Communal Recycling Post-Trial Report

Background

In October 2011 information leaflets and questionnaires were sent to addresses in 23 roads in the Brunswick and Adelaide ward of the city in order to ascertain levels of support for a trial of on-street communal recycling facilities. Following the trial period, the same households were sent questionnaires to evaluate the success of the trial.

Methodology

3274 questionnaires were sent out to 26 roads.

Headline results

- 64% of respondents find the new service easier to use.
- 35% of respondents recycle more with the new service.
- 73% of respondents prefer the new communal recycling bins.

Findings

In total 637 responses were received, 600 (94.2%) of these were completed questionnaires and 37 (5.8%) responses were received through the council's consultation portal. This gives an overall response rate of 19%.

Comments have been grouped under twenty one hadings. Topics were not mutually exclusive and some respondents listed a lot of issues, some had only one area of concern, some made no comment.

Response rates for each street were as follows:

	No. sent	No.	Response
	out	returned	rate (%)
Boundary Passage	1	1	100
Brunswick Place	510	81	15.9
Brunswick Road	305	49	16
Brunswick Street East	54	10	18.5
Cambridge Road	259	60	23.1
Cavendish Mews	5	2	0.4
Chapel Mews	23	4	17.3
Cross Street	26	7	26.9
Farm Road	126	23	18.2
Farman Street	23	4	17.3
Golden Lane	23	7	30.4
Holland Road	2	1	50
Ivy Place	14	5	35.7
Lansdowne Place	435	72	16.5
Lansdowne Road	17	3	17.6
Lansdowne Street	260	56	21.5
Little Western Street	21	9	42.8
Lower Market Street	60	20	33.3
Norfolk Place	7	1	14.3
Norfolk Road	133	22	16.5
Norfolk Square	197	28	14.2
Upper Market Street	43	6	13.9
Waterloo Street	294	61	20.7
Western Road	107	7	65.4
Western Street	63	15	23.8
York Road	266	45	16.9
No street name given		38	
Total	3274	637	100

Responses to each question were as follows:

Q1 Did you recycle using the black box scheme before the trial?	Number of responses	%
Yes, every collection day	354	55.6
Yes, most weeks	144	22.6
Yes, occasionally	49	7.7
No, never	86	13.5
No reply	4	0.6
Total	637	100

Q2 Do you recycle now using the communal recycling bins?	Number of responses	%
Yes, every day	117	18.4
Yes, a few times a week	275	43.2
Yes, about once a week	162	25.4
Yes, occasionally	60	9.4
No, never	21	3.3
No reply	2	0.3
Total	637	100

Q3 Do you recycle more or less since the new scheme has been introduced?	Number of responses	%
I recycle a lot more	134	21
I recycle a bit more	88	13.8
I recycle about the same	315	49.5
I recycle a bit less	46	7.2
I recycle a lot less	41	6.4
I don't recycle at all	13	2.0
Total	637	100

Q4 Please state whether you agree or disagree with the following statements:

I find the new communal recycling service easier to use than the black box scheme:

	Number of	
	responses	%
Strongly agree	276	43.3
Agree	134	21
Neither agree nor Disagree	70	11
Disagree	88	13.8
Strongly disagree	67	10.5
No reply	2	0.3
Total	637	100

I think the streets look better without the black boxes:

	Number of responses	%
Strongly agree	350	54.9
Agree	149	23.4
Neither agree nor Disagree	89	14
Disagree	29	4.6
Strongly disagree	20	3.1
Total	637	100

I prefer the new communal recycling scheme to the black box scheme:

	Number of	
	responses	%
Strongly agree	320	50.2
Agree	145	22.8
Neither agree nor Disagree	59	9.3
Disagree	50	7.8
Strongly disagree	61	9.6
No reply	2	0.3
Total	637	100

The locations of the recycling bins are suitable:

	Number of responses	%
Strongly agree	201	31.6
Agree	278	43.6
Neither agree nor Disagree	58	9.1
Disagree	52	8.2
Strongly disagree	47	7.4
No reply	1	0.2
Total	637	100

There are sufficient recycling bins:

	Number of	
	responses	%
Strongly agree	131	20.6
Agree	269	42.2
Neither agree nor Disagree	85	13.3
Disagree	103	16.2
Strongly disagree	40	6.3
No reply	9	1.4
Total	637	100

The final question allowed for respondents to make any further comments about the proposed trial. Comments have been grouped into 21 themed areas as follows:

Comment	Number
More glass bins are needed/ glass bins need to be sited with	133
other bins/ glass is too heavy to carry long distances	
Bins are often overflowing/ not emptied enough/ need	113
emptying more especially at weekends	
The recycling bins need bigger slots/ openings/ need to be	55
able to lift the lid up/ it's time consuming/ unhygienic to push	
individual items through slots	
Has led to more fly-tipping/ full bins or not enough glass bins	55
has led to more fly-tipping	
General positive comments	50
The streets are tidier now/ there is less vermin mess	30
I am concerned about the noise (especially glass)	28
I am concerned about the loss of parking spaces	21
It is hard to use the new system (on account of health/ physical	18
disability)	
There are not enough bins	18
Recycling is now less convenient	15
Need plastic bag recycling slots in the bins	13
Where can I recycle batteries now	11
Want organic waste collected	9
It is hard to use the system because can't leave young children	8
at home and pop out	
We can now recycle daily/ when we want to	8
Residents need re-usable bags to carry recycling to the bins	7
More information is needed about what can be recycled and	6
where (especially glass now?)	
Want local tetrapak recycling facilities	3
Want more types of plastic to be taken	3
Bins are too far from my house	2

Some groups of comments are linked eg "the bins are over-flowing/ not emptied enough" is sometimes related to people fly-tipping where they can't fit their recycling in the bins. Likewise the "recycling bins need bigger slots" is also sometimes linked to flytipping where recycling gets stuck in the brushes and people can't fit more recycling in and so leave bags by the bins. Siting glass-bins in different areas also seems to be linked to fly-tipping as people don't know where the glass bins are and so leave bags by the main bins.

Results by Street	1							
Q1 Did you recycle using the black	Yes, every co		Yes, mo		Yes, occ	/	No, ne	
box scheme before the trial?	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Boundary Passage (1) ¹	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
Brunswick Place (510)	42	51.9	19	23.5	5	6.2	15	18.5
Brunswick Road (305)	24	49	17	34.7	2	4.1	6	12.2
Brunswick Street East (54)	7	70	1	10	1	10	1	10
Cambridge Road (259)	32	54.2	20	33.9	3	5	4	6.8
Cavendish Mews (5)	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chapel Mews (23)	3	75	1	25	0	0	0	0
Cross Street (26)	4	57.1	3	42.9	0	0	0	0
Farm Road (126)	9	39.1	9	39.1	0	0	5	21.7
Farman Street (23)	2	50	0	0	0	0	2	50
Golden Lane (23)	7	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Holland Road (2)	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ivy Place (14) (Ivy Mews)	3	60	0	0	1	20	1	20
Lansdowne Place (435)	43	59.7	18	25	5	6.9	6	83
Lansdowne Road (17)	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lansdowne Street (260)	36	64.3	10	17.9	3	5.4	7	12.5
Little Western Street (21)	7	77.8	2	22.2	0	0	0	0
Lower Market Street (60)	11	55	4	20	3	15	2	10
Norfolk Place (7)	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
Norfolk Road (133)	12	54.5	6	27.3	1	4.5	3	13.6
Norfolk Square (197)	13	48.1	6	22.2	2	7.4	6	22.2
Upper Market Street (43)	3	50	1	16.7	0	0	2	33.3
Waterloo Street (294)	36	59	9	14.8	6	9.8	10	16.4
Western Road (107)	4	57.1	2	28.6	1	14.3	0	0
Western Street (63)	7	50	2	14.3	1	7.1	4	28.6
York Road (266)	21	46.7	11	24.4	9	20	4	8.9
Total	332	55.7	141	23.6	44	7.4	79	13.2

¹ number in brackets = number of property addresses on the street

Demographic Information

Age	No.	%
18-24	26	4.1
25-34	130	20.4
35-44	118	18.5
45-54	115	18.1
55-64	61	9.6
65-74	40	6.3
75+	20	3.1
No reply/ prefer not to say	127	19.9
Total	637	100

Gender	No.	%
Male	234	36.7
Female	321	50.4
No reply/ prefer not to say	82	12.9
Total	637	100

Is your gender identity the same as the gender you were assigned at birth?	No.	%
Yes	544	85.4
No	2	0.3
No reply/ prefer not to say	91	14.3
Total	637	100

Ethnicity		No.	%
White	English/ Welsh/ Scottish/	468	73.5
	Northern Irish/ British		
	Irish	12	1.9
	Gypsy/ Traveller	0	0
	Polish	7	1.1
	Portuguese	0	0
	Other white background	36	6
Asian or Asian British	Bangladeshi	1	0.2
	Indian	5	0.8
	Pakistani	0	0
	Chinese	2	0.3
	Other Asian background	2	0.3
Black or Black British	African	0	0
	Caribbean	1	0.2
	Sudanese	0	0
	Other Black background	0	0
Mixed	Asian & White	7	1.1
	Asian & Black African	0	0
	Asian & Black Caribbean	0	0
	White & Black African	1	0.2
	White & Black Caribbean	4	0.6

	Any other mixed background	4	0.6
Other Ethnic Group	Turkish	0	0
	Arab	0	0
	Japanese	0	0
	Other	0	0
No reply/ prefer not to sa	ау	85	13.4
Total		637	100

Sexual Orientation	No.	%
Heterosexual	437	68.6
Lesbian	14	2.2
Gay	38	6
Bisexual	16	2.5
Other	0	0
No reply/ prefer not to say	132	20.7
Total	637	100

Religion	No.	%
I have no particular religion	217	34.1
Buddhist	15	2.4
Christian	135	21.2
Hindu	2	0.3
Jain	1	0.2
Jewish	4	0.6
Muslim	3	0.5
Pagan	2	0.3
Sikh	0	0
Agnostic	26	4.1
Atheist	90	14.1
Other	16	2.5
No reply/ prefer not to say	126	19.8
Total	637	100

Disability	No.	%
Yes	71	11.1
No	459	72.1
No reply/ prefer not to say	107	16.8
Total	637	100

Type of Impairment	No.	%
Physical	39	6.1
Long-standing illness	26	4.1
Sensory Impairment	5	0.8
Mental Health Condition	14	2.2
Leaning disability/ difficulty	1	0.2
Other	13	2.6
Total ²	98	

² Some respondents had more than one type of disability