who already have representation on East Cheshire Council

H. Hodkinson

**PARTON, Lindsey**

---

**From:** Peter Nash [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 15 December 2014 20:51  
**To:** COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW  
**Subject:** Macclesfield Town Council Consultation

I write to confirm I fully support the proposals to have 12 town councillors who will be elected in May 2015 in accordance with the distribution set out in your e mail of today's date.

--

Regards

Peter Nash  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**PARTON, Lindsey**

---

**From:** Tim Andrew [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 16 December 2014 16:00  
**To:** COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW  
**Subject:** Macclesfield Community Governance

Dear Sirs,

Your proposal that Macclesfield should have a Parish Council is at odds with the majority of preferences expressed by those who took part in your earlier consultation. This makes one wonder what was the purpose of the consultation. Residents of Macclesfield tend to a low opinion of the Cheshire East Council, following the fiasco of money wasted on the aborted Lyme Green recycling facility and yet more spent on the unpublished report into the matter. The Council's choosing to ignore the wishes of Macclesfield residents in the matter of governance will serve only to add to a sense of alienation from Cheshire East. It would be nice to be able to believe that this latest round of consultation was other than a token gesture, but sadly the Council has done little to give one any confidence that this might be the case.

Yours faithfully,

Timothy Andrew

T. H. Andrew  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**PARTON, Lindsey**

---

**From:** braithwaite [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 16 December 2014 17:39  
**To:** COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW  
**Subject:** Final stage proposals for Macclesfield governance

Please be advised that I support the proposal for a parish council for Macclesfield with 7 wards and 12 councillors.

Regards, Liz Braithwaite (SK11 6PH)

**PARTON, Lindsey**

---

**From:** RAY PERRY <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 15 January 2015 16:49  
**To:** PARTON, Lindsey  
**Subject:** Governance

Hello Lindsey and Gaynor,

I am happy with the Macclesfield governance plan so far. It seems everybody wishes to go ahead with a parish/town council. Good.

The number of councillors per parish ward seems adequate.

Happy New Year to all involved with the governance project.

Regards

Ray Perry



## **PARTON, Lindsey**

---

**From:** PARTON, Lindsey  
**Sent:** 05 January 2015 11:38  
**To:** COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW  
**Subject:** FW: Prospective Macclesfield Town Council

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 19 December 2014 00:17  
**To:** PARTON, Lindsey  
**Subject:** Prospective Macclesfield Town Council

Lindsey, If consultation is being carried out can I suggest some topics people constructing the Macclesfield Town Council might like to consider:

1. Wards: There seems to be a wish to keep CE wards. This may be suitable for simplicity but Macclesfield is made up of a number of distinct communities and these communities should at least be considered when wards are created. There has been no detailed discussion to my knowledge.
2. Number of Councillors: There seems to be a wish for 12. This is too few in my view based on Bollington's experience. Town Councils really need to get down to street level. We have 12 in Bollington for a Town of 8,000 people. Macclesfield has 55,000. I would have said for genuine local representation you will need at least 20 and probably 24.
3. Staff to be appointed: You will need 3/4FTE. Main functions
  - a) Town clerk who acts as the legal advisor and CEO
  - b) Responsible Financial Officer: Looks after the money and keeps everyone in check and on board as far as expenditure goes. This can become quite a job when you manage rented resources like community halls, allotments etc. and are responsible for projects and grants both coming in and going out.
  - c) Mayor and Deputy Mayors Secretary who often doubles as the receptionist and information giver. The face of the organisation.
  - d) The lensperson who does any work outside, maintenance, minor repairs, deliveries, caretaking etc etc.
  - e) There are a number of other roles that might be fulfilled depending on tasks and assets taken on but the above are the basics.
4. Level of precept: This is always the tricky one especially to start with but my own guideline is £1 per band D household per week remembering that a household often contains more than one person and this is less than the price of a pint of milk or half a pint of beer. In Macclesfield that should give a budget of around £900,000 which should be enough to carry out a full range of responsibilities and support some in Town projects.

However with this level of precept you can employ sufficient staff to give a good service, offer useful grants to voluntary organisations or kick start community based projects, and build a capital fund to maintain assets and to support any assets you might acquire through localisation. Any services devolved would have to be paid for by CE.
5. Committee Structure: Even small Councils like Bollington have a Committee Structure and they meet at different times and frequencies depending on the tasks performed.

Normally you have:

  - a) Main Council meets monthly
  - b) Planning Committee Meets monthly
  - c) Strategic Planning Committee bimonthly
  - d) Highways Committee quarterly
  - e) Footpaths Committee quarterly

- f) Civic Events Committee quarterly
- g) Health and Safety bi yearly
- h) Standing Orders Committee bi yearly
- i) Personnel Committee bi yearly
- j))Grants Committee half yearly

There will be task and finish groups from time to time or management groups for assets like Civic Halls etc.

Hope this is helpful.



Regards  
ken



**PARTON, Lindsey**

---

**From:** Sally Lowden  
**Sent:** 14 January 2015 12:27  
**To:** COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW  
**Subject:** Parish/town coucils for Macclesfield

I would like to register my vote for a single town council for Macclesfield.  
Additionally, if that is what most respondents voted for, why is that not the preferred option?

Sally Lowden



## **PARTON, Lindsey**

---

**From:** PEDERSEN ARND  
**Sent:** 15 January 2015 16:35  
**To:** COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW  
**Subject:** Macclesfield Community Governance Review

To [communitygovernance@cheshireeast.gov.uk](mailto:communitygovernance@cheshireeast.gov.uk)

Dear Sir,

### **Re: Macclesfield Community Governance Review**

I wish to record my objection to Cheshire East Council's recommendations for the creation of a parish council for Macclesfield and to the creation of seven parish wards based on existing Borough Ward boundaries.

1. In stage one of this review in July 2013 residents were asked for their views on seven options for Macclesfield:

- No change (Local Area Partnership, Charter Trustees, Local Service Delivery Committee)
- Parish/Town Council(s)
- Community Forums
- Community Development Trusts
- Neighbourhood Management
- Residents' and Tenants' Associations
- Community Associations

As part of the review some public meetings were arranged but these were very poorly attended. Following the review CEC decided that just two options would be put forward for the next stage - parishing for Macclesfield and an enhanced Local Service Delivery Committee. The latter is a new option not consulted upon. The 'No Change' option was dropped together with five others. No details of the review feedback can be found.

2. Stage two of this review took place in July 2014 and consisted of a postal vote. The options put forward were the two decided upon by CEC following stage one, parishing and an enhanced LSDC. The questions that found their way onto the ballot papers were: Should Macclesfield have...

#### Votes Received

- |   |      |        |
|---|------|--------|
| • An Enhanced Macclesfield Service Delivery Committee | 1449 | 3.63%  |
| • A Single Parish / Town Council                      | 4907 | 12.29% |

If you voted for a single parish/town council you were also asked for your preference for

- |                            |      |        |
|----------------------------|------|--------|
| • A Town Council           | 3429 | 69.88% |
| • A Parish Council by Ward | 1478 | 30.12% |

Regrettably the 'No Change' option was absent from the ballot paper. 15.92% of the electors of Macclesfield voted for one of the options. Of the 12.29% of the electors who voted for a Single Parish / Town Council 69.88% voted for a Town Council and 30.12% voted for a Parish Council by Ward. 84% of Macclesfield's electors did not vote. That should have killed off this review.

3. For the final stage of the review CEC has now made recommendations for the creation of a Parish Council for Macclesfield with the creation of seven parish wards. On which planet do CEC

councillors reside? 70% of those who voted for 'A Single Parish / Town Council' voted for a Town Council, 30% voted for a Parish Council. How was a Parish Council arrived at? This reflects poorly of the democratic process. It is autocratic and an insult to those who took the trouble to vote.

I see that the Mayor of Macclesfield Councillor Jackson is urging local groups, such as the Civic Society and Make it Macclesfield, to put forward representatives for election to the Parish Council. With voting to take place at parish level how can their candidates, who may only be known by a few voters across Macclesfield, hope to be elected in a parish by parish election? Hopeless. This is a politicians' stitch-up.

Let us have a single Town Council, as the Civic Society campaigned for. And let us vote in all the wards using the same long ballot paper. Macclesfield is a town, not a collection of parishes.

Arndt Pedersen

## **PARTON, Lindsey**

---

**From:** Irene Pedersen  
**Sent:** 15 January 2015 16:42  
**To:** COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW  
**Subject:** Macclesfield Community Governance Review

To [communitygovernance@cheshireeast.gov.uk](mailto:communitygovernance@cheshireeast.gov.uk)

Dear Sir,

### **Re: Macclesfield Community Governance Review**

I wish to record my objection to Cheshire East Council's recommendations for the creation of a parish council for Macclesfield and to the creation of seven parish wards based on existing Borough Ward boundaries.

1. In stage one of this review in July 2013 residents were asked for their views on seven options for Macclesfield:

- No change (Local Area Partnership, Charter Trustees, Local Service Delivery Committee)
- Parish/Town Council(s)
- Community Forums
- Community Development Trusts
- Neighbourhood Management
- Residents' and Tenants' Associations
- Community Associations

As part of the review some public meetings were arranged but these were very poorly attended. Following the review CEC decided that just two options would be put forward for the next stage - parishing for Macclesfield and an enhanced Local Service Delivery Committee. The latter is a new option not consulted upon. The 'No Change' option was dropped together with five others. No details of the review feedback can be found.

2. Stage two of this review took place in July 2014 and consisted of a postal vote. The options put forward were the two decided upon by CEC following stage one, parishing and an enhanced LSDC. The questions that found their way onto the ballot papers were: Should Macclesfield have...

#### Votes Received

- |   |      |        |
|---|------|--------|
| • An Enhanced Macclesfield Service Delivery Committee | 1449 | 3.63%  |
| • A Single Parish / Town Council                      | 4907 | 12.29% |

If you voted for a single parish/town council you were also asked for your preference for

- |                            |      |        |
|----------------------------|------|--------|
| • A Town Council           | 3429 | 69.88% |
| • A Parish Council by Ward | 1478 | 30.12% |

Regrettably the 'No Change' option was absent from the ballot paper. 15.92% of the electors of Macclesfield voted for one of the options. Of the 12.29% of the electors who voted for a Single Parish / Town Council 69.88% voted for a Town Council and 30.12% voted for a Parish Council by Ward. 84% of Macclesfield's electors did not vote. That should have killed off this review.

3. For the final stage of the review CEC has now made recommendations for the creation of a Parish Council for Macclesfield with the creation of seven parish wards. On which planet do CEC

councillors reside? 70% of those who voted for 'A Single Parish / Town Council' voted for a Town Council, 30% voted for a Parish Council. How was a Parish Council arrived at? This reflects poorly of the democratic process. It is autocratic and an insult to those who took the trouble to vote.

I see that the Mayor of Macclesfield Councillor Jackson is urging local groups, such as the Civic Society and Make it Macclesfield, to put forward representatives for election to the Parish Council. With voting to take place at parish level how can their candidates, who may only be known by a few voters across Macclesfield, hope to be elected in a parish by parish election? Hopeless. This is a politicians' stitch-up.

Let us have a single Town Council, as the Civic Society campaigned for. And let us vote in all the wards using the same long ballot paper. Macclesfield is a town, not a collection of parishes.

Irene Pedersen

Mr Paul Mountford  
Democratic Services Officer,  
Cheshire East Council.

Dear Mr Mountford

**GOVERNANCE REVIEW FOR MACCLESFIELD – CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE 16 JANUARY 2015**

Further to the recent meeting of the Macclesfield Local Service Delivery Committee I am writing with some further representations on behalf of the Macclesfield Civic Society.

We very much welcome the decision of Council to proceed with the establishment of a Parish/Town council for Macclesfield, having supported that position for some time. Our view, which we have already described to yourselves in some detail, has been informed by a number of discussions with town clerks, councillors, and council officers. Consequently at this time we would like to make some additional comments on the decisions facing Council at present.

We do not consider it to be appropriate for the Civic Society to comment on the warding of the unparished area nor the number of councillors to be elected. However the issue of choosing the correct level of the precept prompts us to make the following points.

We believe that the level of precept should allow:-

- 1 The Town Council to operate for the first three years at least without a significant change in precept to allow the Town Council to be seen as competent and to allow it to generate confidence amongst the electorate.
- 2 A premises lease to be arranged for those Town Council administrative staff not located in the Town Hall.
- 3 The normal statutory functions such as managing allotments to be carried out.
- 4 A consultation to take place with the electorate, sooner rather than later, to inform decisions on which services and facilities people in the Town would want their Town Council to provide, and also which issues they would wish to be taken forward into a neighbourhood plan. We believe that decisions about which property if any should be transferred to the Town Council should be taken by the elected Town Councillors, although again these could well be informed by the results of the consultation.

The recent LSDC meeting has made good progress towards a budget and reflects significant effort in the time available by Cheshire East officers, which is recognised. Generally we support the agreements reached although we wish to make the following points:

- 5 A reasonable contingency should be included to take into account the many uncertainties that could arise, for example any discussion about transfer of assets could well require expert independent advice at some cost, and provision for the consultation identified in 4 above.

6 Some accommodation should be provided as of right in the Town Hall

7 The figure of £15k for grants, which we understand to be included, is low in comparison with other towns in the north of Cheshire East, before taking into account the greater population of Macclesfield and the number of charitable organisations based in the Town. What should also be borne in mind is the current trend for support of local organisations, which is clearly moving from Cheshire East to individual town councils.

We believe the above factors point to a grant allowance which as a minimum should be at least double the £15k currently included.

We hope that you will be able to take the above comments into account when finalising the initial budget and precept.

With best wishes I remain

Yours sincerely

*Keith Smith*

Chairman, Macclesfield Civic Society

14 January 2015