

## Item 9.a.8: Wamboin/Bywong/Sutton East Area Waste Management Working Group

<b>SUBJECT</b>	Progress Report of the Palerang W/B/S Waste Management Working Group July 2009		
<b>FILE NO.</b>	WM0016	<b>DIVISION</b>	Infrastructure Planning

### Attachment

1. Waste management Survey Results Overview

### Synopsis

This report details the results of the Palerang Council – Wamboin/Bywong/Sutton East Area Waste Management Working Group’s baseline survey of residents on future waste management options for the three communities.

The survey was conducted following the approval of its content by Council at its 4 June 2009 meeting. Survey forms sent out were initialled by the Director of Infrastructure Planning and the Chair of the Working Group to ensure the integrity of the returned survey forms.

In a cooperative partnership, representatives from each of the three communities, Councillors and staff received and numbered the returned survey forms, and entered the data into a database specially designed for the task. All data were entered twice, by different individuals, and the results cross-checked to verify their integrity.

Summary Data: Survey forms distributed: 1236, Responses: 674

Preferred Option: Council-run roadside wheelie bin collection 133, or 19.7% of all respondents	Small Waste Transfer Station: 507, or 75.2% of all respondents
Support for Council-run roadside wheelie bin collection trial: 212 or 31% of residents responding	Against trial: 454 or 67.4% of residents responding

For full details of responses to all questions, see Attachment 1.

### Recommendation

Recommended that Council acknowledge:

1. that more than one out of every two households in Wamboin, Bywong and Sutton East responded to the waste management survey;
2. this 54.5% response rate is a remarkable return rate, even with supply of reply-paid envelopes, given that survey specialists regard an 8-10% response rate as very good;
3. that of the residents responding to the survey:
  - a. 75.2 % favoured replacement of Macs Reef Road Tip with a small Waste Transfer Station (WTS) on the site;
  - b. just 19.7 % of respondents favoured a roadside waste and recycling wheelie bin collection by Council; and

- c. 67% of respondents were against a Council-run roadside wheelie bin collection trial costing \$30,000 of all Palerang ratepayers' money.
4. That in the face of such overwhelming opposition to the trial, Council postpone plans to hold the roadside wheelie bin collection trial;
5. Given the broad support for a small WTS at the Macs Reef Road Tip site, investigations, concept designs and environmental studies on its feasibility be expedited, including addressing EPA issues with the current landfill, obtaining the required flora and fauna, heritage and Aboriginal study reports and seeking the Director-General of Planning's form & content requirements for the preparation of an EIS, so a Development Application for the small WTS can be prepared; and
6. Should the investigative studies prevent a small WTS being established on the Macs Reef Road landfill site, a second survey be held giving residents the options of choosing either:
  - a. to use Bungendore Waste Transfer Station; or support
  - b. a Council-operated roadside waste and recycling wheelie bin service in the Wamboin / Bywong / East Sutton area.

## Report

1236 survey forms were distributed by mail on 16-17 June to all property owners in the Wamboin/Bywong/Sutton East area. Because of school holidays and the likelihood of people going away, returns were requested by Friday 3 July. Completed surveys received up to 17 July also were accepted.

The Working Group met on Monday, 20 July, to consider the analysis of the baseline survey. After doing so, members agreed there was little justification in spending \$30,000 on a roadside trial in the face of the overwhelming community opposition (almost 2-1). As the majority of the community also strongly rejected a Council-operated roadside waste and recycling wheelie bin service generally (3-1), councillors and community representatives in the Working Group were not confident that the proposed trial would change community attitudes. The Director of Infrastructure Planning was concerned that given the amount of opposition to the trial, resident co-operation to run a meaningful trial was at risk.

It was agreed Council should be asked to postpone plans to hold the roadside collection trial and that studies required to enable lodgement of a Development Application should be expedited. The Director of Infrastructure Planning told the other Working Group members that a consultant had been selected to undertake the flora and fauna study and EPA issues concerning the existing landfill were currently being addressed.

The Working Group discussed the scenario of the required reports ruling out establishment of a small Waste Transfer Station on the Macs Reef Road site. and agreed for this situation to recommend to Council that it hold a second survey offering two options, these being the Council-run roadside wheelie bin service or for residents in the surveyed communities to use the Bungendore WTS.

As shown in the synopsis summary table, there was a very high return of survey forms with a 674 of the 1236 distributed mailed back to Council. This 54.5 % return provided data from more than one out of every two households in the areas involved.

Not all numbers and percentages from this survey add up 'exactly' because all respondents did not necessarily answer all questions. For example, some respondents said they used a current collection service, but did not indicate either frequency or 'pick-up location'. Others said they DIDN'T use a Council landfill, but proceeded to identify quantities and items that they took to landfill sites. Some respondents said they DID use a landfill site, then, in response to the question on frequency of use, said that they never visited either of the landfill sites. Despite these ambiguities, discrepancies were limited to just a couple of individual responses for any particular question.

For those unfamiliar with the statistical nature of surveys, it is interesting to note that even though more than 200 data entry errors were corrected in data entry checking, the statistical results varied very little before and after verification. Similarly, throughout the two-week data entry period, the ratio of property owners for and against a Council-operated roadside wheelie bin collection service and those supporting the proposed trial remained about the same, with little change in daily for-and-against percentages.

### **Financial considerations**

Funds were voted for the concept plans and Environmental Impact Study for the Transfer Station at Council's May meeting. The \$30,000 allocated for the trial roadside wheelie bin service will not be required this money can be returned to the Waste Management Fund reserves.

The development of the proposals for the waste transfer station will allow the preparation of more accurate cost estimates for the construction and operation of the facility. Council will then be in better position to determine the impact of this option on the general waste charge.

### **Policy implications**

Survey specialists regard 8 to 10 % as a very good survey response. With its baseline survey, Council has achieved an unusually high 54.5 % feedback from its target audience. This would indicate that similar approaches might prove a valuable way of obtaining community input in future community consultation exercises and should be considered – having drawn out responses from what is often termed “the silent majority”.

### **Social implications**

The communities of Wamboin, Bywong and Sutton East have voted strongly through this survey for establishment of a small WTS to be built on the Macs Reef Road Tip site when the current landfill closes. This reflects the Community Associations' opinion given to council before the survey. An important social issue for Council is an underlying perception by some ratepayers/residents that Palerang is indifferent to results of community consultation and does not always act on the outcomes. As a result of this baseline survey, Council's response is likely to be scrutinised closely.

Although there was no provision for comments on the survey forms, 151 respondents scribbled or attached written observations.

The support for a roadside service was just under 20% across the board, equally from those who do currently use a collection service and those that don't. There was however, very little support for a roadside service from residents who currently have a commercial service collecting from the house. Another 10 % who didn't support the roadside collection also said “go ahead with the trial”, some commenting that a trial would be the “fair way” of assessing public opinion. But there were many comments too from opponents of the trial, who criticised Council for proposing to spend \$30,000 on the

roadside trial, typified by one respondent describing this as “a waste of Council’s limited financial resources”.

It was clear that the majority of the respondents already using a house or roadside collection service seemed satisfied with the service being provided and one resident said they were “very happy” with their arrangements while another described the commercial services as “cheap and efficient”.

Many respondents wrote that they would have problems with roadside collection because of long driveways and there being nowhere just inside their property gates or suitable areas on the road to store or put out wheelie bins. Other respondents commented on road safety issues with bins on Bungendore and Macs Reef Roads where 100 and 90 kph speed limits applied.

**Environmental considerations**

The survey and comments scribbled on some forms also provided valuable information about quantities of recycling and re-use of dumped materials. Some respondents noted disappointment about Council’s removal of a bank of recycling bins on Denley Drive and others wanted more recycling stations across in the area.

The construction of a waste Transfer Station at Macs Reef will be designated development and thus require the preparation and advertising of an EIS as part of the DA process.

Attachment 1: Waste management Survey Results Overview

**Waste Management Survey Results Overview**

**1 Summary Data**

Survey forms posted out 1236  
 Survey responses received 674 = 54.5%

Note that, in the following data, totals do not always add up to 100% because not all respondents answered all questions, even when it might seem logical that they would.

**2 Preferred Option**

In response to the question "Which [option] do you prefer?" (only one option could be selected):

Roadside Collection 133 = 19.7%  
 Waste Transfer Station 507 = 75.2%

**3 Support for Trial**

In response to the question "Do you support the [proposed] trial?" (only one option could be selected):

Yes 212 = 31.5%  
 No 454 = 67.4%

**4 Private Collection Service**

In response to the question "Do you use O'Sullivan's Household Rural Waste Collection Service?":

Yes 129 = 19.1%  
 No 540 = 80.1%

**5 Private Collection Frequency**

For those respondents who indicated that they used O'Sullivan's, their response to the question "How often do you have O'Sullivan's collect your waste?":

Weekly 40 = 31.0%  
 Fortnightly 76 = 58.9%  
 Monthly 9 = 7.0%  
 Occasionally 1 = 0.8%

**6 Private Collection Service Location**

For those respondents who indicated that they used O’Sullivan’s, their response to the question “From where does O’Sullivan’s collect your waste?”:

Roadside	32	=	24.8%
House	94	=	72.9%

**7 Landfill Usage**

In response to the question “Do you use an existing landfill rubbish tip?”:

Yes	636	=	94.4%
-----	-----	---	-------

**8 Tip Location**

Respondents who indicated that they used either of the two local landfill rubbish tips (respondents could nominate both sites if they used both):

Macs Reef Road	545	=	85.7%
Bungendore	200	=	31.4%

**9 Macs Reef Road Tip Usage**

For respondents who indicated that they used either of the two local landfill rubbish tips, “How often do you use the tip for household waste?”:

Weekly	98	=	15.4%
Fortnightly	125	=	19.7%
Monthly	161	=	25.3%
Occasionally	161	=	25.3%
(Never	30	=	4.7%)

**10 Bungendore Tip Usage**

For respondents who indicated that they used either of the two local landfill rubbish tips, “How often do you use the tip for household waste?”:

Weekly	37	=	5.8%
Fortnightly	29	=	4.6%
Monthly	35	=	5.5%
Occasionally	99	=	15.6%
(Never	179	=	28.1%)

**11 # Bags of Rubbish per Tip Trip**

In response to the question “On average, what quantities of household rubbish do you take to Council tips per visit (# of ‘standard’ plastic shopping bags)?”:

1-3	75	=	11.8%
4-6	104	=	16.4%
7-9	101	=	15.9%
10-12	170	=	26.7%
13-15	8	=	1.3%
16-18	13	=	2.0%
19-21	33	=	5.2%
21-24	8	=	1.3%
>24	87	=	13.7%

**12 Tip Items**

In response to the question “Tick every item you take to the tip (at least occasionally)?”:

General Household Waste	548	=	86.2%
Recyclable Items	494	=	77.7%
Batteries	153	=	24.1%
Building Waste	291	=	45.8%
Computers	123	=	19.3%
Furniture	169	=	26.6%
Green Waste	287	=	45.1%
Oil	172	=	27.0%
Paint	93	=	14.6%
Tyres	94	=	14.8%
White Goods	175	=	27.5%
Wire/Fencing	219	=	34.4%
Other Items	145	=	22.8%

**13 WTS Usage with Collection**

In response to the question “How often would you need to use a transfer station if there was a roadside collection service?”:

Weekly	39	=	6.1%
Fortnightly	72	=	11.3%
Monthly	111	=	17.5%
Occasionally	324	=	50.9%
Never	29	=	4.6%

**14 WTS Usage without Collection**

In response to the question “How often would you need to use a transfer station if there was no roadside collection service?”:

Weekly	129	=	20.3%
Fortnightly	155	=	24.4%
Monthly	170	=	26.7%
Occasionally	139	=	21.9%
Never	7	=	1.1%

**15 Recycling**

In response to the question “Roughly what percentage of your recyclables do you take to a Council recycling facility?”:

0%	96	=	14.2%
1-25%	54	=	8.0%
26-50%	66	=	9.8%
51-75%	26	=	3.9%
76-99%	234	=	34.7%
100%	198	=	29.4%

**16 WTS Items**

In response to the question “What items would you want to take to a waste transfer station?”:

General Household Waste	437	=	68.7%
Recyclable Items	446	=	70.1%
Batteries	168	=	26.4%
Computers	136	=	21.4%
Oil	169	=	26.6%
Other Items	203	=	31.9%

Responses to items 2, 3, 4 & 10 were also analysed according to the location of respondents, but in order to preserve the anonymity of individual respondents these data have not been made publicly available. Nonetheless, while these particular breakdowns were interesting, they did not show any trends that would impact the interpretation of the overall results.

The results for Items 2 & 3 were also analysed with respect to whether or not respondents already used a collection service:



**Preferred roadside collection**

Total	133		
With existing service	29	=	22.5% of those with existing service
Those at roadside	14	=	43.8% of those with roadside service
Those at house	13	=	13.8% of those with house service
No location nominated	2		
Without existing service	102	=	18.9% of respondents
Status unknown	2		

**Supported trial**

Total	212		
With existing service	41	=	31.8% of those with existing service
Those at roadside	19	=	59.4% of those with roadside service
Those at house	21	=	22.3% of those with house service
No location nominated	1		
Without existing service	170	=	31.5% of respondents (without service)
Status unknown	1		