

ZERO WASTE: EDINBURGH AND MIDLOTHIAN

PUBLIC ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOUR TO CURRENT WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICES AND ACCEPTABILITY OF DIFFERENT WASTE TECHNOLOGIES

**KEEP SCOTLAND BEAUTIFUL SURVEY
APRIL 2010**

**Keep Scotland Beautiful Research Team
Wallace House
17-21 Maxwell Place
Stirling FK8 1JU**

Tel: 01786 468 783

www.wasteawarescotland.org.uk

April 2010



• EDINBURGH •
YOUR COUNCIL - YOUR ENVIRONMENT



KSB Report No: Ed & Mid Waste Treatment Report March 2010 LM/SA

When referring to this report please use the following citation:

KSB, 2010: Ed & Mid Waste Treatment Report February 2010 Survey, Keep Scotland Beautiful, Stirling.

Produced and published March 2010 by the Keep Scotland Beautiful Research Team, Keep Scotland Beautiful, Wallace House, 17-21 Maxwell Place, Stirling FK8 1JU
Tel: 01786 468248 Web: www.wasteawarescotland.org.uk.

This report is available from the Keep Scotland Beautiful office and website.

© KSB 2006-2010 All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Keep Scotland Beautiful gratefully acknowledges the support received from the staff of Edinburgh and Midlothian Councils and members of the public who took part in this survey.

FOREWORD

Waste Aware Scotland was a programme established in 2000 and managed by Keep Scotland Beautiful to develop and lead on the 'Waste Aware Scotland' campaigning programme. This provided consistency of Reduce Reuse Recycle messages, and promoted behavioural change with the four key audiences:- Businesses, Consumers, Community Organisations, and Local Authorities who engaged in Waste Prevention and Recycling Infrastructure across Scotland.

As part of the National Waste Plan for Scotland, the Waste Aware Scotland campaigning programme was designed to raise awareness of and change public attitudes and behaviour towards personal waste management, and to achieve a consistency of approach and terminology in waste awareness throughout Scotland. Household surveys were carried out as part of the programme to assess changes in public attitudes and behaviour towards reducing, reusing and recycling.

Zero Waste Scotland is the new single programme being created by the Scottish Government to support delivery of its Zero Waste Plan. It integrates the work of: WRAP Scotland, Waste Aware Scotland, Keep Scotland Tidy, Remade Scotland, Envirowise in Scotland, NISP in Scotland, and some programmes delivered by the Community Recycling Network for Scotland.

This report details the findings of a door to door survey conducted among householders living in Edinburgh and Midlothian Council areas to assess public attitudes and behaviour to current waste management services and their acceptability of different waste technologies.

Nicki Souter
Campaigns Manager
Keep Scotland Beautiful

NATIONAL RECYCLING TARGETS

Zero Waste Scotland – A New Vision for Waste

In January 2008, the new Scottish Government outlined its ambitious plans for a Zero Waste Scotland.

The plans included increasing the targets for waste reduction and recycling in Scotland:

- By 2025 - recycle or compost 70% of municipal solid waste.
- By 2025 – reduce the amount of municipal solid waste sent to landfill to 5%.
- By 2025 – no more than 25% of municipal solid waste is to be used to generate energy.
- 25% cap on Energy from Waste. This cap should not extend to other forms of treatment infrastructure- taking mixed wastes such as mechanical biological treatment, mechanical heat treatment or autoclaving and anaerobic digestion. High efficiency Energy from Waste plants are used only after efforts have been made to reduce, reuse and recycle.

The Scottish Government is developing a new National Waste Management Plan for Scotland which will be called Scotland's Zero Waste Plan. A key part of this activity was to undertake a consultation which ran between August and November 2009.

Scotland's Zero Waste Plan will be published during summer 2010.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
FOREWORD.....	iii
NATIONAL RECYCLING TARGETS.....	iv
CONTENTS.....	v
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	8
2 BACKGROUND TO THE SURVEY.....	9
3. DETAILS OF THE SURVEY PROCESS.....	9
3.1 Developing the Survey Plan.....	9
3.2 The Survey Sample.....	9
3.3 Conducting Additional Surveys close to the Proposed Site.....	9
3.4 Questionnaire Development.....	9
3.5 Data Management.....	9
4. PARTICIPATION IN THE WASTE HIERARCHY: REDUCE, REUSE, RECYCLE.....	9
4.1 Introduction.....	9
4.2 The Waste Hierarchy: Reduce.....	9
4.2.1 Reducing Household Waste.....	9
4.2.2 Participation in Dedicated Waste Reduction Schemes.....	9
4.2.3 Summary of the Reduce Part of the Waste Hierarchy.....	9
4.3 The Waste Hierarchy: Reuse.....	9
4.4 The Waste Hierarchy: Recycling.....	9
4.4.1 Recycling Rates.....	9
4.4.2 Recycling Services Available.....	9
4.4.2 How Respondents Chose to Recycle.....	9
4.5 Summary of Participation in Reduce, Reuse & Recycle.....	9
4.6 Conclusion.....	9
5 FOOD WASTE.....	9
5.1 Introduction.....	9
5.2 Activity to Reduce Food Waste.....	9
5.3 Disposing of Food Waste.....	9
5.4 Attitudes to Reducing Food Waste.....	9
5.5 Attitudes to a Food Waste Kerbside Collection Service.....	9
5.6 Willingness to use a Food Collection Service.....	9
5.7 Conclusion.....	9
6 KERBSIDE SERVICE, ON-STREET RECYCLING AND RECYCLING POINTS.....	9
6.1 Introduction.....	9
6.2 Materials currently Recycled using the Kerbside Service, On-Street Recycling or Recycling Points.....	9
6.3 Opinion of the Kerbside Service, On-street Recycling and Recycling Points.....	9
6.3.1 Rating of Kerbside and Recycling Points Service.....	9

6.3.2	Reasons for Recycling using the Kerbside services, On-street Recycling or the Recycling Points	9
6.4	Suggested Improvements to Kerbside Service, On-Street Recycling and Recycling Points...	9
6.5	Conclusion.....	9
7	RECYCLING CENTRES.....	9
7.1	Introduction.....	9
7.2	Local Recycling Centres.....	9
7.3	Materials Recycled at Recycling Centres.....	9
7.4	Opinion of Recycling Centres.....	9
7.4.1	Satisfaction and Overall Rating of Recycling Centres	9
7.4.2	What Respondents Liked about Recycling Centres	9
7.4.3	What Respondents Dislike about Recycling Centres	9
7.5	Suggested Improvements to Recycling Centres.....	9
7.6	Conclusion.....	9
8	PUBLIC OPINION OF THE PROPOSED ZERO WASTE PARC AT MILLERHILL.....	9
8.1	Introduction.....	9
8.2	Concept of a Zero Waste Parc.....	9
8.3	Developing a Zero Waste Parc at Millerhill.....	9
8.4	Advantages of the Zero Waste Parc.....	9
8.5	Importance of features of the proposed Zero Waste Parc.....	9
8.6	Concerns and possible disadvantages raised about the Zero Waste Parc.....	9
8.7	Communicating the Progress of the Parc.....	9
8.8	Conclusion.....	9
9.	PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS OF THE WIDER ASPECTS OF THE WASTE PROCESS.....	9
9.1	Introduction.....	9
9.2.	Understanding of Where Waste Goes.....	9
9.2.1	Waste put out for recycling	9
9.2.2	General Waste	9
9.3	Public Understanding of Council's Need to Reduce General Waste Amounts.....	9
9.4	Conclusion.....	9
10.	PUBLIC AWARENESS AND OPINION OF WASTE TECHNOLOGIES AVAILABLE.....	9
10.1	Introduction.....	9
10.2	Opinion about treating waste locally.....	9
10.3	Awareness of technologies that could be used within the Parc.....	9
10.4	Utilising Heat Produced from Waste Treatment.....	9
10.5	Energy from Waste as an Alternative to Landfill.....	9
10.6	Awareness of Different Waste Technologies.....	9
10.7	Conclusion.....	9
11	REASONS FOR NOT USING RECYCLING SERVICES.....	9
11.1	Introduction.....	9
11.2	Profile of Non-Recyclers.....	9
11.3	Reasons for Not Recycling.....	9
11.4	Factors to Encourage Future Recycling.....	9
11.5	Conclusion.....	9

APPENDIX 1**9**
 Reporting conventions used.....9

APPENDIX 2**9**

SUMMARY OF TABLES.....**9**

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report examines the findings from the survey conducted by the Keep Scotland Beautiful Research Team on behalf of Edinburgh and Midlothian Councils. The survey interviewed a representative population of 455 respondents and probed a number of subject areas including current reduce, reuse and recycle activity, opinion relating to the proposed Zero Waste Parc at Millerhill and attitudes about waste treatment technologies.

The survey findings revealed that participation rates for recycling were very high (82%). Positive results were also observed for numbers actively reducing their household waste, although awareness of both the range of waste reduction activities that could be carried out and national waste reduction schemes were found to be low. The key factors to motivate respondents to reduce their food waste are the promise of saving money and reducing their waste. Where food waste is generated, 90% of this waste currently goes in the residual bin but 65% of respondents stated that they would be willing to use a food collection service. However, a number of concerns were raised.

92% of recyclers used the kerbside service, the on-street recycling or at Recycling Points. Newspapers, glass bottles and jars, food and drink cans and cardboard were the most popular items to be recycled. The majority of the residents who used the service were very satisfied with it as they rated it as 'very good' or 'good'. The main suggested improvement to the kerbside, the on-street recycling or Recycling Points service was to collect more materials, notably plastics.

Small numbers of respondents used Recycling Centres, but those that do were very satisfied with the service that they received. Satisfaction with Recycling Centres was also evidenced in few respondents who were able to provide responses for neither what they disliked nor any improvements to them. Visits to Recycling Centres were infrequent.

Generally respondents were very positive about the potential to develop a Zero Waste Parc. The Millerhill site overall was found to be a suitable location.

The main advantages that respondents perceived about the Zero Waste Parc were the provision of energy and that it would be good for the environment. The importance of screening, the impact on the environment and the provision of employment opportunities were all graded 'essential' or 'very important' features by more than half of respondents. The main concerns about the potential development were air pollution and the potential for increased traffic in the area. The latter of which was a particular concern for local respondents. Local residents who were surveyed in addition to the general survey were also positive about the proposal, although as may be expected a few concerns and objections were raised with 12% of local residents stated that developing a Zero Waste Parc at Millerhill was 'very unacceptable'.

On the whole respondents were aware that their general waste goes to landfill but they were confused about what happens to their recycled waste with over half responding 'don't know'. Communicating the message of where residents waste goes is therefore very important to increase public knowledge and understanding of the issues involved. The level of awareness about different waste technologies was found to be very low as Energy from Waste was the most frequently cited, but only a quarter of respondents had heard of this.

Respondents were very positive about the possibility of using Energy from Waste as an alternative to landfill.

Key Statistics

- 58% of respondents are actively trying to reduce the amount of waste produced in the household
- 82% of respondents recycle
- 98% of users of Recycling Centres were satisfied with them
- 65% of respondents stated that developing a Zero Waste Parc at Millerhill was either 'acceptable' or 'very acceptable'
- 77% of respondents agreed that the concept of a Zero Waste Parc was either a 'very good' or a 'good' idea
- The most frequently mentioned advantages of the proposed Zero Waste Parc were that it would be good for the environment (36%), it would provide energy (29%) and would reduce the amount of waste going to landfill (28%)
- 96% of respondents agreed that utilising heat produced from waste treatment for local homes was a good idea
- 70% of respondents were positive about using Energy from Waste as an alternative to landfill

2 BACKGROUND TO THE SURVEY

In 2008/09 the recycling rate within the Edinburgh Council area was found to be 30%, and the figure for the Midlothian Council area was 37.4%. Whilst this rate has been increasing year on year, there is much still to do in order for both Councils to meet local and Government targets. Edinburgh has to reach a recycling rate of 38.65% by the end of 2011 and 43.6% by the end of 2012. Midlothian's long term target is that by 2025, at most, 5% of residual waste will go to landfill.

The long term recycling and composting targets that have been set by the Scottish Government are:

- 40% by 2010
- 50% by 2013
- 60% by 2020
- 70% by 2025

Targets that have been set for biodegradable municipal waste are:

- 0.88 million tonnes in 2012/13
- 0.62 million tonnes in 2019/20

In response to these targets, Edinburgh and Midlothian Councils have jointly commissioned a Zero Waste Project in response to Scottish Government policy of moving towards a Zero Waste Scotland by progressively reducing, reusing and recycling more municipal waste. Hence the Zero Waste Project will examine ways that waste can be diverted from landfill. As a result, the main aim of this project is to work with a private sector partner to treat the mixed waste that is currently collected by the two councils and can not be readily recycled. Planning permission in principle will be requested for a site near to Millerhill for this waste treatment facility before summer 2010.

Consultation with the public is therefore required in order to assess public opinion about this proposed project as well as get a steer as to how the public would like to see in their waste treated. Thus this survey has been commissioned by Edinburgh and Midlothian Council to question a representative sample of the population to identify current waste management behaviour as well as attitudes to a range of waste management services.

The survey probed a number of topic areas ranging on knowledge and participation in various aspects of the waste hierarchy, perception of the recycling services available, opinion of reducing food waste, knowledge about taxes and fines that council's face in the future, knowledge of different methodologies to treat waste and finally public opinion about the proposed Zero Waste Parc at Millerhill.

The aim of the survey was to assess public attitudes and behaviour of the current waste management services and assess public understanding and acceptability of different waste technologies within Edinburgh and Midlothian Council areas.

As a result the survey had three primary objectives:

- To develop a questionnaire to ensure the aims and objectives were met
- To conduct surveys in 455 households in area (thus providing a confidence level of 95%)
- Produce a report based on this research activity

3. DETAILS OF THE SURVEY PROCESS

3.1 Developing the Survey Plan

The survey covers a representative sample from the City of Edinburgh and Midlothian Council area.

The total number of households in the survey area was obtained from the General Register Office for Scotland website, Scotland's 2001 Census Results Online (SCROL) using their 'Analyser Tool' and relevant 'Accommodation Type' table.

The survey sample size was calculated using a statistical equation taken from Brown and Vance (1961) checked by C A Howie of the Department of Computing Science and Mathematics at the University of Stirling. The total number of households is inserted into the formula which calculates the survey sample size using 50% as the apriori estimate (this assumes no bias prior to surveying i.e. there is a 50:50 chance of respondents answering yes or no to any given question), significance level of 5% (i.e. confidence level 95%) and 2% as the acceptable error (the margin of error) in the estimate of the percentage.

To ensure a fully representative cross section was obtained, the survey profile was based on housing type and age group. Using the same SCROL Analyser Tool the distribution of the total sample by housing type and the four age groups was calculated in the same proportions as the 2001 Census. The housing types used were: detached, semi-detached, terraced and flats. The age groups are: 18-29, 30-44, 45-59 and 60+. However, when surveying, priority was given to obtaining representative household type rather than age group as the time constraints of the survey would not permit this¹.

In total 455 surveys were undertaken across the Edinburgh and Midlothian area, with 406 being conducted in Edinburgh and 49 in Midlothian.

3.2 The Survey Sample

As shown in the tables below, the following residents were surveyed. Based on the population and household breakdown obtained from the SCROL Analyser Tool.

Table 3.1 Age breakdown surveyed

	Number	% of total 455 respondents
18-29	101	22%
30-44	108	24%
45-59	93	20%
60+	153	34%
No response	0	0%
Total	455	100%

Table 3.2 Housing type surveyed

	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Detached	49	11%
Semi-detached	69	15%
Terraced	76	17%
Flat	261	57%

¹ However, sufficient numbers for each age group were obtained to facilitate meaningful analysis.

In accordance with the survey plan the following numbers were surveyed in the Edinburgh and Midlothian Council area.

Table 3.3 Council area surveyed

	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Edinburgh	406	89%
Midlothian	49	11%
Total	455	100%

The survey numbers were then split by postcode to ensure geographical representation.

Table 3.4 Postcode district surveyed

	Number	% of total 455 respondents
EH3	24	5%
EH4	50	11%
EH6	33	7%
EH7	34	7%
EH8	23	5%
EH9	20	4%
EH10	29	6%
EH11	41	9%
EH12	36	8%
EH13	13	3%
EH14	33	7%
EH15	19	4%
EH16	26	6%
EH17	16	4%
EH19	11	2%
EH22	25	5%
EH26	14	3%
EH30	8	2%

3.3 Conducting Additional Surveys close to the Proposed Site

A number of additional surveys were also carried out in order to assess whether local opinion to the Zero Waste Parc differed substantially to residents living in other areas of the Edinburgh and Midlothian Council areas. An additional 9 surveys were carried out in the postcode area of EH21 and were combined with the 25 surveys conducted in the postcode area of EH22 as part of the overall survey.

Thus local opinion has been obtained from a sample of 34 residents.

This number is exceptionally low and so variations between local opinion and the main survey findings should be purely treated as an indication of local opinion as statistical significance can not be obtained. Therefore the survey of the generic population (455 respondents) should be used as the gauge of public opinion, to help to inform decision making purposes and communication articles.

3.4 Questionnaire Development

The questions used in the survey were designed in collaboration with Edinburgh and Midlothian Councils in order to meet the initial aims and objectives of the research proposal.

Questionnaires were completed by a team of Research Assistants from Keep Scotland Beautiful carrying out face to face interviews with householders, randomly selected within the survey area, but meeting the criteria of the calculated survey plan profile. The survey questionnaire relates to households, not individuals.

An established principle is that the response(s) to each question are unprompted. Thus although the questionnaire contained a list of expected responses for each question, these were there only to aid the surveyor to quickly record the replies and for ease of coding. The list of options were never revealed to the respondent (except for the questions asking for an overall rating as experience has shown that a guide to the grades was required to give a consistent base for the rating).

3.5 Data Management

Once all survey respondents were gathered, all questionnaires were checked for completeness and assigned a unique identification number when input. The answers to the survey questions were manually entered into a database using specialist software for public opinion surveys, QPMSR.

The data is analysed using Microsoft Excel and is imported into a word processing document and formatted to a Survey Report Style Sheet. The report is prepared using Waste Aware Scotland's in-house editorial guidelines. The report is prepared and the draft report (PDF format) undergoes an internal review from which a 'first proof' report is prepared. The first proof is reviewed by the local authority and from that a final report is prepared. The circulation of the final report (PDF format) is to the local authority and via Keep Scotland Beautiful's website (if approved).

The original paper questionnaires are held in storage for several years and the server where the electronic data is held is backed up daily with the back up tape stored off-site.

The Appendices Section provides more detail about the reporting conventions used in this report as well as a full list of the tables produced per survey question, some of which are used in the main body of this report. These tables are ordered by the question number surveyed.

4. PARTICIPATION IN THE WASTE HIERARCHY: REDUCE, REUSE, RECYCLE

4.1 Introduction

In order to gauge the level of participation in various aspects of the Waste Hierarchy, respondents were asked a series of questions about what they do to actively reduce the amount of waste in their household, how they reuse certain items and also whether they recycle.

Respondents who stated that they were active recyclers were then asked a series of questions relating to the kerbside recycling service and also their local Recycling Centre. The participation aspect of these questions is reported on in this section although further detail is provided in sections 6 and 7.

4.2 The Waste Hierarchy: Reduce

4.2.1 Reducing Household Waste

Reducing the amount of waste that is produced within a household can be achieved in many ways. This may help to explain why 293 (64%) of the 455 respondents confirmed that they had done something to reduce the amount of household waste produced.

However, not all of these respondents were 'true' reducers. If the respondent stated any of the following, they were classified as false reducers. Included in the false reducing categories were:

- Recycling
- Hire/ borrow tools
- Take clothes to charity shop
- Use rag bag scheme
- Borrow books/CDs/DVDs

Whilst all of these options are worthy activities, they actually are either recycling or reuse activities and so to prevent double counting with other survey questions, they have been omitted here. 27 of the 293 respondents stipulated a 'false' reduction answer, resulting in 266 of the respondents being 'true' reducers. This equates to 58% of the respondents.

Of these 266 'true' reducers, a wide variety of responses were highlighted as ways to reduce their household waste. Using their own shopping bags (43% of reducers), reducing the amount of food wasted (39% of reducers), home composting (26% of reducers) and avoiding the use of plastic bags (22% of reducers) were the top four most popular responses.

Table 4.1 Steps taken to reduce household waste

Q11. Actions carried out in the last year to reduce household waste	Number of responses	% of 266 respondents who are 'true' reducers of household waste	% of total 455 respondents
Use own shopping bags/boxes	115	43	25
Reduce food waste	104	39	23
Home composting	69	26	15
Reduce/avoid use of plastic bags	58	22	13
Use refillable containers	56	21	12
Reduce use of disposable plastic bags	50	19	11
Buy food loose	39	15	9
Repair equipment	38	14	8
Avoid buying overpackaged goods	34	13	7
Repair bikes	24	9	5
Reduce paper use	21	8	5
Feed food waste to animals	11	4	2
Reduce unwanted mail	10	4	2
Buy less	9	3	2
Avoid 'fast food'	8	3	2
Bulk buying	8	3	2
Use services rather than products	5	2	1
Nothing	3	1	1
Other	8	3	2

Other includes burning waste, returning returnable bottles & using real nappies

The kitchen canny and bike station projects were not mentioned by any respondents.

Midlothian residents were slightly more likely to state that they reduced the use of plastic bags, used their own shopping bags and home composted. Midlothian's were slightly less likely to use refillable containers. As might be expected detached and semi-detached properties were more likely to home compost. Older respondents were slightly more likely to home compost or use their own shopping bags, and younger respondents were less likely to repair bikes. Although differences were observed, none of these differences were found to be significant.

Thus even among the 'true' reducers the rate of participation for all of the various types of reduction remains low. There is therefore more work that can be done to encourage action to be taken to reduce the amount of household waste produced.

4.2.2 Participation in Dedicated Waste Reduction Schemes

Both Edinburgh and Midlothian Councils participate in a range of Waste Reduction Schemes including Home Composting, Real Nappies, Reducing Unwanted Mail and Love Food Hate Waste. This subsection investigates participation rates in these schemes starting with reducing food, which had the greatest participation rate. All respondents were asked about these schemes.

Over half the respondents questioned (53%) stated that they had actively tried to reduce the amount of food waste in the past year. Residents living in detached properties were slightly

more likely to try to reduce their food waste, but the difference was not enough to produce a statistical significant difference. This is discussed in more detail in section 5.

2 out of 10 respondents stated that they composted at home in the past year (97 respondents), which is encouraging.

17% of respondent stated that they have tried to reduce the amount of unwanted mail. When asked the detail of what they did to reduce unwanted mail, 68% of the 78 respondents stated that they had used online services and 21% used the Mailing Preference Service or used the opt out boxes on promotional materials. Few individuals had utilised the Royal Mail Door to Door opt out service (8 respondents) and the Electoral Register opt out was not mentioned by any respondent.

Table 4.2 Steps taken to reduce unwanted mail

Q14. Actions carried out to reduce unwanted mail in the last year	Number of responses	% of 78 respondents who have done something to reduce unwanted mail	% of total 455 respondents
Used online services	53	68	12
Mailing Preference Service	16	21	4
Used Opt Out tick box on promo materials	16	21	4
Write to sender	9	12	2
Used Royal Mail Door to Door opt out	8	10	2
Other	1	1	0

Other is 'Never print anything'

The final waste reduction activity explored was Real Nappies. In 88% of the cases the use of nappies was not applicable to them as there were no babies in the family home. Only 1% of all 455 respondents (4 individuals) stated that they had used real nappies, with a further 11% stating that they had not used real nappies.

4.2.3 Summary of the Reduce Part of the Waste Hierarchy

Figure 4.1 summarises the various aspects that can contribute to the reduce part of the Waste Hierarchy. As the graph shows, participation rates for the 5 categories vary greatly.




Figure 4.1 Variations in the participation rates in Waste Reduction Schemes

4.3 The Waste Hierarchy: Reuse

For 7 pre-determined categories of items, respondents were asked what they did in the past year with items that needed to be replaced. The graph below summarises the proportionate breakdown between what was reused, not reused and were not disposed of. Clothes were the item most likely to be reused, with bikes being the least likely.




Figure 4.2 Variations in the reuse of items

These items are discussed in more detail and are summarised in Table 4.3, but if required further information can be found in the full table of results in Appendix 2.

Table 4.3 Reusing certain items of household waste

Q23 Summary (percentage of 455 respondents)	Never disposed of them	Given to charity	Put in wheeled bin	Arrange council uplift	Take to Recycling Centre
Clothes	23	70	5	0	0
Furniture	54	16	1	16	11
Electrical items	51	8	12	8	18
White goods	58	3	1	19	14
Bikes	67	7	1	1	3
Toys	54	14	1	0	2
Books/CDs/DVDs	38	45	0	1	4

The vast majority of respondents who chose to reuse their clothes did so by donating them to charity (70% of all respondents). The 23% of respondents who did not reuse their clothes stated that they had 'never disposed of them', whilst 5% chose to put their unwanted clothes in the wheeled bin.

The reuse of furniture was very low primarily because 54% of respondents stated they had never disposed of furniture. The next most popular responses were to give to charity (16%) and to arrange a council uplift (16%). Donating to a furniture reuse scheme was very low, as only 12 respondents (3%) had done this.

A similar number of respondents, 51%, stated that they had not had need to dispose of an electrical item in the past year. The most popular reuse category was to take the item to a Recycling Centre. Only 8% of respondents donated their item to charity, and this is perhaps due to the health and safety restrictions placed on charities. Electricals had the highest proportion of respondents in all the categories placing their item in the wheeled bin (12%).

264 respondents did not dispose of white goods in the past year. Where white goods needed to be disposed of, the majority were via a council uplift (19%) or via a Recycling Centre (14%). Arranging a council uplift was most likely to occur in the white goods category. Only 2% of respondents stated that the retailer had taken away their white goods, despite this usually being highly promoted in store.

As with white goods, bikes are also not disposed of very frequently, hence 67% of respondents stated they had not disposed of them in the past year. A further 18% did not have a bike. The most popular reuse category was to give to charity (7%) or to take to a Recycling Centre (3%).

Over half of respondents did not dispose of toys in the past year, and a further quarter did not have toys. When toys were disposed of, they were most likely donated to charity (14%) or donated to schools or community groups (3%). Only a very small number (1%) were placed in the wheeled bin.

45% of respondents elected to donate their books, CDs or DVDs to charity. The next most common reuse of these items was to give them away to family or friends (7%). 38% of respondents stated that they had not disposed of these items in the past year. Only 13 respondents put their item in the wheeled bin which implies that respondents may be more

likely to understand the value, both in terms of enjoyment and financial , of reusing these items.

4.4 The Waste Hierarchy: Recycling

4.4.1 Recycling Rates

The overwhelming majority of residents surveyed stated that they participated in some form of recycling activity (82% of respondents). Only 18% stated they did not recycle at all.

Table 4.4 Participation in recycling

Q25. Whether recycle in any way	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	374	82
No	80	18
Don't know	1	0
Total	455	100

Analysing this recycling rate further highlights a number of key differences between respondent groups:

- Compared to the other age ranges 18-29 age range were the least likely to recycle (72%). This difference is statistically significant
- 94% of residents of semi-detached housing recycled, which is a statistically significant difference from the 82% observed above
- Respondents from Midlothian were more likely to recycle (92% compared to 81% for Edinburgh)
- The highest recycling rates were found in EH19 (100%), EH30 (100%), EH7 (91%) and EH9 (90%)
- The lowest recycling rates were found in EH13 (54%), EH8 (65%), EH11 (68%) and EH17 (69%).

4.4.2 Recycling Services Available

The overwhelming majority of respondent were aware of the recycling services that were available to them as only 4% stating that they did not know and 4% stating no services were available. However, very few considered that Recycling Centres were a service available to them (9%). Recycling Points and the brown garden bin were mentioned in just over a quarter (28% each) of instances.

94% of the 49 respondents from the Midlothian area perceived that the blue box was available to them to recycle, with the red box achieving a similarly high numbers of respondents (90%). The blue box was also perceived to be the most available among Edinburgh residents with 46% saying that it was available to them. 42% of Edinburgh respondents were aware of the red box, and 29% have the tenement on-street recycling available to them.

Table 4.5 Recycling services available


Q24. Recycling services considered to be available	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Blue box (Edinburgh)	187	41
Red box (Edinburgh)	170	37
Tenement on-street Recycling Point (Edinburgh)	117	26
Blue bag (Edinburgh)	57	13
Salvation Army bag (Edinburgh)	23	5
Blue box (Midlothian)	46	10
Red box (Midlothian)	44	10
Brown bin (garden)	126	28
Recycling Points	129	28
Recycling Centres	40	9
None	19	4
Don't know	16	4
Other	26	6

Other includes Communal bins

Note: 19 out of the 26 other of the responses were communal bins from Edinburgh residents. It is not clear whether these bins were communal recycling services or whether they were standard bins where recycling was not available. They have therefore been categorised separately in the 'other' section rather than being added to the 'tenement on-street Recycling Point' section.

4.4.2 How Respondents Chose to Recycle

The 374 respondents who stated that they recycled were then asked how they recycled. As summarised in the pie-charts below, of these 374 respondents, 92% recycle their household waste in either a Kerbside service or on-street Recycling Points. A third of the 374 respondents also use Recycling Centres.



Figures 4.3 & 4.4: Use of Kerbside Services and Recycling Centres

The use of Recycling Centres was found to be equally spread across the Edinburgh and Midlothian areas. However, residents of flats and the 18-29 age group were the least likely to use Recycling Centres and this difference was found to be statistically significant. Residents of detached or semi-detached properties were more likely to use Recycling Centres.

4.5 Summary of Participation in Reduce, Reuse & Recycle

All respondents were also asked whether they were aware of the Waste Hierarchy, and 41% of respondents confirmed that they were. This awareness is shown in the graph below along with participation rates for reduce (58% see note), reuse (45% see note) and recycle activities (82%). Generally younger residents or residents living in detached properties were more aware of the waste hierarchy (question 9).




Figure 4.5: Comparing participation rates of the Waste Hierarchy

Note: Numbers in the reduce category are only the 'true' reducers. The reuse percentage was calculated by averaging the 7 categories.

4.6 Conclusion

58% of the respondents stated they had actively tried to reduce their household waste. This is a very encouraging figure, but the variety of how residents are reducing their waste is relatively narrow, as using own shopping bags and reducing food waste predominated. Participation rates for waste reduction schemes such as Home Composting or Real Nappies were low but the results are nevertheless encouraging. There is therefore more that could potentially be achieved here, through education and encouragement.

Variable results were found for the number of respondents who elected to reuse items that needed to be replaced. These variations were mostly because individuals did not dispose of higher value goods within the past year. Charities were most likely to benefit from donations of clothes and books, CDs and DVDs. Electrical items were more likely to be taken to a Recycling Centre and white goods were most likely to be taken away by a council uplift.

The participation rate for recycling was very high, with 82% of respondents stating they recycled. Notable participation differences were observed between different postcodes with the highest participation rate being 100% and the lowest being 54%. Midlothian residents were most likely to recycle, as were semi-detached residents and the 18-29 year olds were the least likely age group to recycle.

Residents of both Edinburgh and Midlothian were aware of the on-street recycling facilities that were available to them.

5 FOOD WASTE

5.1 Introduction

This section examines in more detail current activity, opinion and potential for changing the way food waste is disposed of.

The reduction in food waste participation rates summarised in Section 4 showed that 53% (243 residents) had actively reduced the amount of food waste in their household in the past year. These 243 residents were then asked the details of what they have reduced.

All 455 respondents were asked about how they currently dispose of their food waste. During this survey opinion was also obtained about the benefits of reducing food waste and the potential introduction of a food waste collection service.

5.2 Activity to Reduce Food Waste

Of the 243 respondents who have taken steps to reduce the amount of food waste, over half have been using their leftovers. The main ways in which consumers were reducing food waste is detailed in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 Steps taken to reduce food waste

Q17. Actions taken to reduce the amount of food waste	Number of responses	% of 243 respondents who have taken action to reduce food waste	% of total 455 respondents
Use leftovers	139	57	31
Composting	78	32	17
Eat it	74	30	16
Buy less/what's needed	73	30	16
Feed to animals	34	14	7
Plan food shopping better	34	14	7
Freeze food	22	9	5
Buy loose	14	6	3
Store food better	4	2	1
Other	6	2	1

Other is 'serve smaller portions', 'bulk buying', 'owning a wormery' & 'don't buy ready meals'

The responses fall into two main categories: those that utilise the food waste that is produced (top three answers in particular) and those that actually reduce the amount of waste that could be produced (such as buy less, plan shopping better and store food better).

5.3 Disposing of Food Waste

All respondents were asked what they did with the food waste that they did dispose of. As a food waste collection service is not currently available, the overwhelming majority of respondents presently dispose of their food waste using their residual bin. Composting was the next most popular option for disposing of food waste.

Table 5.2 **Disposing of food waste**

Q19. Current methods of disposing of food waste	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Residual bin	408	90
Compost	86	19
Feed to pets	21	5
Feed to animals/birds	14	3
Other	18	4

Other includes 'no food waste', 'garden waste bin', 'alternative composters' & 'don't know'

5.4 Attitudes to Reducing Food Waste

When all respondents were asked what the main benefits were to reducing the amount of food waste, respondents were split between the responses of 'saving money', and 'reducing the amount of waste'. Saving money and reducing the amount of waste were therefore key motivational factors in relation to reducing the amount of food waste produced per household.

Table 5.3 **Attitudes to reducing the amount of food waste**

Q18. Perceived benefits of reducing the amount of food waste	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Save money	240	53
Reduce waste	216	47
Environmental reasons	62	14
Reduces amount in residual bin	45	10
Reduces amount to landfill	42	9
Reduces smell from bins	27	6
Nothing	13	3
Don't know	39	9
Other	4	1

Other includes 'providing compost', 'reducing vermin' & 'reducing landfill gas'

However, analysing this question in more depth reveals that individuals who currently do not reduce their food waste are statistically significantly less likely to perceive that saving money is a benefit of reducing food waste. So whilst they are aware that 'reducing waste' is a benefit, they are not aware of the potential to save money. This figure is highlighted in Figure 5.1.




Figure 5.1: Comparing the perceived benefits by those who currently reduce food waste and those that do not.

5.5 Attitudes to a Food Waste Kerbside Collection Service

In addition to reducing food waste, respondents were also asked what they thought the advantages of a food waste collection service would be. The most frequently mentioned response was that it would reduce the amount of waste that is collected in the residual bin (41% of respondents). A quarter also stated that a key advantage was that it would be good for the environment.

Table 5.4 Perceived advantages of a food waste collection service

Q21. Perceived advantages of a kerbside food waste collection service	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Reduces waste in normal bin	186	41
Good for environment	120	26
Reduces waste to landfill	64	14
Encourages recycling	61	13
Nothing	51	11
Good way to recycle more	46	10
Handy/convenient	34	7
Feel good factor	31	7
Reduces smell	7	2
Don't know	48	11
Other	9	2

Other includes reduces landfill charges, find out how much you waste, raise awareness

Respondents who were currently reducing the amount of food waste were more likely to state 'good for the environment' or the 'feel good factor' compared to those who did not reduce their food waste.

Respondents were also asked to highlight any potential disadvantages to a kerbside food waste caddy service.

Compared to the advantages, a wider range of disadvantages could be thought of by the residents surveyed. The factor that was of greatest concern was the smell (34% of respondents). Strong opinions were also felt for the storage of waste inside (20%), the potential to attract vermin/insects (17%) and the lack of storage space inside (17%).

Table 5.5 Perceived disadvantages of a food waste collection service

Q22. Perceived disadvantages of a kerbside food waste collection service	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Smell	155	34
Storage of food waste (inside)	92	20
Attracts vermin/insects	78	17
Lack of bin storage space (inside)	76	17
Nothing	73	16
Separation of food waste	70	15
Need reliable service	47	10
Hygiene/disease spreading potential	41	9
Storage of food waste (outside)	39	9
Lack of bin storage space (outside)	38	8
Collections not frequent enough	29	6
Vandalism/security	12	3
Compost waste	10	2
Not enough waste	8	2
Don't know	32	7
Other	26	6

Other includes time constraints, bin too small & too many bins

Respondents who stated they did not reduce the amount of their food waste were more likely to perceive a disadvantage of smell or the storage of food waste inside. Respondents aged between 18 and 29 years of age were statistically significantly more likely to mention the lack of bin storage space inside as a disadvantage to a kerbside food waste collection service. No major differences were observed between residents of different housing types, with respondents living in flats being only slightly more likely to state that lack of inside storage space was a disadvantage.

5.6 Willingness to use a Food Collection Service

Two thirds of respondents stated that they would be willing to use a food waste collection service in the future. There was no discernable difference between individuals who currently reduce their household waste and those that do not, as a similar percentage were willing to use a food waste collection service.

Table 5.6 Willingness to use a food waste collection service

Q20. Whether willing to use a food waste collection service	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	296	65
No	151	33
Don't know	8	2
Total	455	100

Analysing this result in more depth reveals that Midlothian and detached household groups were slightly more likely to be willing to use a food waste collection service, but this difference was not found to be statistically significant. However, examining individuals who would not be willing to use a food waste collection service, residents from EH4 postcode or individuals aged above 60 years were statistically significantly more likely to say that they would not be willing to use the potential service.

5.7 Conclusion

A large number of respondents who have reduced the amount of food wasted have done so by using their leftovers. Where food waste is generated, 90% of this waste currently goes in the residual bin. The introduction of a food waste collection service could help to prevent this waste going to landfill.

The factors that are the key to motivating respondents to reduce their food waste were the promise of saving money and reducing their waste. 65% of respondents stated that they would be willing to use a food waste collection service. Many see the advantage of introducing a kerbside food waste collection service is the reduction of waste in the normal bin and that it is good for the environment. Although a number of advantages to the scheme were mentioned, respondents highlighted a wider range of disadvantages. The key concerns were smell, the storage of food waste inside, the potential to attract vermin and insects and the lack of bin storage space inside. However, previous survey work conducted by the Keep Scotland Beautiful Research Team has found that the majority of these concerns disappear once the food waste collection service has been introduced.

6 KERBSIDE SERVICE, ON-STREET RECYCLING AND RECYCLING POINTS

6.1 Introduction

This section details current activity, opinion and suggestions for further improvements to the kerbside services, on-street recycling or Recycling Points used by the respondents.

The participation rates presented in Section 4 found that 374 respondents 'recycled in some way'. When asked how they recycled, 92% of the 374 recyclers either used a kerbside service, on-street recycling or a Recycling Point. This 92%, who stated that they used one of the services, were then asked further details about their use of the service, their opinion of it as well as suggestions for further improvements. In total 345 respondents were asked these questions (92% of the 374 recyclers). As a result most of the percentages refer to a 345 respondent baseline. Where this is not the case, it has clearly been stated.

6.2 Materials currently Recycled using the Kerbside Service, On-Street Recycling or Recycling Points

Table 6.1 details the range of materials that are currently recycled using either kerbside services, the on-street recycling or at Recycling Points. More than half of the respondents who use one of these services, have recycled:

- Newspapers
- Glass bottles and jars
- Food and drink cans
- Cardboard
- Other types of paper

Table 6.1 Materials recycled

Q29. Materials currently recycled using the Kerbside service, On-street Recycling or Recycling Points	Number of responses	% of 345 respondents who use Kerbside service/ RPs	% of total 455 respondents
Newspapers	269	78	59
Glass bottles and jars	260	75	57
Food and drink cans	211	61	46
Cardboard	195	57	43
Paper (other types)	175	51	38
Magazines	131	38	29
Plastic bottles	130	38	29
Unwanted mail flyer	79	23	17
Garden waste	58	17	13
Textiles	53	15	12
Shoes	35	10	8
Drink cartons/Tetra Paks	34	10	7
Alu foil dishes	30	9	7
Other plastic	20	6	4
Phone book/Yellow Pages	18	5	4
Aerosols	15	4	3
Envelopes	15	4	3
Other	5	1	1

Other includes plastic bags & packaging

6.3 Opinion of the Kerbside Service, On-street Recycling and Recycling Points

6.3.1 Rating of Kerbside and Recycling Points Service

72% of the respondents who used the Kerbside or the Recycling Points Service stated that the current service was either ‘good’ or ‘very good’. Only 10% of respondents stated that the current service was ‘poor’ or ‘very poor’.




Figure 6.1: Rating of Kerbside service, on-street recycling or Recycling Points

Residents of semi-detached properties were more likely to rank the service as ‘very good’ (31%). Midlothian residents were more likely to state that the service they received was ‘very good’ (38% compared to 23% for Edinburgh).

Ranking differences were also evident for various postcodes ranging from all of the residents in EH30 who use the kerbside, on-street recycling or Recycling Point service as 100%. The lowest rating postcode was EH8 with 43% (statistically significant) as shown in Figure 6.2.




Figure 6.2: Comparing those rating the service very good or good by postcode

6.3.2 Reasons for Recycling using the Kerbside services, On-street Recycling or the Recycling Points

Not only did respondents think that the service they use to recycle was good, they also stated a wide variety of reasons as to why they used the recycling services. The ease of use and the fact that recycling was good for the environment were the two most popular reasons.

Table 6.2 Reasons for recycling using Kerbside service, on-street recycling or Recycling Points

Q30. Reasons for using the Kerbside service, On-street Recycling or Recycling Points	Number of responses	% of 345 respondents who use Kerbside service/ RPs	% of total 455 respondents
Easy to use	117	34	26
Good for environment	111	32	24
Handy/convenient	96	28	21
Reduces waste in normal bin	60	17	13
Reduces waste to landfill	44	13	10
Can recycle more materials this way	27	8	6
Good idea	21	6	5
Feel good factor	19	6	4
Educates/encourages everyone to recycle	15	4	3
Don't have a build up of recyclates in house	11	3	2
Saves going to Recycling Centre	8	2	2
Guilt/ social duty	7	2	2
Saves energy & resources	7	2	2
Other	26	8	6

Other includes asked/ told to, good service, habit & don't know

6.4 Suggested Improvements to Kerbside Service, On-Street Recycling and Recycling Points

The most popular response for the suggested improvements for any of the recycling services was to collect more materials (38%). Of the 130 respondents who suggested this, plastic was most popular response. The suggested materials were:

- Plastic containers (tubs/pots etc): 60 responses
- Plastic bottles: 55 responses
- Glass bottles/jars/dishes: 27 responses
- Plastic bags: 21 responses
- Batteries: 8 responses
- Food Trays: 8 responses
- Food Waste: 8 responses
- Cans: 6 responses
- Cardboard: 4 responses
- Tetrapak cartons: 4 responses
- Envelopes: 3 responses
- Aerosols: 2 responses
- Metals: 2 responses
- Other (incl paper, broken glass & garden waste): 8 responses

Some items suggested as part of these additional materials can already be collected according to the results in Section 6.2 Interestingly Section 5 of this report showed 65% of all respondents would be willing to use a food collection service, yet collecting food waste as an additional material only generated 8 responses.

Table 6.3 **Suggested improvements to the Kerbside service, on-street recycling or Recycling Points**

Q31. Suggested improvements (if any) for the Kerbside service, On-Street Recycling and Recycling Points	Number of responses	% of 345 respondents who use Kerbside service/ RPs	% of total 455 respondents
Collect more materials	130	38	29
Nothing	122	35	27
Collected more often	58	17	13
More local Recycling Points	19	6	4
Alternative container type	16	5	4
Provision of additional box	16	5	4
More information provided	11	3	2
Bigger bins at Recycling Points	7	2	2
Empty Recycling Points bins more often	7	2	2
New/ better lids	6	2	1
Better maintenance at Recycling Points	5	1	1
Tidier/ Cleaner	5	1	1
Crew replace boxes properly	4	1	1
Assistance for elderly/disabled	2	1	0
Don't know	21	6	5
Other	23	7	5

Other includes better labelling, need a new box & improved communal bins

Table 6.3 shows that when asked what improvements they would like to see, a wide range of responses were generated. Nevertheless 'nothing' and 'don't know' accounted for 41% of the respondents who use one of the kerbside services which also indicates contentment with the system. The third most popular response was to collect more often, which predominantly came from the postcode districts of EH8 and EH14. There was no discernable difference for this option between Edinburgh and Midlothian Council area.

The 16 respondents who stated that they would prefer an alternative container type, 4 stated they would prefer a bigger bin or box, a further 2 would prefer better lids to their box. The remainder ranged from one bin for all recyclates, compartments within bins, to wheely bins instead of boxes.

6.5 Conclusion

92% of recyclers used the kerbside service, the on-street recycling or at Recycling Points. Newspapers, glass bottles and jars, food and drink cans and cardboard were the most popular items to be recycled. The majority of the residents who used the service were very happy with it as they rated it as 'very good' or 'good'. This positive rating was found to vary substantially between different postcodes, with EH8 being the least likely to rate the service positively and EH30 the most likely to rate it. Nevertheless the overall satisfaction with the service is also apparent in the suggested improvements, as 41% of those using the service could not think of any further improvements to it.

Strong motivational factors exist as to why residents use the service and these mostly relate to convenience and care for the environment. Compared to the motivational factors for reducing food waste, reducing the amount of waste in the household bin is less of a motivational factor for using the recycling services.

The main suggested improvement to the kerbside, the on-street recycling or Recycling Points service was to collect more materials, notably plastics.

7 RECYCLING CENTRES

7.1 Introduction

This section examines the use of Recycling Centres in more detail especially, the satisfaction with the service and suggestions for future improvements.

The results presented in Section 4 showed that 374 out of the 455 respondents stated that they recycled in some way. Of these 374 individuals, 33% use Recycling Centres (125 respondents). This equates to 27% of the whole survey sample.

This section of questions was only asked to the 125 respondents who used Recycling Centres, as a result percentages refer to the 125 baseline and not the whole survey sample of 455 respondents.

7.2 Local Recycling Centres

Recycling Centre users were asked the location of the Recycling Centre that they used the most, and how frequently they visited this centre.

The majority of respondents only visited the Recycling Centre when it was necessary for them to do so. Generally visits to Recycling Centres were infrequent.

Table 7.1 Frequency of visit to Recycling Centre

Q37. Frequency materials taken to most used Recycling Centre	Number	% of 125 respondents who use Recycling Centres	% of total 455 respondents
As required	54	43	12
2 or 3 times per year	23	18	5
Monthly	19	15	4
Every couple of months	10	8	2
Fortnightly	6	5	1
Weekly	5	4	1
4 times a year	4	3	1
Twice weekly	1	1	0
Other	3	2	1
Total	125	100	27

The Recycling Centre which is used the most by respondents is Craigmillar CRC, which is frequented by 29% of those who use Recycling Centres.

Table 7.2 Location of Recycling Centres

Q35. Location of most used Recycling Centre	Number	% of 125 respondents who use Recycling Centres	% of total 455 respondents
Craigmillar CRC, Old Edinburgh Road	36	29	8
Braehead CRC, Craigs Road	29	23	6
Seafield CRC, Fillyside Road	29	23	6
Sighthill CRC, Bankhead Avenue	14	11	3
Stobhill Depot, Newtongrange	7	6	2
Penicuik Depot	3	2	1
Don't know	1	1	0
Other outwith Edinburgh or Midlothian area	6	5	1
Total	125	100	27

Other includes Stirling & Fife

The use of the Recycling Centres needs to be compared to the postcodes where the use of Recycling Centres is greatest. Respondents from neighbouring postcode districts of Craigmillar (EH16) predominantly use this Recycling Centre. EH19 and EH17 contained the greatest number of Recycling Centre users and they mostly frequently visited Stobhill or Craigmillar sites respectively.




Figure 7.1: Percentage users of Recycling Centres by Postcode district

7.3 Materials Recycled at Recycling Centres

A wide variety of items are recycled by the 125 individuals who utilised the Recycling Centres. In total 58% of respondents recycled some sort of electronic or electrical equipment whether it was large or small. Recycling general waste and garden waste were also popular reasons to visit the Recycling Centre.

Table 7.3 Materials recycled

Q36. Items recycled at most used Recycling Centre	Number	% of 125 respondents who use Recycling Centres	% of total 455 respondents
Small WEEE	65	52	14
Large WEEE	61	49	13
General waste (bulky)	54	43	12
General waste (excess)	34	27	7
Garden waste	32	26	7
Fridge/freezers	25	20	5
Plastic bottles	25	20	5
Wood	24	19	5
Food and drink cans	20	16	4
Glass bottles & jars	17	14	4
Textiles & shoes	16	13	4
Cardboard	15	12	3
Rubble/bricks	13	10	3
Batteries (household)	12	10	3
Paper (any type)	12	10	3
Scrap metals	12	10	3
Glass bottles & jars	9	7	2
Batteries (car)	7	6	2
Other plastic	5	4	1
Furniture	5	4	1
Books	4	3	1
CDs/DVDs/Videos	3	2	1
Tyres	3	2	1
Engine oil	2	2	0
Other	7	6	2

Other includes bikes, toys, gas cylinders & paint tins and tiles

7.4 Opinion of Recycling Centres

Users of Recycling Centres were asked to rate the service they had received, as well as likes and dislikes of their local Recycling Centre.

7.4.1 Satisfaction and Overall Rating of Recycling Centres

98% of the residents who stated that they used Recycling Centres were satisfied with them. Only one respondent was not satisfied, and one further respondent 'did not know'. In terms of rating the service, of the 125 respondents who used Recycling Centres, no one rated the service below average. Figure 7.3 shows 92% rated the service they received at the Recycling Centre as either 'very good' or 'good'.




Figure 7.2: Rating of Recycling Centre service

There was no discernable difference between the rating for most of the Recycling Centres, as all of them were predominantly ranked very good or good in relation to their service. The Stobhill Depot was statistically more likely to have been rated as average.

7.4.2 What Respondents Liked about Recycling Centres

The convenience of the centres was a key feature that respondents liked the most (35% of those who use Recycling Centres). Friendly and helpful staff and good site management were also key positive factors.

Table 7.4 What respondents like about Recycling Centres

Q39. What liked about Recycling Centres	Number of Responses	% of 125 respondents who use Recycling Centres	% of total 455 respondents
Handy/convenient	44	35	10
Staff friendly/helpful	33	26	7
Good site management	30	24	7
Only way to recycle certain items	23	18	5
Wide range of materials accepted	17	14	4
Good for environment	13	10	3
Good site layout	12	10	3
Close by	6	5	1
Feel good factor	5	4	1
Good access	4	3	1
Good opening hours	4	3	1
Reduces waste in bin	4	3	1
Clean & tidy	3	2	1
Nothing	3	2	1
Too good to dump section	2	2	0
Don't know	9	7	2
Other	2	2	0

Other is 'labelling is good' & 'homeless furniture place'

Examining the answers to this question in more detail by comparing the reasons why respondents like their Recycling Centre against the location name of their Recycling Centre reveals that:

- Over half of respondents who used Seafield, and ‘Centres outwith Edinburgh or Midlothian area’ stated that they liked the convenience of the site,
- Staff were noted to be particularly friendly and helpful at Braehead and Sighthill Recycling Centres,
- Good site management was predominantly mentioned by respondents who use centres ‘outwith Edinburgh or Midlothian area’.

7.4.3 What Respondents Dislike about Recycling Centres

Generally respondents were less able to highlight what they disliked about Recycling Centres compared to what they liked, as the majority response was ‘nothing’. Seven respondents stated that staff were unhelpful, and three wanted domestic waste to be taken from vans or taxis.

Table 7.5 What respondents dislike about Recycling Centres

Q40. What disliked about Recycling Centres	Number of Responses	% of 125 respondents who use Recycling Centres	% of total 455 respondents
Nothing	91	73	20
Staff unhelpful	7	6	2
Accept domestic waste from vans/ taxis	3	2	1
Poor accessibility	2	2	0
Smell	2	2	0
Bad opening times	1	1	0
Bad site management	1	1	0
Not emptied frequently enough	1	1	0
Too far away	1	1	0
Untidy site	1	1	0
Don't know	13	10	3
Other	6	5	1

Other includes ‘weight restrictions’ & ‘too good to dump should be collected from the pavement once a month’

7.5 Suggested Improvements to Recycling Centres

A similarly small number of respondents were able to suggest improvements to Recycling Centres, as the majority who provided a response only stated ‘nothing’ or ‘don’t know’ (84% of respondents who use Recycling Centres). Where improvements were suggested, these mirrored the main factors that respondents did not like about Recycling Centres, notably ‘more helpful staff’, and ‘accept vans with domestic waste’.

Table 7.6 Suggested improvements to Recycling Centres

Q41. Suggested improvements (if any) for Recycling Centres	Number of Responses	% of 125 respondents who use Recycling Centres	% of total 455 respondents
Nothing	92	74	20
Staff more helpful	4	3	1
Closer/more sites	3	2	1
Accept vans with domestic waste	2	2	0
Collect more materials	2	2	0
Improve accessibility of site	2	2	0
Improve signage	2	2	0
Improve site layout	2	2	0
Increase opening hours	2	2	0
Provide Too Good to Dump area	2	2	0
Don't know	13	10	3
Other	3	2	1

Other is 'more parking space', 'improve traffic management' & 'advertise'

7.6 Conclusion

27% of the 455 respondents used Recycling Centres, but those that do were very satisfied with the service that they received. Materials are taken to Recycling Centres as required rather than at regular intervals.

The convenience and the friendliness of the staff were notable favourable factors about Recycling Centres. The main materials that were recycled at centres were WEEE, general waste and garden waste.

8 PUBLIC OPINION OF THE PROPOSED ZERO WASTE PARC AT MILLERHILL

8.1 Introduction

This section of the report examines public opinion of the proposed Zero Waste Parc at the Millerhill site. A range of factors were investigated here including the overall rating of the concept, the importance of certain features in the development and how respondents would like to be kept informed about future developments.

As mentioned in the methodology, a number of surveys were conducted close to the proposed site as well as the generic population survey. Where opinion from these local residents differs substantially this has been highlighted in this section.

8.2 Concept of a Zero Waste Parc

Respondents were first asked about what they thought about developing a Zero Waste Parc and were then asked to rate the idea of developing a Zero Waste Parc at Millerhill.

In general respondents were very happy about the concept of a Zero Waste Parc development as 77% of respondents rated the idea as 'good' or 'very good'. Only 3% of respondents thought the idea was 'poor' or 'very poor'.

Table 8.1 Rating the concept of a Zero Waste Parc

Q49. Overall rating of idea to develop a Zero Waste Parc	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Very good	171	38
Good	178	39
Average	77	17
Poor	8	2
Very poor	4	1
Don't know	17	4
Total	455	100

Individuals who currently do not recycle were more likely to state that the idea was 'very good' with recyclers more likely to state the idea was 'good'. There was no discernable difference between the age groups and housing types in relation to opinion of this type of development. However there were some geographic differences. Local respondents surveyed as part of the additional survey, were less likely to state that idea to develop a parc was a 'good' or 'very good', with only 59% replying in this way and 12% stating that the idea was 'very poor'.

Geographic differences were also evident as part of the generic survey. Postcodes that were more likely to rate the concept as 'poor' or 'very poor' were:

- EH22
- EH3
- EH13

The postcodes that were more likely to rate the concept as 'very good' or 'good' were:

- EH14
- EH26
- EH13
- EH3

- EH30

Residents of EH3 and EH13 appear to be more likely to have stronger opinions, either negative or positive.

8.3 Developing a Zero Waste Parc at Millerhill

When asked about the acceptability of developing a Zero Waste Parc at Millerhill, almost two thirds of the respondents surveyed thought the idea of the Zero Waste Parc was either 'acceptable' or 'very acceptable'. Only 2% of respondents stated that the development of the Zero Waste Parc was 'very unacceptable'.

Table 8.2 Acceptability of Zero Waste Parc

Q59. Overall acceptability of the development of the Zero Waste Parc at Millerhill	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Very acceptable	157	35
Acceptable	136	30
Don't mind	129	28
Quite unacceptable	2	0
Very unacceptable	10	2
Don't know	21	5
Total	455	100

Examining the profile of respondents in more detail reveals that whilst there was little discernable difference between respondents of different age groups, there was a difference between those who were additionally surveyed close to the proposed site, as 12% of the local residents said that the development of the Zero Waste Parc was 'very unacceptable'. This difference was statistically significant. However, this difference was very small, and, as the graph below shows, generally local residents had broadly similar opinions to the general population.




Figure 8.1: Difference of opinion between local residents and the generic population

This very slight difference observed between the extra local residents is also evidenced in the detail of the generic survey. Postcodes that were more likely to state the concept of a Zero Waste Parc at Millerhill was ‘very unacceptable’ or ‘unacceptable’ were:

- EH22
- EH19
- EH13
- EH3

The latter two postcodes were also highlighted in Section 8.2 as more likely to object to the concept of a Zero Waste Parc and so it is not surprising that situating one at Millerhill is also not acceptable.

Similar to the results observed in Section 8.2, respondents who do not currently recycle were more likely (statistically significant) to find the idea of a Zero Waste Parc at Millerhill ‘very acceptable’.

The graph below compares opinions for the previous two questions and shows that overall opinion is very positive about both the concept and the acceptability of a Zero Waste Parc at Millerhill.




Figure 8.2: Comparing opinion between concept of ZWP and acceptability of ZWP at Millerhill

Respondents were also asked whether they felt that Millerhill was a suitable location. The overwhelming majority of respondents (87%) stated that the proposed Millerhill site was a suitable location. Only 2% of the 455 respondents stated that the site was unsuitable, and when asked the reason for this, stated that the main reasons were due to increased traffic, air pollution and because the site was too close to housing.

Only three respondents were able to propose an alternative site for the proposed development. Two of these respondents simply stated that they preferred the development to be further away from houses, with the other respondent stating the Queensferry waste area would be a suitable alternative.

85% of the extra respondents surveyed in the direct vicinity of the proposed site stated that it was a suitable location. However, of those stating the site was unsuitable, three quarters were particularly concerned about increased traffic, and air pollution, with half of the respondents being concerned about incineration. Only one respondent suggested an alternative location: Crammond.

8.4 Advantages of the Zero Waste Parc

Respondents were able to highlight a range of advantages of a Zero Waste Parc. Of the 455 respondents, 36% stated that the Zero Waste Parc would be 'good for the environment'. The provision of energy and reducing the amount of waste going to landfill were also popular responses among respondents.

Table 8.3 Advantages of Zero Waste Parc

Q56. Perceived advantages of a Zero Waste Parc	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Good for environment	165	36
Provides energy	131	29
Reduces waste going to landfill	126	28
Saves Council taxes & fines	107	24
Increase recycling	77	17
Provides jobs	64	14
Good use of land	44	10
Saves householder Council Tax	19	4
Don't know	64	14
Other	24	5

Other includes nothing, reduced transport costs and a closer location

Respondents who lived close to the proposed site were more likely to state that the provision of energy was an advantage (38% compared to 28% who live further away). Residents from detached properties were also more likely to see this as an advantage. The provision of jobs was also more likely to be highlighted as an advantage by local residents, as it was cited by 29% of local respondents compared to 13% of those who lived further away (statistically significant).

As would be expected respondents who stated that the idea of a Zero Waste Parc at Millerhill was 'very acceptable' were more likely to state that perceived advantages were good for the environment or the provision of energy. Residents who stated that the development was 'very unacceptable' or 'unacceptable' were more likely to respond 'nothing', 'saves Council taxes and fines' or the 'provision of jobs'. There was no discernable difference between age groups.

8.5 Importance of features of the proposed Zero Waste Parc

Respondents were asked to rank the importance of 5 different features of the proposed Zero Waste Parc ranging from 'essential' through to 'not important'. The importance of screening, the impact on the environment and the provision of employment opportunities were all graded 'essential' or 'very important' by more than half of respondents. In all of the 5 features listed in Table 8.4 below, less than 10% of respondents thought that they were not important at all.

Table 8.4 Importance of various features of the proposed Zero Waste Parc

Summary of Q58	Number of responses for Essential & Very Important	% of total 455 respondents
A. The importance of the appearance/ layout and building design for the Zero Waste Parc	203	45%
B. The importance of the screening the Parc by fences or trees	236	52%
C. The importance of the provision of a visitor/education centre at the Parc	183	40%
D. The importance of the impact on the environment by the building of a Parc	292	64%
E. The importance of the local employment and business opportunities at the Parc	287	63%

Respondents were more likely to be moderated in their response to ‘the appearance and building design of the proposed Zero Waste Parc’ compared to some of the other features listed. Only 18% of respondents deemed this to be an ‘essential’ feature yet more than half stating that appearance and building design were either ‘important’ or ‘fairly important’. However this moderate response was not found in the responses from local respondents as 44% of local respondents deemed the appearance and building design to be ‘essential’ and this difference was found to be statistically significant.

The effect of visual pollution was a key concern about the proposed development of the Zero Waste Parc. In conjunction with this finding, the importance of screening the Parc by fences was deemed to be ‘essential’ by 27% of respondents. When the results from just the local respondents were examined, 62% of the respondents stated screening was ‘essential’ (statistically significant). Screening the Parc is therefore a key design consideration for the Zero Waste Parc.

Compared to the other 4 features of the Parc, the need to provide a visitor or education centre split opinion. 22% of respondents deemed this to be ‘essential’, yet half of respondents deemed this only to be ‘important’ or ‘fairly important’. Local respondents were more likely to rank this of lesser importance.

The impact on the environment generated strong positive reactions with the highest percentage of respondents stating that this was ‘essential’ or ‘very important’ (64%). In fact 42% of respondents stated that this was ‘essential’. There was no observable difference of opinion between local residents and those who reside further away as both ranked this feature highly. Residents therefore believed that ensuring a minimal impact on the environment is also a key feature for this development.

The importance of local employment opportunities was deemed as a key advantage to the site development by 29% of local residents (Section 8.4). In agreement with this finding, 44% of local respondents deemed this to be an ‘essential’ feature of the Parc. The provision of job opportunities is also a key positive feature that is associated with the Parc.

8.6 Concerns and possible disadvantages raised about the Zero Waste Parc

However, a wide variety of concerns were raised about the proposed Zero Waste Parc, with the key concern being the potential of air pollution. Two out of ten respondents were also worried about the potential of increased traffic in the area.

Table 8.5 Potential disadvantages and concerns about the Zero Waste Parc

Q57. Perceived disadvantages/concerns about a Zero Waste Parc	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Air pollution	130	29
Increased traffic	92	20
Noise pollution	67	15
Smell	61	13
Nothing	53	12
Damage to wildlife	36	8
Incineration	32	7
Damage to ecology	27	6
Affect on local area/ population	20	4
Visual pollution	17	4
Litter	15	3
Don't know	131	29
Other	14	3

Other mostly relates to costs and site safety and security

Local residents were more likely to be concerned about increased levels of traffic (38%-statistically significant difference), air pollution (35%) and the smell (24%). Respondents who stated that the concept of a Zero Waste Parc was 'unacceptable' or 'very unacceptable' were more likely to be concerned about increased levels of traffic (50%). Conversely respondents who were very positive about the concept of a Zero Waste Parc were more likely to be concerned about increased traffic (34%), noise pollution (23%) and the smell (22%).

8.7 Communicating the Progress of the Parc

7 out of ten respondents stated that they wished to be informed about the progress of the Zero Waste Parc. Of the respondents who want to be kept informed, half stated that television would be the most appropriate method of communication.




Figure 8.3: Preferred method of communicating progress of the Parc

79% of the local residents wanted to be kept informed about the progress of the Parc. These residents also agreed that television was the best method of communication (70% of those wishing to be informed stated this option). Newspapers, leaflets, newsletters and meetings were also popular choices with the local residents.

8.8 Conclusion

Generally respondents were very positive about the potential to develop a Zero Waste Parc. The Millerhill site was found to be a suitable location. Local residents who were surveyed in addition to the general survey were also positive about the proposal with 59% stating it was 'very acceptable' or 'acceptable'. A few concerns and objections were raised with 12% of local residents stated that developing a Zero Waste Parc at Millerhill was 'very unacceptable'.

The main advantages that respondents perceived about the Zero Waste Parc were the provision of energy and that it would be good for the environment. The importance of screening, the impact on the environment and the provision of employment opportunities were all graded 'essential' or 'very important' features by more than half of respondents. The main concerns about the potential development were air pollution and the potential for increased traffic in the area. The latter of which was a particular concern for local respondents.

Communicating developments of the Zero Waste Parc to residents will be very important. 7 out of 10 respondents stated that they wanted to be kept informed about how the Parc is progressing. The most appropriate means of communicating these messages was deemed to be the television or in print/ newspaper.

9. PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS OF THE WIDER ASPECTS OF THE WASTE PROCESS

9.1 Introduction

This section investigates the degree of awareness around the wider aspects of waste management, such as what happens to their waste after they have disposed of it, why local councils need to reduce the amount of waste going to landfill and what will happen if the amount going to landfill does not reduce.

9.2. Understanding of Where Waste Goes

9.2.1 Waste put out for recycling

Despite participation rates for recycling being very high, and despite a wide variety of responses being mentioned, generally respondents seem to be confused about what happens to their recycled waste. This lack of awareness is also amplified as over half of the respondents stated that they did not know what happened to their recycled waste. 'Made into new bottles or jars' was the most likely answer, but only 2 out of 10 respondents could think of this response. Raising awareness of what happens to the recycled waste could therefore be a key action point for Edinburgh and Midlothian Councils.

Table 9.1 What happens to materials after they are collected by the recycling service

Q43. Perception of what happens to materials collected using the recycling services	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Made into new bottles/jars	100	22
Made into new cardboard packaging	84	18
Made into newsprint	79	17
Made into new cans	74	16
Made into new plastic products	55	12
Sold on to make new products	52	11
Made into new other glass products	27	6
Sold on to re-processors	15	3
Landfilled	12	3
Shipped abroad	10	2
Nothing	9	2
Made into compost	8	2
Don't know	246	54
Other	21	5
Made into new bottles/jars	100	22

Other includes 'burnt/ incinerated', 'taken by salvation army', 'stockpiled' & 'made into insulation'

Individuals who did not recycle were found to be less likely to know that recycled items were made into cans, bottles, plastic products or cardboard packaging.

9.2.2 General Waste

61% of respondents correctly identified that their non-recycled general household waste was sent to landfill. However, over a third of respondents (37%) were unaware of where their non-recycled waste goes.

Although there is an awareness that general household waste was sent to landfill, 92% of respondents did not know the specific locations of the landfills used by the Councils. Interestingly local residents surveyed in addition to the general survey were more likely to know the location of their local landfill.

9.3 Public Understanding of Council's Need to Reduce General Waste Amounts

Questions were asked to respondents in respect of whether they understood why the council's had a need to reduce the amount of waste going to landfill.

Landfill taxes and EU fines were the third most popular answer as to why the amount of waste going to landfill needs to be reduced. The primary reason stated for needing to reduce the amount of waste was because the council were running out of landfill space. 42% of respondents stated this. Additionally a substantial proportion of respondents (29%) were unaware of reasons for the council needing to drastically reduce the amount of waste going to landfill.




Figure 9.1: Perceived reasons for the council needing to reduce waste going to landfill

Local respondents were slightly more likely to state that the need to reduce the amount going to landfill was due to the council running out of space and because of landfill taxes/ EU fines.

When respondents were specifically asked whether they were aware of any taxes and fines that would be imposed on the council, the percentage confirming that they were aware doubled to 31%. There was no discernable difference in awareness of taxes and fines between residents of Edinburgh and Midlothian. Of this 31% a large majority of those who were aware of taxes of fines correctly mentioned Landfill tax and EU fines (69% & 54% respectively of those who were aware of fines and taxes).

9.4 Conclusion

On the whole respondents were aware that their general waste goes to landfill but they were confused about what happens to their recycled waste with over half responding 'don't know'. Communicating the message of where residents waste goes is therefore very important to increase public knowledge and understanding of the issues involved.

Almost one in three were aware of these taxes and fines when they were specifically asked about them.

10. PUBLIC AWARENESS AND OPINION OF WASTE TECHNOLOGIES AVAILABLE

10.1 Introduction

This section reviews the questions used to gauge the level of awareness of the various technologies that could feature in the proposed Zero Waste Parc. Opinion was also sought about treating waste locally. All respondents were asked these questions.

10.2 Opinion about treating waste locally

Respondents were asked about their opinion of treating waste locally. Generally the respondents were in agreement about the advantages of treating waste locally. Over three quarters agreed that reducing transport distances were better for costs and environment and that the technology could better suit local circumstances.

Table 10.1 Advantages of treating waste locally

Summary of Q54	Number of respondents who Agreed	% of total 455 respondents
a) Treating waste locally will reduce transport distances which are better for cost and the environment	352	77
b) By treating waste locally there will be smaller facilities to treat local waste volumes only	332	73
c) By treating waste locally the choice of technologies can suit local circumstances	345	76

Local respondents were more likely to agree that about the advantages of treating waste locally, with 82% agreeing about all three.

10.3 Awareness of technologies that could be used within the Parc

Generally there was a low level of awareness amongst residents about waste technologies. Only 108 (24%) of respondents were aware of technologies that could be used within the Parc. When these 108 respondents were asked what technologies could be used within the Parc, a wide range of responses were received. The most frequently identified technologies were:

- Energy from waste (41%)
- Incineration (36%)
- Anaerobic digestion (25%)
- Gasification (10%)
- Recycling (10%)

Table 10.2 Awareness of technologies

Q51. Awareness of technologies that could be used within the Parc	Number of responses	% of 108 respondents who are aware of technologies	% of total 455 respondents
Energy from waste	44	41	10
Incineration	39	36	9
Anaerobic digestion	27	25	6
Gasification	11	10	2
Recycling	11	10	2
In-vessel Composting	9	8	2
Materials recovery (dry recyclables only)	7	6	2
Mechanical/Heat Treatment	5	5	1
Mechanical/Biological Treatment	3	3	1
Nothing	3	3	1
Don't know	7	6	2
Other	2	2	0

Other is Transfer station, Biomass

Local residents were less likely to state that they were aware of technologies that could be used within the Parc. Respondents who were aware of the taxes and fines that will be imposed on councils if the amount of landfill is not reduced were slightly more likely to be aware of the technologies mentioned above.

10.4 Utilising Heat Produced from Waste Treatment

A huge majority (96%) of respondents stated that utilising the heat produced for local homes/businesses was a good idea.

Table 10.3 Utilising heat produced for local homes businesses

Q55. Whether agreed/disagreed that utilising heat produced for local homes/ businesses is a good idea	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Agree	435	96
Disagree	1	0
Neither agree/disagree	19	4

Local respondents predominantly agreed that utilising the heat produced for local homes was a good idea, but the percentage was slightly lower than the results found for the generic population survey (85% compared to 96%). This difference is statistically significant. Statistically significant differences were also found in postcode district EH19 where respondents were also less likely to agree with this statement.

10.5 Energy from Waste as an Alternative to Landfill

Respondents were asked about their opinion as using Energy from Waste as an alternative to landfill. 70% of respondents stated that this was either 'very acceptable' or 'acceptable'. A further quarter of respondents were neutral stating that they did not mind. Only 1% of respondents stated that utilising Energy from Waste as an alternative to landfill was very unacceptable.




Figure 10.1: Acceptability of Energy from Waste as a Landfill Alternative

Respondents local to the proposed site were slightly less likely to state that Energy from Waste as an alternative to landfill was acceptable or very acceptable (59%). A greater percentage remained neutral (29%), and 9% of respondents stated that utilising Energy from Waste as an alternative to landfill was very unacceptable.

10.6 Awareness of Different Waste Technologies

Respondents were asked whether they were aware of any of the following technologies that could be used in the Zero Waste Parc. Generally there was a very low level of awareness for all the types of technologies. Respondents were generally most aware about Energy from Waste (28% of respondents).

Table 10.4 Awareness of different technologies

Summary of Q52 Whether heard of:	Yes	% of total 455 respondents stating Yes	No	% of total 455 respondents stating No
a: Materials Recycling Facility (MRF)	59	13	363	80
b: Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT)	23	5	398	87
c: Mechanical Heat Treatment (MHT)	20	4	401	88
d: Anaerobic Digestion (AD)	51	11	369	81
e: Energy from Waste (EfW)	129	28	291	64

10.7 Conclusion

On the whole respondents were very positive about the advantages of recovering waste especially locally. Respondents were very positive about the possibility of using Energy from Waste as an alternative to landfill.

The level of awareness about different waste technologies was found to be very low. Energy from Waste was the most frequently cited and also most widely known technology.

11 REASONS FOR NOT USING RECYCLING SERVICES

11.1 Introduction

This section profiles the respondents that currently do not recycle, examines reasons why they did not recycle and what factors would encourage them to recycle in the future.

11.2 Profile of Non-Recyclers

As reported in Section 4, 18% of respondents stated that they did not recycle in any way. Profiling these individuals in more depth reveals that respondents were more likely to be from the Edinburgh Council area, notably the postcode areas of:

- EH13 (46% of respondents from this area- statistically significant difference)
- EH8 (35% of respondents from this area)
- EH11 (32% of respondents from this area- statistically significant difference)
- EH17 (31% of respondents from this area)

There was no noticeable difference between the proportions of different housing types and those that do not recycle. Examining the age profiles in more depth shows that a statistically significant 28% of 18-29 year olds did not currently recycle.

11.3 Reasons for Not Recycling

A wide variety of reasons were given by the 80 respondents who currently do not recycle. The lack of service was the most likely response, followed by too much trouble and don't have very much waste.

Table 11.1 Reasons for not recycling

Q26. Reasons for not recycling any household waste	Number of responses	% of 80 respondents who do not recycle	% of total 455 respondents
No service/facilities	23	29	5
Too much trouble	14	18	3
Don't have much waste	13	16	3
Too old/infirm/disabled	13	16	3
Don't know how to	8	10	2
Don't know where facilities are	8	10	2
Takes too much time	6	8	1
Have to travel too far	5	6	1
Just moved in	5	6	1
No incentives	4	5	1
Don't have many recyclates	3	4	1
Not interested	3	4	1
Cynicism over recycling	2	3	0
Unreliable service	2	3	0
Other	6	8	1

Other includes 'makes no difference', 'not enough room to store', 'don't trust the council'

The majority of responses for 'no service/ facilities' originated from respondents living in the postcode districts of EH13, EH6 and EH17.

11.4 Factors to Encourage Future Recycling

Although 28% of non-recyclers stated that ‘nothing’ would encourage them to recycle, a number of other factors were also mentioned. Grouping these factors together shows that

- 26% of the responses related to some sort of service being introduced (kerbside collection, more/closer Recycling Points, or neighbourhood recycling bins)
- 20% of responses wanted more information (what and where to recycle and benefits)
- 10% of the responses related to either financial penalty or incentive to encourage recycling
- 7% of the responses related to the development of the current service (recycle more materials, more frequent collection, more reliable service)

Table 11.2 Factors to encourage recycling

Q27. Factors encouraging participation in recycling	Number of responses	% of 80 respondents who do not recycle	% of total 455 respondents
Nothing	22	28	5
Kerbside collection scheme	14	18	3
More/closer Recycling Points	12	15	3
More information on what can be recycled	10	13	2
More information on where to recycle	8	10	2
Financial incentive to recycle	7	9	2
Financial penalty for not recycling	5	6	1
Information outlining the benefits of recycling	5	6	1
Neighbourhood/street recycling bins	4	5	1
Ability to recycle more materials	2	3	0
More frequent kerbside collections	2	3	0
More reliable service	2	3	0
Provision of household containers	2	3	0
Don't know	16	20	4
Other	4	5	1

Other includes ‘more bins at recycling points’, ‘assurance no mess’

11.5 Conclusion

Only 80 respondents did not recycle in anyway. Their reason for not recycling was mostly due to a perceived lack of service or facilities. A wide variety of options were cited to encourage recycling in the future with 26% of the responses relating to the introduction of a service.

APPENDIX 1

Reporting conventions used

This report gives a summary of the main results of the survey, and, where appropriate, the results for several containers are combined into one table. This is to enable the general trends to be more readily identified and to enable comparisons between boxes, bins and other facilities.

The complete results, presented in the order of the questions in the questionnaire, are given in a Data Analysis spreadsheet, which is available from the Waste Aware Scotland Research Team.

Terms

In this report, the following terms are used:

‘respondent(s)’	refers to all who answered the survey.
‘users’/‘non-users’	refers to those who use (or do not use) at least one part of the currently available recycling services.
‘responses’	refers to multiple response survey questions where a user or non-user can give several answers. In tables, totals are only given for single response questions.
‘high rise flat’	refers to flats five or greater stories high.
‘tenement’	refers to flats one to four stories high with a shared communal entrance.
‘recycling facility’	refers to either Recycling Centres or Recycling Points where there is no differentiation between the two.

Results

The results of the survey findings are given in two formats: the number and the percentage of the total survey sample, or sample sub-set.

Percentages are calculated for both the number of respondents answering that question and for the total number of service users and/or the total number of survey respondents as appropriate.

In tables where there is a second percentage column, this percentage will not always total 100% as it is the percentage of the earlier defining sample set. Percentages are rounded and may not always exactly total 100.

Some questions are structured to explore and identify particular recycling attitudes and behaviour, and as the questions become more specific, the survey sample then becomes a smaller sample sub-set and the percentages are related to that particular (smaller) sub-set. This is defined by the column title and corresponding table footnote.

In tables, data are presented in descending order, except for the following responses: ‘don’t know’, ‘not specified’, ‘no response’ and ‘others’ – these are presented at the foot of the table.

In tables the following terms are used:

‘0’	denotes value is less than 1
‘_’	denotes not appropriate to calculate a value
‘Don’t know’	denotes that the response was ‘don’t know’
‘Not specified’	denotes that the response was general or vague and not a specific response
‘No response’	denotes no reply
‘Other’	denotes alternative replies to the standard list or classification of responses.

Responses to Multi-Response Questions

Responses given to multi-response questions are indicative of a range of public attitudes. The responses are grouped into standard (i.e. most frequently occurring) categories, or grouped into new categories so that the total number of ‘others’ (i.e. uncategorised comments) does not exceed 10% of the total responses or the sample sub-set thereof. If the number of responses in any standard category amounts to less than 2% then it is included in ‘others’.

In this report only the main results are given in some of the tables but all of the responses, including the categorising of multi-response questions, are available in the Data Analysis spreadsheet.

In tables, percentages are calculated on the total number of respondents answering that question and not the number of responses.

APPENDIX 2

SUMMARY OF TABLES

Q9. Awareness of Waste Hierarchy	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	186	41
No	269	59
Total	455	100

Q10. Whether done anything to reduce the amount of household waste produced	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	293	64
No	160	35
Don't know	2	0
Total	455	100

Q11. Actions carried out in the last year to reduce household waste	Number of responses	% of 293 respondents who have done something to reduce household waste	% of total 455 respondents
Use own shopping bags/boxes	115	39	25
Reduce food waste	104	35	23
Home composting	69	24	15
Reduce/avoid use of plastic bags	58	20	13
Use refillable containers	56	19	12
Reduce use of disposable plastic bags	50	17	11
Buy food loose	39	13	9
Repair equipment	38	13	8
Avoid buying overpackaged goods	34	12	7
Repair bikes	24	8	5
Reduce paper use	21	7	5
Feed food waste to animals	11	4	2
Reduce unwanted mail	10	3	2
Avoid 'fast food'	8	3	2
Bulk buying	8	3	2
Use services rather than products	5	2	1
Nothing	3	1	1
Other	8	3	2

Other includes burning waste, returning returnable bottles & using real nappies

Q12. Whether composted at home in the last year	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	97	21
No	358	79
Total	455	100

Q13. Whether done anything to reduce the amount of unwanted mail received by household in last year	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	78	17
No	377	83
Total	455	100

Q14. Actions carried out to reduce unwanted mail in the last year	Number of responses	% of 78 respondents who have done something to reduce unwanted mail	% of total 455 respondents
Used online services	53	68	12
Mailing Preference Service	16	21	4
Used Opt Out tick box on promo materials	16	21	4
Write to sender	9	12	2
Used Royal Mail Door to Door opt out	8	10	2
Other	1	1	0

Other is 'Never print anything'

Q15. Whether used real nappies in the last year	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	4	1
No	50	11
Not applicable (no babies)	401	88
Total	455	100

Q16. Whether done anything to reduce the amount of food waste in the last year	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	243	53
No	210	46
Don't know	2	0
Total	455	100

Q17. Actions taken to reduce the amount of food waste	Number of responses	% of 243 respondents who have taken action to reduce food waste	% of total 455 respondents
Use leftovers	139	57	31
Composting	78	32	17
Eat it	74	30	16
Buy less/what's needed	73	30	16
Feed to animals	34	14	7
Plan food shopping better	34	14	7
Freeze food	22	9	5
Buy loose	14	6	3
Store food better	4	2	1
Other	6	2	1

Other is serve smaller portions, bulk buying, owning a wormery & don't buy ready meals

Q18. Perceived benefits of reducing the amount of food waste	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Save money	240	53
Reduce waste	216	47
Environmental reasons	62	14
Reduces amount in residual bin	45	10
Reduces amount to landfill	42	9
Reduces smell from bins	27	6
Nothing	13	3
Don't know	39	9
Other	4	1

Other includes providing compost, reducing vermin & reducing landfill gas

Q19. Current methods of disposing of food waste	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Residual bin	408	90
Compost	86	19
Feed to pets	21	5
Feed to animals/birds	14	3
Other	18	4

Other includes 'no food waste', 'garden waste bin', 'alternative composters' & 'don't know'

Q20. Whether willing to use a food waste collection service	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	296	65
No	151	33
Don't know	8	2
Total	455	100

Q21. Perceived advantages of a kerbside food waste collection service	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Reduces waste in normal bin	186	41
Good for environment	120	26
Reduces waste to landfill	64	14
Encourages recycling	61	13
Nothing	51	11
Good way to recycle more	46	10
Handy/convenient	34	7
Feel good factor	31	7
Reduces smell	7	2
Don't know	48	11
Other	9	2

Other includes reduces landfill charges, find out how much you waste, raise awareness

Q22. Perceived disadvantages of a kerbside food waste collection service	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Smell	155	34
Storage of food waste (inside)	92	20
Attracts vermin/insects	78	17
Lack of bin storage space (inside)	76	17
Nothing	73	16
Separation of food waste	70	15
Need reliable service	47	10
Hygiene/disease spreading potential	41	9
Storage of food waste (outside)	39	9
Lack of bin storage space (outside)	38	8
Collections not frequent enough	29	6
Vandalism/security	12	3
Compost waste	10	2
Not enough waste	8	2
Don't know	32	7
Other	26	6

Other includes time constraints, bin too small & too many bins

Q23A. Methods of disposing of clothes replaced or no longer needed in the last year	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Given to charity	318	70
Never disposed of them	106	23
Put in wheeled bin	24	5
Other	10	2

Other includes 'taken to community recycling centre reuse cabins' & 'donate to rag bag scheme'

Q23B. Methods of disposing of furniture replaced or no longer needed in the last year	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Never disposed of them	244	54
Given to charity	74	16
Arrange council uplift	72	16
Take to Recycling Centre	50	11
Given away to family/friends	16	4
Furniture reuse organisation	12	3
Other	21	5

Other includes 'offer online exchange' & 'sell'

Q23C. Methods of disposing of electrical items replaced or no longer needed in the last year	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Never disposed of them	234	51
Take to Recycling Centre	82	18
Put in wheeled bin	54	12
Arrange council uplift	38	8
Given to charity	35	8
Given away to family/friends	11	2

Other	21	5
--------------	----	---

Other includes 'organised retailer uplift' & 'online exchange'

Q23D. Methods of disposing of white goods replaced or no longer needed in the last year	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Never disposed of them	264	58
Arrange council uplift	88	19
Take to Recycling Centre	65	14
Given to charity	12	3
Given away to family/friends	8	2
Organised retailer uplift	8	2
Other	15	3

Other includes 'put in wheeled bin' & 'sell'

Q23E. Methods of disposing of bikes replaced or no longer needed in the last year	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Never disposed of them	306	67
Don't have these items	82	18
Given to charity	33	7
Take to Recycling Centre	12	3
Given away to family/friends	10	2
Other	20	4

Other includes 'arrange council uplift' & 'sell'

Q23F. Methods of disposing of toys replaced or no longer needed in the last year	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Never disposed of them	244	54
Don't have these items	115	25
Given to charity	64	14
Schools/community groups	15	3
Given away to family/friends	11	2
Take to Recycling Centre	11	2
Other	7	2

Other includes 'put in wheeled bin' & 'sell'

Q23G. Methods of disposing of books/CDs/DVDs replaced or no longer needed in the last year	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Given to charity	206	45
Never disposed of them	175	38
Given away to family/friends	31	7
Schools/community groups	17	4
Take to Recycling Centre	17	4
Sell	15	3
Put in wheeled bin	13	3
Other	14	3

Other includes 'don't have these items' & 'arrange council uplift'

Q24. Recycling services considered to be available	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Blue box (Edinburgh)	201	44
Red box (Edinburgh)	184	40
Recycling Points	129	28
Brown bin (garden)	126	28
Tenement on-street Recycling Point (Edinburgh)	117	26
Blue bag (Edinburgh)	57	13
Recycling Centres	40	9
Blue box (Midlothian)	32	7
Red box (Midlothian)	30	7
Salvation Army bag (Edinburgh)	23	5
None	19	4
Don't know	16	4
Other	26	6

Other includes Communal bins

Q25. Whether recycle in any way	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	374	82
No	80	18
Don't know	1	0
Total	455	100

Q26. Reasons for not recycling any household waste	Number of responses	% of 80 respondents who do not recycle	% of total 455 respondents
No service/facilities	23	29	5
Too much trouble	14	18	3
Don't have much waste	13	16	3
Too old/infirm/disabled	13	16	3
Don't know how to	8	10	2
Don't know where facilities are	8	10	2
Takes too much time	6	8	1
Have to travel too far	5	6	1
Just moved in	5	6	1
No incentives	4	5	1
Don't have many recyclates	3	4	1
Not interested	3	4	1
Cynicism over recycling	2	3	0
Unreliable service	2	3	0
Other	6	8	1

Other includes 'makes no difference', 'not enough room to store', 'don't trust the council'

Q27. Factors encouraging participation in recycling	Number of responses	% of 80 respondents who do not recycle	% of total 455 respondents
Nothing	22	28	5
Kerbside collection scheme	14	18	3
More/closer Recycling Points	12	15	3
More information on what can be recycled	10	13	2
More information on where to recycle	8	10	2
Financial incentive to recycle	7	9	2
Financial penalty for not recycling	5	6	1
Information outlining the benefits of recycling	5	6	1
Neighbourhood/street recycling bins	4	5	1
Ability to recycle more materials	2	3	0
More frequent kerbside collections	2	3	0
More reliable service	2	3	0
Provision of household containers	2	3	0
Don't know	16	20	4
Other	4	5	1

Other includes 'more bins at recycling points', 'assurance no mess'

Q28. Whether currently recycle using the Kerbside service, On-street Recycling or Recycling Points	Number	% of 374 respondents who recycle	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	345	92	76
No	29	8	6
Total	374	100	82

Q29. Materials currently recycled using the Kerbside service, On-street Recycling or Recycling Points	Number of responses	% of 345 respondents who use Kerbside service/ RPs	% of total 455 respondents
Newspapers	269	78	59
Glass bottles and jars	260	75	57
Food and drink cans	211	61	46
Cardboard	195	57	43
Paper (other types)	175	51	38
Magazines	131	38	29
Plastic bottles	130	38	29
Unwanted mail flyer	79	23	17
Garden waste	58	17	13
Textiles	53	15	12
Shoes	35	10	8
Drink cartons/Tetra Paks	34	10	7
Alu foil dishes	30	9	7
Other plastic	20	6	4
Phone book/Yellow Pages	18	5	4
Aerosols	15	4	3
Envelopes	15	4	3
Other	5	1	1

Other includes plastic bags & packaging

Q30. Reasons for using the Kerbside service, On-street Recycling or Recycling Points	Number of responses	% of 345 respondents who use Kerbside service/ RPs	% of total 455 respondents
Easy to use	117	34	26
Good for environment	111	32	24
Handy/convenient	96	28	21
Reduces waste in normal bin	60	17	13
Reduces waste to landfill	44	13	10
Can recycle more materials this way	27	8	6
Good idea	21	6	5
Feel good factor	19	6	4
Educates/encourages everyone to recycle	15	4	3
Don't have a build up of recyclates in house	11	3	2
Saves going to Recycling Centre	8	2	2
Guilt/ social duty	7	2	2
Saves energy & resources	7	2	2
Other	26	8	6

Q31. Suggested improvements (if any) for the Kerbside service, On-Street Recycling and Recycling Points	Number of responses	% of 345 respondents who use Kerbside service/ RPs	% of total 455 respondents
Collect more materials	130	38	29
Nothing	122	35	27
Collected more often	58	17	13
More local Recycling Points	19	6	4
Alternative container type	16	5	4
Provision of additional box	16	5	4
More information provided	11	3	2
Bigger bins at Recycling Points	7	2	2
Empty Recycling Points bins more often	7	2	2
New/ better lids	6	2	1
Better maintenance at Recycling Points	5	1	1
Tidier/ Cleaner	5	1	1
Crew replace boxes properly	4	1	1
Assistance for elderly/disabled	2	1	0
Don't know	21	6	5
Other	23	7	5

Other includes better labelling, need a new box & improved communal bins

Q32. Suggestions for other materials to be collected	Number of responses	% of 130 respondents who want more materials to be collected	% of total 455 respondents
Plastic containers (tubs/pots etc)	60	46	13
Plastic bottles	55	42	12
Glass bottles/jars/dishes	27	21	6
Plastic bags	21	16	5
Batteries	8	6	2
Food Trays	8	6	2
Food waste	8	6	2
Cans	6	5	1
Cardboard	4	3	1
Tetrapak cartons	4	3	1
Envelopes	3	2	1
Aerosols	2	2	0
Metals	2	2	0
Other	10	8	2

Other includes paper, broken glass & garden waste

Q33. Overall rating of Kerbside and Recycling Point Service	Number of responses	% of 345 respondents who use Kerbside service/ RPs	% of total 455 respondents
Very good	87	25	19
Good	160	46	35
Average	63	18	14
Poor	20	6	4
Very poor	13	4	3
Don't know	2	1	0
Total	345	100	76

Q34. Whether used Recycling Centres	Number	% of 374 respondents who recycle	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	125	33	27
No	249	67	55
Total	374	100	82

Q35. Location of most used Recycling Centre	Number	% of 125 respondents who use Recycling Centres	% of total 455 respondents
Craigmillar CRC, Old Edinburgh Road	36	29	8
Braehead CRC, Craigs Road	29	23	6
Seafield CRC, Fillyside Road	29	23	6
Sighthill CRC, Bankhead Avenue	14	11	3
Stobhill Depot, Newtongrange	7	6	2
Penicuik Depot	3	2	1
Don't know	1	1	0
Other outwith Edinburgh or Midlothian area	6	5	1
Total	125	100	27

Other includes 'Stirling'

Q36. Items recycled at most used Recycling Centre	Number	% of 125 respondents who use Recycling Centres	% of total 455 respondents
Small WEEE	65	52	14
Large WEEE	61	49	13
General waste (bulky)	54	43	12
General waste (excess)	34	27	7
Garden waste	32	26	7
Fridge/freezers	25	20	5
Plastic bottles	25	20	5
Wood	24	19	5
Food and drink cans	20	16	4
Glass bottles & jars	17	14	4
Textiles & shoes	16	13	4
Cardboard	15	12	3
Rubble/bricks	13	10	3
Batteries (household)	12	10	3
Paper (any type)	12	10	3
Scrap metals	12	10	3
Glass bottles & jars	9	7	2
Batteries (car)	7	6	2
Other plastic	5	4	1
Furniture	5	4	1
Books	4	3	1
CDs/DVDs/Videos	3	2	1
Tyres	3	2	1
Engine oil	2	2	0
Other	7	6	2

Other includes 'gas cylinders' & 'paint'

Q37. Frequency materials taken to most used Recycling Centre	Number	% of 125 respondents who use Recycling Centres	% of total 455 respondents
As required	54	43	12
2 or 3 times per year	23	18	5
Monthly	19	15	4
Every couple of months	10	8	2
Fortnightly	6	5	1
Weekly	5	4	1
4 times a year	4	3	1
Twice weekly	1	1	0
Other	3	2	1
Total	125	100	27

Q38. Whether satisfied with Recycling Centre system	Number	% of 125 respondents who use Recycling Centres	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	123	98	27
No	1	1	0
Don't know	1	1	0
Total	125	100	27

Q39. What liked about Recycling Centres	Number of Responses	% of 125 respondents who use Recycling Centres	% of total 455 respondents
Handy/convenient	44	35	10
Staff friendly/helpful	33	26	7
Good site management	30	24	7
Only way to recycle certain items	23	18	5
Wide range of materials accepted	17	14	4
Good for environment	13	10	3
Good site layout	12	10	3
Close by	6	5	1
Feel good factor	5	4	1
Good access	4	3	1
Good opening hours	4	3	1
Reduces waste in bin	4	3	1
Clean & tidy	3	2	1
Nothing	3	2	1
Too good to dump section	2	2	0
Don't know	9	7	2
Other	2	2	0

Other is 'labelling is good' & 'homeless furniture place'

Q40. What disliked about Recycling Centres	Number of Responses	% of 125 respondents who use Recycling Centres	% of total 455 respondents
Nothing	91	73	20
Staff unhelpful	7	6	2
Accept domestic waste from vans/ taxis	3	2	1
Poor accessibility	2	2	0
Smell	2	2	0
Bad opening times	1	1	0
Bad site management	1	1	0
Not emptied frequently enough	1	1	0
Too far away	1	1	0
Untidy site	1	1	0
Don't know	13	10	3
Other	6	5	1

Other includes 'weight restrictions' & 'too good to dump should be collected from the pavement once a month'

Q41. Suggested improvements (if any) for Recycling Centres	Number of Responses	% of 125 respondents who use Recycling Centres	% of total 455 respondents
Nothing	92	74	20
Staff more helpful	4	3	1
Closer/more sites	3	2	1
Accept vans with domestic waste	2	2	0
Collect more materials	2	2	0
Improve accessibility of site	2	2	0
Improve signage	2	2	0
Improve site layout	2	2	0
Increase opening hours	2	2	0
Provide Too Good to Dump area	2	2	0
Don't know	13	10	3
Other	3	2	1

Other is 'more parking space', 'improve traffic management' & 'advertise'

Q42. Overall rating of Recycling Centre service	Number	% of 125 respondents who use Recycling Centres	% of total 455 respondents
Very good	69	55	15
Good	46	37	10
Average	8	6	2
Don't know	2	2	0
Total	125	100	27

Q43. Perception of what happens to materials collected using the recycling services	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Made into new bottles/jars	100	22
Made into new cardboard packaging	84	18
Made into newsprint	79	17
Made into new cans	74	16
Made into new plastic products	55	12
Sold on to make new products	52	11
Made into new other glass products	27	6
Sold on to re-processors	15	3
Landfilled	12	3
Shipped abroad	10	2
Nothing	9	2
Made into compost	8	2
Don't know	246	54
Other	21	5
Made into new bottles/jars	100	22

Other includes 'burnt/ incinerated', 'taken by salvation army', 'stockpiled' & 'made into insulation'

Q44. Perception of what happens to general household waste collected in area that is not recycled	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Sent to landfill	278	61
Shipped abroad	5	1
Burnt/incinerated	4	1
Don't know	169	37
Other	5	1

Other includes 'nothing' & 'sent to plant to recover recyclates (MBT)'

Q45. Perceived location of landfill site used by council	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Dunbar (for Edinburgh)	26	6
Roslin (for Midlothian)	8	2
Don't know	417	92
Other	7	2

Other includes Seafield, Sea front at Leith, Linlithgow, Gorebridge, Gilmerton, Dalkeith, Braehead

Q46. Perceived reasons for council needing to drastically reduce amount of waste going to landfill	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Running out of space	190	42
Climate change	105	23
Landfill tax/ EU fines	68	15
Waste of resources	48	11
Government policy & targets	33	7
Landfill gas	11	2
Save costs especially transport	11	2
Don't know	130	29
Other	10	2

Other includes nothing, to keep sanitary, to keep Scotland beautiful

Q47. Whether heard of any taxes or fines imposed on council if amount of waste going to landfill is not reduced year on year	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	139	31
No	311	68
Don't know	5	1
Total	455	100

Q48. Knowledge of types of taxes/fines	Number of responses	% of 139 respondents who are aware of taxes or fines	% of total 455 respondents
Landfill tax	96	69	21
EU fines	75	54	16
Landfill gate fees	5	4	1
Don't know	5	4	1

Q49. Overall rating of idea to develop a Zero Waste Parc	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Very good	171	38
Good	178	39
Average	77	17
Poor	8	2
Very poor	4	1
Don't know	17	4
Total	455	100

Q50. Whether aware of technologies that could be used within the Parc to treat waste	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	108	24
No	337	74
Don't know	10	2
Total	455	100

Q51. Awareness of technologies that could be used within the Parc	Number of responses	% of 108 respondents who are aware of technologies	% of total 455 respondents
Energy from waste	44	41	10
Incineration	39	36	9
Anaerobic digestion	27	25	6
Gasification	11	10	2
Recycling	11	10	2
In-vessel Composting	9	8	2
Materials recovery (dry recyclables only)	7	6	2
Mechanical/Heat Treatment	5	5	1
Mechanical/Biological Treatment	3	3	1
Nothing	3	3	1
Don't know	7	6	2
Other	2	2	0

Other is Transfer station, Biomass

Q52A. Whether heard of MRF (Materials Recycling Facility)	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	59	13
No	363	80
Don't know	33	7
Total	455	100

Q52B. Whether heard of MBT (Mechanical Biological Treatment)	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	23	5
No	398	87
Don't know	34	7
Total	455	100

Q52C. Whether heard of MHT (Mechanical Heat Treatment)	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	20	4
No	401	88
Don't know	34	7
Total	455	100

Q52D. Whether heard of AD (Anaerobic Digestion)	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	51	11
No	369	81
Don't know	35	8
Total	455	100

Q52E. Whether heard of EfW (Energy from Waste)	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	129	28
No	291	64
Don't know	34	7
No response	1	0
Total	455	100

Q53. Overall acceptability of Energy from Waste technology as a landfill alternative	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Very acceptable	173	38
Acceptable	145	32
Don't mind	108	24
Quite unacceptable	13	3
Very unacceptable	4	1
Don't know	12	3
Total	455	100

Q54A. Whether agreed/disagreed that by treating waste locally there will be reduced transport distances which are better for cost and environment	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Agree	352	77
Disagree	8	2
Neither agree/disagree	95	21
Total	455	100

Q54B. Whether agreed/disagreed that by treating waste locally there will be smaller facilities to treat local waste volumes only	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Agree	332	73
Disagree	7	2
Neither agree/disagree	116	25
Total	455	100

Q54C. Whether agreed/disagreed that by treating waste locally the choice of technologies can suit local circumstances	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Agree	345	76
Disagree	5	1
Neither agree/disagree	105	23
Total	455	100

Q55. Whether agreed/disagreed that utilising heat produced for local homes/ businesses is a good idea	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Agree	435	96
Disagree	1	0
Neither agree/disagree	19	4

Q56. Perceived advantages of a Zero Waste Parc	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Good for environment	165	36
Provides energy	131	29
Reduces waste being landfilled	126	28
Saves Council taxes & fines	107	24
Increase recycling	77	17
Provides jobs	64	14
Good use of land	44	10
Saves householder Council Tax	19	4
Don't know	64	14
Other	24	5

Other includes nothing, reduced transport costs and a closer location

Q57. Perceived disadvantages/concerns about a Zero Waste Parc	Number of responses	% of total 455 respondents
Air pollution	130	29
Increased traffic	92	20
Noise pollution	67	15
Smell	61	13
Nothing	53	12
Damage to wildlife	36	8
Incineration	32	7
Damage to ecology	27	6
Affect on local area/ population	20	4
Visual pollution	17	4
Litter	15	3
Don't know	131	29
Other	14	3

Other mostly relates to costs and site safety and security

Q58A. Overall rating of the importance of the appearance/ layout and building design for the Zero Waste Parc	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Essential	80	18
Very important	123	27
Important	130	29
Fairly important	82	18
Not important	40	9
Total	455	100

Q58B. Overall rating of the importance of the screening the Parc by fences or trees	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Essential	122	27
Very important	114	25
Important	130	29
Fairly important	66	15
Not important	23	5
Total	455	100

Q58C. Overall rating of the importance of the provision of a visitor/education centre at the Parc	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Essential	99	22
Very important	84	18
Important	139	31
Fairly important	90	20
Not important	43	9
Total	455	100

Q58D. Overall rating of the importance of the impact on the environment by the building of a Parc	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Essential	192	42
Very important	100	22
Important	114	25
Fairly important	33	7
Not important	16	4
Total	455	100

Q58E. Overall rating of the importance of the local employment and business opportunities at the Parc	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Essential	218	48
Very important	69	15
Important	114	25
Fairly important	41	9
Not important	13	3
Total	455	100

Q59. Overall acceptability of the development of the Zero Waste Parc at Millerhill	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Very acceptable	157	35
Acceptable	136	30
Don't mind	129	28
Quite unacceptable	2	0
Very unacceptable	10	2
Don't know	21	5
Total	455	100

Q60. Whether agree or disagree that Millerhill appears a suitable site	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Agree	394	87
Disagree	11	2
Don't know	50	11
Total	455	100

Q61. Reasons for disagreeing that Millerhill is a suitable site	Number of responses	% of 11 respondents who disagree that Millerhill is a suitable site	% of total 455 respondents
Increased traffic	3	27	1
Air pollution	3	27	1
Too close to housing	3	27	1
Noise pollution	1	9	0
Not a suitable area	1	9	0
Don't know	1	9	0
Other	4	36	1

Other includes 'don't trust the council', 'unfair to ask' & 'smell'

Q62. Whether can suggest a suitable alternative site	Number of responses	% of 11 respondents who disagree that Millerhill is a suitable site	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	3	27	1
No	7	64	2
Don't know	1	9	0
Total	11	100	2

Suggested site: 'Queensferry' & 'further from populated areas'

Q63. Whether would like to be kept informed about the progress of the Zero Waste Parc	Number	% of total 455 respondents
Yes	318	70
No	136	30
Don't know	1	0
Total	455	100

Q64. Best channels/methods used to disseminate information	Number of responses	% of 318 respondents who wish to be kept informed	% of total 455 respondents
TV	160	50	35
Print/ newspaper	130	41	29
Leaflet	73	23	16
Newsletter	74	23	16
Web site	37	12	8
E-newsletter	22	7	5
Radio advert	13	4	3
Meetings	8	3	2
Social media	5	2	1
Don't know	1	0	0
Other	11	3	2

Other includes 'council tax statement', 'door to door', 'library posters' & 'local councillors'