

# Methodology:

---

For each question, the free text response was read by an individual (Business Insight Business Partner) and assigned a code that best described the respondent's comment.

Once around 100 comments had been read per question it was found that the comments were falling into the same codes. This allowed the analyst to create a selectable drop-down list. Extra codes were created when new comments didn't fall into existing codes.

The same analyst coded the first download of data for each question (around 2,000 responses per question) which ensured the robustness of the codes, but allowed them to be added to or refined

Examples of comments making up each comment were then captured to help illustrate what each code meant

The remaining downloads of data (around 4,500 responses per question) were coded by the Business Support team, who simply had to select the relevant code from the drop-down whilst referring to the coding examples below. The same individual completed each question to ensure consistency in interpretation of the codes.

Spot-checking of responses to ensure consistent interpretation of the codes was conducted by the Business Insight Business Partner

Question 16 was coded entirely by the Business Insight Business Partner to ensure consistency in coding this in depth question.

# Coding examples

---

The information below sets out the codes used for each question and specific examples from respondents who commented on the question as well as answering it directly. Additional explanation is given where required. Examples of the comments are copied directly from respondents, spelling and/or factual errors have not been corrected.

*We propose to close the below sites on two of their quietest weekdays. All sites would stay open on Friday, Saturday, Sunday & Mondays. If you have a preference for which weekday a site should remain open, please indicate this below*

---

## Affects by ability to work/volunteer

- I work for a garden charity and we are only able to help our clients with their gardening on Tuesday and Wednesdays

## Consecutive days open better

- Consecutive days open are easier to remember
- Consecutive days to the weekend are better for long weekends or dealing with waste generated over the weekend

## Distributes closure more evenly

- If you distribute the closure more evenly throughout the week, it reduces the number of days the sites are closed in a row

## Doesn't affect me / I don't mind

- It doesn't matter what day the site is open as long as it is well communicated.
- I don't use these sites
- These aren't my usual sites
- I work during the week so would recycle at the weekend anyway
- I am retired so can recycle at any time
- My visits do not follow a particular pattern

## Don't like any options

- I wouldn't want it to be closed on any day
- Haven't given us the option of no closures
- I think it should be open every day

## May result in unintended consequences

- fly tipping will be much more prevalent
- Any day removed will make queues worse at weekends, what is the plan to address this?

## Most convenient for me

- Because this is my day off
- Would prefer no closure because I would be unaware before loading car - wasted journey

## Negatively affects me

- Too far to go
- If you go and it's closed you are highly likely to get stuck in traffic going to another site and it would add another 40mins minimum to my round trip journey

***People from outside of the County use Buckinghamshire Household Recycling Centres, at a cost to local taxpayers. What do you think we should do about this?***

---

**Aim for reciprocal arrangements** – *comments suggesting that working with other Local Authorities to ensure fair compensation is received.*

- Get The Council Of those residents to contribute
- Why not have the choice, come to an agreement with Oxfordshire to for them to help run the site.
- Reciprocal agreements should be sought from neighbouring council to allow access
- It's the fairest option.
- A fair way of covering some of the costs; happens elsewhere

**County residency shouldn't matter** – *comments suggesting that all households pay council tax, so local borders shouldn't matter.*

- There will be Bucks residents who go to non-Bucks sites
- Doubtless tips in neighbouring counties are used by Bucks residents: swings and roundabouts.
- People who live on County borders will obviously go to the nearest site within their County or not.
- I live just across the border in Berkshire and Burnham is my nearest HRC
- People should be able to use their nearest facility regardless of which county they are resident in.

**Makes financial sense for Bucks** – *Comments suggesting that this option would be financially prudent for Buckinghamshire*

- To generate income, rather than stopping them.
- Surely if this is a cost cutting exercise, raising extra revenue should be the first thing to be done.
- It would help to offset some of the costs of running the site.
- extra income for the County, and making use of the County's money more usefully for residents
- Then they can make a choice if they want to use our facilities, but we can benefit from their choice
- If financial savings are required this would be the most obvious method

**May result in unintended consequences** – *This option may lead to other issues elsewhere and negate the possible benefits*

- Better to have it disposed of correctly than dumped elsewhere
- We all need to limit fly tipping
- If recycling centres start being too difficult for people to access people will not bother and fly tipping

**Over the border not our financial responsibility**

- Our Council Tax is high so have no wish to subsidise users from outside Bucks
- Why should people from other counties be able to use bucks facilities for free when residents pay tax towards it?
- I'm not paying for someone to use it for free

**People should not be deterred from recycling** – *comments suggest that any barrier to using the HRCs would deter people from recycling and this is not welcomed.*

- People should be encouraged to recycle regardless of the local authority they live in
- Restrictions on recycling result in less recycling. Allowing access is for the greater good.
- Waste is a national problem. No council should charge for use of these facilities

**Preserve service for Bucks residents** – *Comments make clear that the priority is the service for Buckinghamshire.*

- Sites get too busy at times
- If we the council is cash strapped they need to prioritise their residents. Why should our services be cut when we have paid our council tax and others that haven't use our services for free?
- The local taxpayers should have their own site, not open to all
- Should be local service for local People
- Buckinghamshire residents should have priority

**They can use it but should be charged**

- I am happy that my local tax covers the cost of disposing for local residents, however I suspect that some/many non-Bucks residents use the sites to avoid their local site charges
- Residents pay for their local services and can always use their own counties. However, people should be given a choice and pay for the privilege of that choice.

- If people outside the county really want to use Bucks facilities should pay for it as bucks residents do through their council tax

### **They should use their local facility**

- We all pay taxes, if there are sites nearer to them within their council why wouldn't they use them for free?
- They've got their own sites to go to
- People should use the facilities in the area in which they pay Council Tax.

### **Too impractical to administer** – *comments worrying about the implementation of the scheme, which would reduce any benefits.*

- I think introducing a scheme which needs admin and "policing" will add to costs unnecessarily.
- The cost of administering would probably outweigh the benefit
- The whole review is to save money, the first two choices will have associated costs to administrate and police on a 'car by car' basis causing further queues. If we allow residents from outside Bucks to use the services then advertise to Bucks residents that they also can use cross border services

***We cannot continue with 10 Household Recycling Centres. Considering the options detailed here, please select your preferred option below.***

---

**As few closures as possible** – *comments highlighting that any closures would have negative consequences*

- Better to close 1 rather than 2
- Would prefer that none are closed
- Closing 1 will minimise disruption the most compared to closing 2

**As long as it isn't my site**

- Anything as long as you don't close Bledlow
- Close any site, but do NOT close Burnham
- Hopefully not Aylesbury as we have nowhere that close by being retired

**Doesn't affect me / I don't mind**

- I don't use either of the proposed sites
- I am flexible, I use the sites so infrequently I don't mind a minor inconvenience

**Find alternative funding** – *Comments suggesting other methods for finding the service, to negate the need for change.*

- Don't close any just charge per vehicle!
- Why not keep them open! Agree with Oxford to help fund Bledlow
- Whenever I have visited the site it seems grossly overmanned. Have less staff at recycling centres.
- Close one site and reduce open days at all others
- I would rather pay more council tax for services

**Growth agenda not considered** – *Comments suggesting that the options do not full consider the amount of housing growth planned in the county*

- Aylesbury is a large and growing town
- Two is too many with the number of houses being built
- Thousands of new homes to be built in Bucks

**Makes sense to me (1 site)** – *Comments where respondents think that the option is a sensible idea*

- So that you can stagger the closures and understand the impacts before closing the second
- As long as it is the least busy site
- Because this will enable you to still provide a good level of service whilst still hitting your savings
- Will allow you to start finding savings with minimal impact

**Makes sense to me (2 sites)** – *Comments where respondents think that the option is a sensible idea*

- As long as you improve the remaining sites
- This will deliver the highest cost savings with minimal disruption
- Better to do it now and maximise the savings
- It will help make the system sustainable for the future

**Not getting VfM** – *Respondents expressing a general comment about the lack of value for money for the services they use currently*

- We have very little for our money each month we pay our council tax. I would like something for my near £300 each month
- Council tax will not go down, so I want more bang for my bucks!
- Recycling centres are very important. Where's the money going!?

**Will lead to negative consequences**

- This is sending the wrong message about recycling
- Will lead to more flytipping
- Will make the other sites busier
- Cause greater inconvenience for those residents

Two questions shared coded examples.

***If we close one site our preferred option would be to close Bledlow. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this option? Also, If we close two sites our preferred option for sites to close would be Bledlow & Burnham. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this?***

---

### **Doesn't affect me / don't mind**

- I don't use it/these facilities
- no strong view as not directly affected
- Doesn't impact me
- It's probably not used as much as the others

### **Don't want any sites to close** – *comments highlighting that any closures would have negative consequences*

- I don't want any to close
- No sites should be closed
- Don't really want any site to close

### **Find additional funding** – *In line with previous questions comments, suggestions around finding funding from other Local Authorities, BCC departments or direct from residents*

- I would fund it by charging Oxford or close another site
- It is an important site to local cross-border communities. Please consider charging or seeking Oxfordshire CC support
- Revenues could be increased by charging residents from Oxfordshire
- Additional charges from certain categories of waste will also boost revenues
- Further savings can be made and locals would be happy to pay Â£1 per visit
- I prefer you close none. Why isn't holding a referendum to give authority to raise the Council Tax and not be hamstrung by central government cuts not in the survey?
- Charge users from Slough as with Langley thereby making site cost effective for Bucks residents

### **Growth Agenda not considered** – *Comments suggesting that the options do not full consider the amount of housing growth planned in the county*

- 2000 new homes being built nearby in near future
- further housing which will increase the need for a further waste site
- Lots of new housing in Chinnor and Thame- population increase and need
- Bledlow serves a growing population; with the new development in Risborough this will only increase
- We live in Taplow which is a rapidly expanding community
- We need to keep these sites open as increased housing development in this region means there will be more demand for recycling centres/tips

### **It is a good facility** – *Comments expressing how much they liked the site at the moment*

- Because it is easy and good to use with personal service
- Bledlow is well run, friendly and has a large catchment area. There are usually none of the long queues associated with Rabans Lane
- Convenience AND the site has ALWAYS been very efficiently run and organised.
- Burnham is the best run site in Bucks
- Burnham is a fantastically well run site and so easy to use

### **Makes sense to me** - *Comments where respondents think that the option is a sensible idea*

- It is rather Rural perhaps
- Assuming that Bledlow is one of the least-used sites, then it makes sense to close it.
- Alternative sites are reasonably near
- Likely to inconvenience the least number of users
- Been to Burnham . Hard to find and disorganised
- Both have other options to go to
- These are rural locations
- Based on the evidence you have set out it looks to be the best option

### **Negatively affects me** – *direct consequences to the individual expressed*

- That is my local site. Too far to travel to another site
- To go somewhere else we have to travel narrow lanes. Not great with a trailer

- Because it's the one I use!
- We are forced to maintain Horse Chestnut Trees which produce green waste
- Burnham is our closest and we live in Taplow and aren't allowed to use the Maidenhead centre
- this is not an option, people will have to travel for miles to the nearest tip

**Negatively impacts the area** – *comments suggesting the local area, and not the individual would be affected.*

- This would undoubtedly lead to fly tipping across the area and especially on rural Chiltern roads
- If you close either of these sites you will be overwhelmed with people fly tipping
- Recycling centres are vital for our environment and to avoid more landfill / non-recyclable content.
- Bledlow provides a service to a rural area of Bucks
- People will be inconvenienced
- Lots of older residents who do not like to drive to Aylesbury
- Shouldn't close either. If the council and government are serious about recycling it should be invested in

**Not getting VfM** – *Respondents expressing a general comment about the lack of value for money for the services they use currently*

- I pay taxes, do your job stop making the ordinary persons lives more difficult
- Because I pay a lot of tax, and Bledlow Ridge is my local site
- We pay tax to have access to waste disposal sites within a reasonable distance from our homes.
- Burnham is always treated as a poor relation by Bucks CC due to its proximity to Slough. The dump is the one service where we feel the village actually gets value from the taxes we have to pay.

**You've already made up your minds** – *comments suggesting the consultation is a fait accompli and will not affect the outcome*

- You have already made your mind up which one your closing
- Loaded question. Whatever we say you will do it

*If there are any other realistic options or potential impacts from our proposals that we should consider, please provide details below*

---

### **Flytipping might increase**

- Increasing the barriers to recycling will increase fly-tipping and result in higher costs to clear up
- I don't believe that there would not be more flytipping, if they can't dispose of it for free they will dump it
- Flytipping may well become a bigger issue if you close sites

### **Charging options to consider**

- Happy to pay a £1-2 charge per visit to keep it open
- We should charge over-the-border residents to use our sites, better than stopping them altogether
- I think you charging people from outside buckinghamshire county council is a brilliant idea.
- If it is because Burnham is close to Slough, Slough should pay their fair usage
- Would prefer an annual license (charged) with proof of residence
- Weigh vehicle in and out, have a monthly limit, charge for certain types of waste, charge non residents heavily for all types of waste.

### **Income generation suggestion**

- Increase Council tax to cover costs
- Increase energy from waste to generate more income
- Why don't you sell the different waste streams to generate income, or have more incinerators?
- Review your contracts and make more money from the different waste streams instead
- Charge higher penalties for flytipping
- The government are highly likely to give new funding to councils for waste management in the coming years after Brexit is dealt with
- press Govt for realistic financial allocations - waste is a national concern
- You need to fight the reduction in central govt funding more strongly - don't just expect residents to deal with massive reductions in services.

### **Restrict days (i.e. don't close sites)**

- Restrict days/times across all sites to find savings and maintain total coverage rather than closing sites
- Restrict days/times at Bledlow/Burnham rather than closing them altogether
- why not close more sites one day week instead of 3 sites on 2 days a week
- Close more sites for a couple of days per week
- Retaining all sites, each one to be open maybe 2/3 days a week.

### **Growth Agenda not fully considered**

- There is significant housing growth expected in the area, has the Council considered all the extra waste this will produce. Seems illogical to be closing sites
- Significant growth around Princes Risborough and the North of the County, surely we need more recycling centres not fewer
- Increased inconvenience to user/community:
- Consider the impact on the elderly population that live near Bledlow
- There are a lot of old people in Burnham that use the recycling centre who would have to drive to another centre.
- Closing Bledlow is going to cost me more time and money in fuel



- Having more people travelling further is going to make congestion worse in the area
- Using Wycombe instead of Bledlow isn't a viable option, it is too far
- Has anyone actually driven from Princes Risborough to Aston Clinton in 20 mins at the weekend?
- more rural area than the bigger sites - but it is still vital to those communities
- If you close Burnham most people will travel to Beaconsfield which is a very busy site, it would become a day's outing to take your waste due to the high usage at weekends.

### Find savings elsewhere

- Find savings from elsewhere in the Council e.g. reduce Chief Exec salary, Members luncheons, Stop HS2, reduce pensions
- Look at wasted spending in other areas such as Social Care
- make the big wigs of the council take a pay cut. See if they could live on less money

### Review kerbside offering

- Can we have bigger or second bins to collect our household waste e.g. green, then we won't need to go to the tip as much
- Can we have occasional bulky waste collection from our homes instead; can we have total waste collection from home, this would cut down on car journeys and help those without access to a car
- They should provide bigger bins and collect more types of waste from our houses
- Since most waste is garden waste, why don't you increase how much you collect from households

### Opening time options to consider

- Could you reduce the hours that sites are open, rather than closing any sites?
- If a recycling centre is assessed as being more frequently used in summer, it may be better to close the site for 3 days in winter and only 1 day in summer
- An Aylesbury site needs to be open later during the week, 4pm is not acceptable as this forces everyone who works to only visit during the weekend and the queuing at weekends is already significant.

### Impact on environment

- Have you considered the impact on the environment of more car journeys to reach sites further away?
- You should not be closing recycling sites. It is outrageous that you are proposing this. Save the Planet!

### Site closure options to consider

- Close Amersham, it is poorly designed and Chesham which is excellent is nearby
- Close Rabans Lane, there is Aston Clinton which is a much better site nearby
- Close Aston Clinton as close to Aylesbury. Close Amersham or Chesham as close together
- Close Chesham, which is near to Amersham and expand facilities at Amersham. This gives a fairer geographical distribution.

### New idea (may not be a new idea to the Council)

- Could we have a Council Skip to visit our area for a few hours a day once or twice a year
- Urban areas could have fewer larger sites and Rural areas could have more smaller sites
- Enforce the use of permits
- Use ANPR to identify out-of-county
- Offer garden composters and other recycling equipment and materials for sale on site
- Replacing two sites, and rebuilding/using one larger site?

### **Collaborate better with neighbouring authorities**

- Collaborate with neighbouring authority to share the costs of sites near the border
- reciprocal arrangements / contributions from neighbouring counties to make the sites more viable

### **Value for Money**

- This is the only service I use from the Council, what value am I getting for my Council tax?
- If you are going to continue cutting our services, you should reduce what you charge us in Council Tax
- As tax payers we should have this facility in our area.

### **Longer queues**

- If you close sites, it will just increase the demand at the remaining sites and in turn the congestion

### **Agree with recommendations**

- I think your proposals make sense
- Generally well thought out survey
- I'm sure you've explored the options and given it more thought than I have the time for
- Better for bcc residents to have a free service at fewer sites than having to pay.

### **Promote recycling more**

- We should be making recycling easier not harder
- Bucks does not do nearly enough recycling or outreach, except to this very few of us who care about sustainability and follow your page. Do more! Reducing recycling is not the right choice.

### **Resourcing model review**

- Use volunteers to manage sites instead of paid for staff
- Restrict the days sites are open and run a bank system of staff to move between them
- Sites look over-staffed; fewer staff on site
- Is it not possible that the tips could be worked in conjunction with Biffa or similar organisations to keep the running of the tip viable

### **Rural Communities Impacted**

- Whilst I acknowledge that Bucks maintains more sites per resident than other counties, the rural nature of the county should be considered (i.e. people may be commuting further and having to drive greater distances for the recycling centres) when compared to other counties. This should be considered in the context of impact on individuals.
- It is important to serve all locations. You should support rural locations and not penalise them
- Urban areas can be served by fewer, larger sites, more rural areas need more and smaller sites

### **Microsites strategically located**

- If you need to cut the larger facilities, why don't you provide smaller containers for residents to pre-sort before collection like they do in Europe, it would save time and manpower before being recycled
- put more paper & other recycling opportunities back into car parks etc.
- Local skips - like most other countries use
- Increase the use of mini recycling locations around the area that could be cleared every couple of days

### **Displaced to residual**

- Increased barriers to recycling may reduce recycling and displace recyclables into residual waste
- I would put more rubbish to landfills so less would be recycled

### Improve quality of remaining sites

- make Buckingham more efficient if it is the most expensive. due to its remoteness from rest of locations it may need special actions
- If you are going to reduce the days that the sites are open, at least pay some attention to the management of the sites – Raban's Lane has no marshalling thus when busy it's a/ dangerous and b/very inefficient leading to long queues

### More re-use shops

- I do think all the sites should have the shop option

### More garden fires

- there will be increased local garden fires to burn garden rubbish (adding to carbon emissions)
- This will increase bonfires

### Stop over-the-border users

- Prevent non-residents from access
- Stop outsiders using the sites
- Keep for local residents only

### Unitary

- See what happens with unitary authorities

### Null

- too many to list in such a small space
- The options provided for this review are stupid...I was not allowed to dis -agree in some cases. The Bledlow site is always busy seven days a week all year round so closing it is clearly not an option. There has to be a better way to save money
- I use the Beaconsfield site and find it a wonderful facility so please keep it open
- If people are prepared to travel it has got to be responsible
- Close a different one. Why choose Bledlow?
- no mention of asbestos and other dangerous chemicals?
- Your travel times for the Bledlow Ridge site are incorrect. I think you have used travel times to Bledlow, and not Bledlow Ridge.
- You are not consulting you are delivering a result.