

**REPORT TO: ENVIRONMENTAL AND CONSUMER PROTECTION COMMITTEE  
- 19<sup>th</sup> AUGUST 2002**

**REPORT ON: SCOTTISH WASTE AWARENESS GROUP SURVEY (SWAG)**

**REPORT BY: DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND CONSUMER PROTECTION**

**REPORT NO: 599-2002**

**1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1.1 To inform members of the findings of the survey undertaken by SWAG in connection with the National Waste Strategy and the Tayside Area Waste Strategy.

**2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 That the Committee note the findings of the survey.

**3.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

3.1 There are no financial implications associated with this report.

**4.0 DUNDEE 21 IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 All sections of the community are empowered to participate in decision making.

**5.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 None.

**6.0 BACKGROUND**

6.1 As a component of the Area Waste Strategy process, undertaken within the National Waste Strategy, a survey of public opinion was undertaken by SWAG.

6.2 The purpose of the survey was to facilitate consultation with key stakeholders, by seeking their opinion on a number of aspects of waste disposal.

6.3 The survey was conducted across Tayside using the following approaches: -

- Door to door questionnaires (1000 face to face interviews across Tayside)
- Focus groups (up to 12 participants)

- 6.4 The purpose of these approaches was to: -
- assess attitudes to reduce, re-use and recycle
  - appraise attitudes to final disposal options
  - appraise attitudes to each of the proposed options in the Area Waste Strategy
- 6.5 Interesting facts to emerge are as follows: -
- 95% of respondents had not heard of the waste hierarchy
  - 56% of respondents indicated they presently practice some form of waste reduction within their own homes
  - 58% of respondents indicated they currently practiced some form of recycling
  - 65% of respondents indicated a willingness to participate in kerbside collection schemes for recycling
  - 81% of respondents indicated they had no idea what it cost for the weekly collection and disposal of domestic waste
  - the overall preferred choice for disposal was energy from waste
  - the least preferred choice for disposal was landfill
  - the most environmentally favourable option was perceived to be a materials recycling facility
  - the least environmentally friendly option was perceived to be landfill
- 6.6 Of the 56% of respondents who currently practice some form of waste reduction, the major element comprised recycling activities (45%).
- 6.7 Of the 58% of respondents who stated they currently practiced some form of recycling activities, the most commonly recycled material was newspaper (76% of recyclers).
- 6.8 Of those who indicated they did not recycle (42%), the main reason given was that it was too much trouble (23%), an almost equal number (21%) cited not knowing where facilities are situated.
- 6.9 When asked what would encourage them to recycle more, or recycle, both recyclers and non-recyclers cited kerbside collection as the prime reason (33%) with additional bring systems being cited by 26%.
- 6.10 The majority of respondents (74%) believed that householders should not be charged for the amount of waste they produced.
- 6.11 Of the householders with gardens 77% (including composters and non-composters) indicated that nothing would encourage them to compost more.
- 6.12 Of the sampled population in Tayside, 61% said that they would be willing to participate in a separate green waste collection system.
- 6.13 The most commonly perceived advantage of disposal by waste to energy was energy production, with the most commonly perceived disadvantage being pollution levels/fumes.

## **7.0 CONSULTATION**

Chief Executive  
Director of Support Services  
Director of Finance

## **8.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS**

8.1 Area Waste Strategy SWAG Survey.

## **9.0 SIGNATURE**

---

Director of Environmental and Consumer Protection

Date: 29<sup>th</sup> July 2002