



Community Review of Bulk Waste Options

Prepared for: City of Vincent

Prepared by: CATALYSE[®] Pty Ltd ©

22 September 2020

© Copyright CATALYSE[®] Pty Ltd 2020



Contents

Introduction	3
Strategic insights	5
Waste management processes	10
MARKYT® Performance Scorecards Waste Management Services	15
Waste reduction	22
Usage of bulk waste services	26
Bulk waste perceptions	30
Bulk waste preferences	36

Introduction

Introduction and methodology

In August, the City of Vincent administered a Bulk Waste Review to evaluate community priorities and to measure Council's performance against key indicators in the Strategic Community Plan.

Scorecards invitations were sent to 4,001 randomly selected households (1,000 by mail and 3,001 by email). The City provided supporting promotions through its communication channels.


1,004 respondents completed a scorecard.

601 randomly selected residents completed a scorecard reducing the sampling error to $\pm 3.96\%$ at the 95% confidence interval.

A further 360 residents and 43 out of area respondents opted in.

As responses were similar between randomly selected and opt-in residents, these responses have been analysed together. Out of area respondents have been analysed separately.

The final dataset was weighted by age and gender to match the ABS Census population profile. Data has been analysed using SPSS. Where sub-totals add to $\pm 1\%$ of the parts, this is due to rounding errors to zero decimal places.



Strategic Insights

Community bulk waste preferences

Based on top 2 ranking

#1 Preference

No change
56% ranked 1 or 2

#2 Preference

Retain current service + limit on amount of waste
+ limit time waste is permitted on verge
44% ranked 1 or 2

#3 Preference

On request + 2m3 limit +
costs included in Council Rates +

loose, uncontained
27% ranked 1 or 2

OR

skip bin
34% ranked 1 or 2

Preferences for bulk waste options

Payment options

Included in Council rates

64%

7% unsure

User pays

30%

Timing of collections

Scheduled

52%

8% unsure

On-request

40%

Volume of hard bulk waste

Unlimited

49%

13% unsure

Limit of 2m3

38%

Collection method

Skip bin

49%

12% unsure

Loose, uncontained

40%

Sufficient space for skip bin

Yes

61%

6% unsure

No

33%

Support for excess waste costs

No

47%

9% unsure

Yes

44%

Waste Performance Scorecard

General Waste Collections

78

Performance Index Score

5 index points above the MARKYT® Industry Average and on par with 2019

Recycling Collections

75

Performance Index Score

5 index points above the MARKYT® Industry Average and on par with 2019

Verge-side General Waste

69

Performance Index Score

On par with the MARKYT® Industry Average and up 4 index points from 2019

Verge-side Green Waste

74

Performance Index Score

Up 6 index points from 2019

On demand, paid mattress and white goods collection

61

Performance Index Score

Down 6 index points from 2019

Suggested Improvements

FOGO / 3 bin system



Local drop-off points



Education / workshops



More frequent recycling collections



Community up-cycling and sharing



Composting of green waste / FOGO waste




Green waste bins



Waste management processes | Importance v Effectiveness

All waste management processes are considered to be important and the City is considered to be fairly effective with all processes receiving an effectiveness score above 50 points out of 100.

Keeping white goods, televisions, computers and mattresses separate from other bulk waste is considered to be slightly less important than recycling, removing contaminants and reducing waste to landfill.



Q. How important do you think it is to: Base: All respondents, excludes no response (n = varies) 10 point scale, low to high
Q. How effective do you think the City of Vincent has been in the following areas? Base: All respondents, excludes unsure and no response (n=varies) 10 point scale, low to high

Waste management processes

Importance of waste management processes

Increasing recycling is considered to be the most important waste management process with an index score of 90 out of 100, closely followed by removing contaminants from the waste stream, with a score of 89.

Reducing the amount of waste going into landfill has dropped in importance since 2019 from 91 index points to 86.

Waste management processes | perceived importance

% of respondents


■ High (8-10)

■ Moderate (5-7)

■ Low (1-4)

Index Score

2019 2020



Q. How important do you think it is to:

Base: All respondents, excludes 'unsure' and 'no response' (n = varies)

Importance of waste management processes

Community Variances

Views are fairly similar across the community. Some of the variances include:

- People living in West Perth are less likely to consider increasing recycling to be important.
- Removing contaminants from the waste stream is more important for people aged 70+ years and those living in a duplex, villa or unit.
- Reducing the amount of waste going into landfill is more important for people ages 70+ years.
- Keep white goods, televisions, computers and mattresses separate other bulk waste is more important to residents of Leederville, people aged 55+ years and people living in houses on large lots.

Community Variances

Importance Index Score

	Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
Increase recycling	90	89	90	88	92	90	91	90	89	84	89	89	91	90	89	88	94	89	94	93	90	90	92	88	88
Remove contaminants from the waste stream, such as paint and batteries	89	89	89	74	88	90	90	89	89	88	87	87	91	87	90	90	94	89	90	87	89	88	94	88	88
Reduce the amount of waste going into landfill	86	85	87	85	85	88	87	86	84	88	83	82	89	86	86	84	91	85	90	88	85	86	90	87	85
Keep white goods, televisions, computers and mattresses separate from other waste during bulk waste collections	71	73	68	53	69	76	68	70	74	66	73	70	72	66	72	77	84	71	70	77	71	72	71	71	60

Q. How important do you think it is to:

Base: All respondents, excludes 'unsure' and 'no response' (n = varies)


Effectiveness of waste management processes

The City of Vincent is seen to be most effective at educating the community about how to recycle and reduce waste, with an index score of 60. This score has increased from 55 index points in 2019.

The City is seen as less effective at encouraging community members to remove contaminants from the waste stream and encouraging community members to keep white goods, televisions, computers and mattresses separate from other bulk waste.

Waste management processes | effectiveness

% of respondents



Q. How effective do you think the City of Vincent has been in the following areas?

Base: All respondents, excludes 'unsure' and 'no response' (n = varies)

Effectiveness of waste management processes

Community variances

Effectiveness ratings are fairly similar across the community. Some notable variances include:

- Older people (70+ years) rate the City's effectiveness more highly across all waste management processes.
- People living in an apartment rate the City more highly for educating the community about how to recycle and reduce waste, increasing recycling and reducing waste going to landfill.
- West Perth residents rate the City more highly for educating the community about how to recycle and reduce waste. Perth residents rate the City more highly for increasing recycling.
- East Perth residents and people living in a duplex, villa or unit rate the City more highly for encouraging the community to keep white goods, e-waste and mattresses separate from other bulk rubbish.

Community Variances Effectiveness Index Score	Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
	Educating the community about how to recycle and reduce waste	60	59	61	51	58	59	60	56	61	66	59	59	61	59	60	60	66	60	58	56	60	57	59	61
Increasing recycling	56	57	54	57	55	55	54	55	57	57	61	56	56	53	57	59	68	56	55	55	55	57	58	55	65
Reducing waste going into landfill	54	53	55	54	55	50	54	50	56	51	57	54	54	50	57	55	67	54	51	56	53	53	54	54	62
Encouraging community members to remove contaminants from the waste stream	52	52	53	53	56	52	52	48	54	49	49	51	54	48	53	57	66	52	50	55	53	48	56	49	53
Encouraging community members to keep white goods, televisions, computers and mattresses separate from other waste during bulk waste collections	51	51	52	59	50	51	51	50	52	47	50	51	52	49	51	53	60	52	49	53	51	51	56	51	49

Q. How effective do you think the City of Vincent has been in the following areas?

Base: All respondents, excludes 'unsure' and 'no response' (n = varies)

MARKYT[®] Performance Scorecards

Waste Management Services

MARKYT® Performance Scorecard


General waste collections (green lid bin)

Performance ratings

% of respondents


98%
Positive rating*

78
Performance Index Score
(out of 100)




Trend Analysis

Performance Index Score



MARKYT Industry Standards

Performance Index Score



City of Vincent	78
Industry High	86
Industry Average	73

Variances across the community

Performance Index Score

Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
78	80	76	73	80	84	78	74	78	76	79	79	78	77	80	78	81	79	76	66	79	75	78	85	76

Q. How would you rate the following waste management services?


Base: All respondents, excludes 'unsure' and 'no response' (n = 901). * Positive rating = excellent, good or okay

MARKYT® Performance Scorecard

Recycling collections (yellow lid bin)


Performance ratings

% of respondents




Trend Analysis

Performance Index Score



MARKYT Industry Standards

Performance Index Score



City of Vincent	75
Industry High	84
Industry Average	70

Variances across the community

Performance Index Score

Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
75	76	73	72	75	80	75	73	76	70	74	76	74	75	74	76	80	75	73	70	75	75	71	81	72

Q. How would you rate the following waste management services?


Base: All respondents, excludes 'unsure' and 'no response' (n = 903). * Positive rating = excellent, good or okay

MARKYT® Performance Scorecard

Annual bulk hard waste collections


Performance ratings

% of respondents




Trend Analysis

Performance Index Score



MARKYT Industry Standards

Performance Index Score



City of Vincent	69
Industry High	86
Industry Average	71

Variances across the community

Performance Index Score

Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
69	69	69	70	67	69	71	62	69	73	68	69	69	69	67	69	76	69	69	61	69	68	72	71	71

Q. How would you rate the following waste management services?


Base: All respondents, excludes 'unsure' and 'no response' (n = 903). * Positive rating = excellent, good or okay

MARKYT® Performance Scorecard

Annual bulk green waste collections


Performance ratings

% of respondents




Trend Analysis

Performance Index Score



MARKYT Industry Standards

Performance Index Score



City of Vincent	74
Industry High	NA
Industry Average	NA

Variances across the community

Performance Index Score

Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
74	73	74	74	71	76	76	65	74	72	70	74	73	74	71	74	78	74	75	68	75	71	73	74	73


Q. How would you rate the following waste management services?

Base: All respondents, excludes 'unsure' and 'no response' (n = 854). * Positive rating = excellent, good or okay

On-demand, paid collection of mattresses and white goods

Performance ratings

% of respondents




Trend Analysis

Performance Index Score



MARKYT Industry Standards

Performance Index Score



City of Vincent	61
Industry High	NA
Industry Average	NA

Variations across the community

Performance Index Score

Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
61	59	64	48	63	66	61	50	67	56	58	62	60	66	58	56	58	62	60	57	61	60	65	65	65


Q. How would you rate the following waste management services?

Base: All respondents, excludes 'unsure' and 'no response' (n = 293). * Positive rating = excellent, good or okay

Additional suggestions to improve waste management

Additional suggestions to improve waste management

% of respondents (excludes no response)




Waste Reduction

Perceived impact of waste on climate change


Do you believe reducing waste helps to reduce the impact of climate change and global warming?

% of respondents



Trend Analysis

% Yes



91% of respondents believe reducing waste helps to reduce the impact of climate change and global warming.

There has been an increase of 6% points since 2019.

This is higher among renters and people living in a duplex, villa or unit.

Variances across the community

% Yes

Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
91	89	93	72	91	92	94	92	90	90	86	89	93	94	89	85	89	90	96	77	91	93	96	91	88

Q. Do you believe reducing waste helps to reduce the impact of climate change and global warming?

Base: All respondents, excludes 'no response' (n = 852)


Sustainable practices to reduce hard bulk waste

Nearly everyone is taking proactive steps to reduce hard bulk waste:

- 88% gave unwanted items to friends and family and 87% donated unwanted items to charity.
- 63% gave unwanted items to local community members via online networks and 61% sold items via online market places.
- 10% sold items to second-hand shops and 4% held garage sales.
- Only 3% of respondents did not do any of the above.

Actions taken to dispose of unwanted items

% of respondents



Q. Over the past 12 months, have you done any of the following to dispose of unwanted items?

Base: All respondents, excludes 'no response' (n = 928)

Sustainable practices to reduce hard bulk waste

Community variances

- Older people (70+ years) and people living in a duplex, villa, unit, townhouse or apartment were less likely to give away items to family and friends.
- Opt-in respondents, Mount Hawthorn residents and younger people (18-39 years) were more likely to donate items to charity.
- Younger people (18-39 years) were more likely to have sold items to second-hand shops or antique stores.
- Mount Hawthorn residents and renters were more likely to have sold items online.
- East Perth residents and people living in houses on large lots were more likely to have sold items via a garage sale.

Community Variances

% of respondents

	Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
Gave items away to family and friends	88	87	89	83	83	87	89	91	90	88	83	84	94	90	90	86	76	88	89	89	91	92	80	80	80
Used online forums or community groups to give items away to local community members	87	86	88	78	88	81	89	88	89	79	81	82	92	87	90	85	83	86	91	79	88	89	79	93	79
Donated items to charity	63	56	73	43	42	60	74	58	66	45	46	58	68	73	67	45	25	62	68	60	69	66	44	57	43
Sold items to second-hand shops or antique stores	61	57	67	56	57	64	60	57	63	63	62	62	60	72	64	44	22	60	67	45	64	56	63	57	61
Sold items online via online forums, Gumtree, Facebook, etc	10	9	12	11	8	12	9	19	11	9	6	10	10	12	10	9	6	10	15	11	12	8	9	7	7
Sold items via a garage sale	4	3	6	16	4	2	4	1	5	4	2	3	5	4	5	3	2	4	6	11	4	5	0	3	0

Q. Over the past 12 months, have you done any of the following to dispose of unwanted items?

Base: All respondents, excludes 'no response' (n = 928)

Usage of Bulk Waste Services

Items disposed of using bulk waste services

The most popular use for the City's bulk waste services is disposing of furniture that is broken or unsuitable to be reused, with 62% of respondents using the service for this purpose.


This is followed by 42% using bulk waste services for disposing of general household waste and 41% for timber products.

The least popular use for the City's bulk waste services is disposing of clothes, books and toys, with 12% of respondents using the services for this purpose. This is followed by disposing of exercise equipment, bikes and scooters with 13% of respondents.

14% of respondents did not use the City's bulk waste services to dispose of any of the items listed.

Items disposed of using bulk waste services

% of respondents



Items disposed of using bulk waste services

Community variances

Community Variances

% of respondents

	Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
Furniture - broken or unsuitable to be reused	62	57	70	63	58	63	68	59	60	59	52	57	67	64	66	58	46	61	74	82	67	62	49	52	46
General household waste	42	42	42	40	34	38	48	38	43	50	25	41	43	42	44	40	40	42	41	40	49	36	39	33	28
Timber products	41	40	44	59	35	30	50	38	42	41	27	44	39	38	46	45	43	44	25	62	50	38	37	22	14
Steel and metal waste	37	37	36	51	38	29	39	36	36	48	33	42	32	35	42	35	34	37	36	58	41	33	43	29	15
Furniture - suitable to be reused	29	27	32	24	23	38	28	34	30	20	27	29	30	27	33	31	28	29	33	42	30	37	16	26	20
e-Waste and electronic items	27	27	27	22	23	30	30	23	25	31	25	30	23	21	31	37	36	26	33	37	31	20	25	27	10
White goods	21	20	23	19	23	17	25	18	22	23	13	21	21	19	23	28	18	20	32	33	26	22	26	6	5
Rugs and carpets	21	20	22	14	23	20	24	20	21	16	18	18	24	19	25	26	15	20	30	36	25	20	10	8	19
Mattresses	15	13	17	2	16	16	16	16	16	10	9	14	14	16	16	14	4	14	19	20	16	12	9	20	7
Exercise equipment, bikes and scooters	13	12	14	31	12	11	19	13	8	4	7	12	14	9	22	13	11	13	15	30	16	6	15	6	6
Clothes, books and toys	12	11	13	8	6	7	12	11	14	16	15	12	12	12	16	9	7	12	11	12	15	11	6	7	5


Q. Over the past two years, which items have you disposed of using the City's bulk hard waste collection service?

Base: All respondents, excludes 'no response' (n = 920)

Most recent bulk waste usage

Most recent bulk waste usage

% of respondents



71% of respondents have used the City's bulk hard waste collection service in the past 12 months. 11% of respondents have never used this service.

East Perth residents are most likely to have used the service in the past 12 months.

People living in a duplex, villa, unit or apartment are less likely to have used the service in the past 12 months.

Variations across the community

% used in past 12 months

Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
71	66	78	85	62	71	70	65	76	72	64	69	72	71	74	70	65	71	71	79	78	68	54	69	50

Q. When did you last use the City's bulk hard waste collection service?

Base: All respondents, excludes 'no response' (n = 911)

Bulk Waste Perceptions

Main concerns with bulk hard waste collections

The amount and type of items being disposed of through hard bulk waste collections that could be recycled or recovered is the biggest concern for respondents, with 75% of respondents being at least moderately concerned an index score of 58.


This is followed by the environmental impacts from hard bulk waste collections with an index score of 53 and illegal dumping on verges with a score of 45.

Bulk waste issues | level of concern

% of respondents

■ High ■ Moderate ■ Low

Index Score



Q. Thinking about annual bulk hard waste collections, how concerned are you with the following issues?

Base: All respondents, excludes 'unsure' and 'no response' (n = varies)

Main concerns with bulk hard waste collections

Community variances

- West Perth residents are less concerned with the amount and type of items being disposed of that could be recycled or recovered and with illegal dumping on verges.
- People living in townhouses are more concerned with environmental impacts from hard bulk waste collections.
- East Perth residents and older people (70+ years) are more concerned with impact on the overall appearance of the area.
- East Perth and West Perth residents, renters and people living in a duplex, villar or unit are less concerned with non-residents being attracted to the area to search through items on the verge.
- Older people are more concerned with time taken to collect waste.
- People living in a duplex, villar or unit are more concerned with waste obstructing verge access or sight-lines.

Community Variances

% of respondents

	Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
Amount and type of items being disposed of that could be recycled or recovered	58	58	59	53	61	65	57	63	56	48	62	59	58	60	56	54	61	57	66	66	56	56	58	65	67
Environmental impacts from hard bulk waste collections	53	55	51	46	56	59	49	56	55	56	56	52	56	52	54	54	60	53	54	45	51	53	59	65	55
Illegal dumping on your verge	45	47	41	41	46	42	49	36	44	31	50	47	43	41	47	50	53	46	36	40	45	43	51	44	41
Impact on the overall appearance of the area	39	43	34	54	43	37	42	33	39	28	41	42	36	36	41	39	50	41	25	37	40	35	47	42	38
Non-residents being attracted to the area to search through items on the verge	36	37	35	18	33	33	44	35	36	16	31	39	35	34	38	36	44	39	19	36	39	37	21	32	32
Time taken to collect waste	33	34	31	32	39	25	35	31	35	22	34	35	32	29	37	34	45	34	25	34	35	30	38	26	36
Waste obstructing verge access or sight-lines	32	33	31	23	40	27	34	26	32	34	31	34	31	30	35	33	38	34	22	26	31	30	45	35	30

Q. Thinking about annual bulk hard waste collections, how concerned are you with the following issues?

Base: All respondents, excludes 'unsure' and 'no response' (n = varies)

Perceptions | 15% of bulk verge waste is recycled


54% of respondents believe that the current rate at which bulk verge waste is recovered and recycled is not acceptable.

Only 26% consider this to be acceptable.

Responses were fairly similar across the community.

15% of bulk verge waste can be recovered and recycled. Is this acceptable?

% of respondents



Variations across the community

% Yes, it is acceptable to recover and recycle 15% of bulk verge waste.

Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
26	25	28	32	31	21	29	24	27	23	21	27	25	30	21	22	27	26	26	34	25	32	19	19	34

Q. Currently, around 15 percent of material collected through the bulk verge collection service can be recovered and recycled. Do you think this is acceptable?

Base: All respondents, excludes 'no response' (n = 909)

Perceptions | Sufficient verge space for a skip bin


61% of respondents have sufficient verge space for a skip bin up to 3 cubic metres at their home.

East Perth and Mount Hawthorn residents are most likely to have enough room for a skip bin, while Highgate and Perth residents are least likely.

People living in a duplex, villa, unit, townhouse or apartment are less likely to have room for a skip bin on their verge.

Do you have sufficient verge space for a skip bin that is up to 3 cubic metres where you live?

% of respondents



Variations across the community

% Yes I have sufficient verge space for a skip bin that is up to 3 cubic metres

Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
61	58	64	79	26	53	74	63	62	57	37	65	57	62	60	60	57	61	55	70	70	53	43	46	47

Q. Do you have sufficient verge space for a skip bin that is up to 3 cubic metres where you live?

Base: All respondents, excludes 'no response' (n = 910)

Perceptions | Additional charges for excess bulk waste

47% of respondents believe that residents should not have to pay an additional cost if they exceed a limit of 2 cubic metres of hard bulk waste.


44% of respondents believe that residents should pay an additional cost for excess bulk waste.

East Perth residents and people living in houses on large lots are most likely to oppose additional costs for excess bulk waste.

Leederville residents are most likely to support additional costs for excess bulk waste.

Should residents be required to pay additional costs if they exceed a limit of 2 cubic metres of hard bulk waste per household?

% of respondents



Variances across the community

% Yes, residents should be required to pay additional costs if they exceed a limit of 2 cubic metres of hard bulk waste

Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
44	46	40	4	43	55	42	37	45	39	50	46	42	46	44	37	41	44	41	18	44	44	41	50	45

Q. Should residents be required to pay additional costs if they exceed a limit of 2 cubic metres of hard bulk waste per household?

Base: All respondents, excludes 'no response' (n = 909)

Bulk Waste Preferences

Preferences | Scheduled vs On-request


52% of respondents prefer to keep hard bulk waste collections on a scheduled basis.

West Perth residents and people living in a duplex, villa or unit are most likely to prefer the current scheduled service.

Mount Lawley residents are most likely to prefer an on-request service.

Preferences | Scheduled vs On-request

% of respondents



Community Variances

% of respondents

	Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
Scheduled	52	53	49	41	50	54	53	39	54	70	47	50	52	51	52	53	54	52	53	57	51	47	72	49	56
On-request	40	39	43	44	43	40	39	53	40	18	43	45	37	41	40	39	39	40	40	42	41	44	23	46	34

Q. Would you prefer to keep hard bulk waste collections on a scheduled basis where they occur at the same time of year for all residents OR change to an on-request service where residents can choose to have their collection at different times of the year?

Base: All respondents, excludes 'no response' (n = 910)


Preferences | Loose, uncontained vs skip bin

49% of respondents prefer a skip bin versus 40% preferring loose, uncontained hard bulk waste collections.

Renters, people living in houses on larger lots and people living in a duplex, villa or unit are most likely to prefer loose, uncontained hard bulk waste collection.

Preferences | Loose, uncontained vs Skip bin

% of respondents



Community Variances

% of respondents

	Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
Loose, uncontained	40	39	41	31	45	40	39	42	38	48	40	38	40	41	39	42	31	37	57	53	39	33	56	39	39
Skip bin	49	49	48	56	39	47	53	40	47	50	52	56	43	50	48	44	51	52	29	44	48	54	34	51	49

Q. If the City of Vincent changed to an on-request hard bulk waste collection service, would you prefer that residents continue to put waste out on the verge loose and uncontained OR used skip bins (when there is sufficient space to use this option)?

Base: All respondents, excludes 'no response' (n = 910)

Preferences | Unlimited volumes vs Limit of 2 cubic metres


49% of respondents prefer no limit on volume of hard bulk waste collection versus 38% who prefer a limit of two cubic metres to be imposed.

East Perth residents and people living in houses on larger lots are most likely to prefer unlimited bulk waste.

Leederville residents are most likely to prefer a limit of two cubic metres for hard bulk waste collections.

Preferences | Unlimited volumes vs Limit of 2 cubic metres

% of respondents



Community Variances

% of respondents

	Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
Unlimited volumes	49	47	51	71	45	34	54	50	49	42	42	47	49	47	49	53	51	48	55	69	50	46	56	42	45
Limit of 2 cubic metres	38	39	37	17	41	50	35	41	38	37	46	42	36	40	40	31	37	39	36	26	37	46	39	40	35

Q. Should the City of Vincent continue to collect unlimited volumes of waste OR introduce a limit of 2 cubic metres per household to help achieve the City's waste target of zero waste to landfill by 2028?

Base: All respondents, excludes 'no response' (n = 910)

Preferences | User pays vs Council rates


64% of respondents prefer the cost of hard bulk waste collections to be included in Council rates versus 30% who prefer a user pays system.

East Perth residents and people living in houses on larger lots are most likely to prefer the cost be included in Council rates.

People living in townhouses are most likely to prefer a user pays system.

Preferences | User pays vs Council rates

% of respondents



Community Variances

% of respondents

	Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
User pays	30	36	21	8	29	30	26	25	33	28	37	32	27	32	28	26	30	31	19	14	26	30	34	40	39
Council rates	64	58	72	81	67	66	68	65	59	61	55	62	66	64	64	62	62	63	73	79	67	63	61	55	55

Q. In principle, do you think that only residents who use the hard bulk waste service should pay for the service when they use it (a user pays model) or do you think that the cost of the service should be included in Council rates?

Base: All respondents, excludes 'no response' (n = 909)

Ranking of Bulk waste options

Bulk waste options | Ranking from most preferred (1) to least preferred (6)
% of respondents

Most preferred ← → Least preferred

■ 1 ■ 2 ■ 3 ■ 4 ■ 5 ■ 6

A. Retain current bulk hard waste collection service – an annual, scheduled service with costs included in Council rates.




B. Retain current service but introduce limit on amount of waste and time waste permitted on the verge.



E. Change to a skip bin on request with a limit of 2m3. Costs would continue to be included in Council rates.



C. Change to on-request service with a limit of 2m3 uncontained, loose waste. Costs would continue to be included in Council rates.



F. Change to a skip bin on request with a limit of 2m3 (as per option E) but with a user pays pricing model.



D. Change to on-request service with limit of 2m3 uncontained, loose waste (as per option C) but with a user pays pricing model.



Q. The City held a Community Panel Session to discuss in detail different service options and to refine the options for wider community consultation. This discussion resulted in six options for hard bulk waste collections. We would like to understand which options you prefer. Please RANK your preferred choices by placing a number from 1 to 6 in each box. 1 = most preferred and 6 = least preferred.

Base: All respondents, excludes 'no response' (n = varies)

Ranking of bulk waste options | Most preferred

Community variances

Community Variances

% Most preferred

	Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
A. Retain current bulk hard waste collection service – an annual, scheduled service with costs included in Council rates.	43	41	46	62	46	40	43	49	41	54	39	39	47	39	43	51	51	41	56	75	45	37	47	39	28
B. Retain current service but introduce limit on amount of waste and time waste permitted on the verge.	11	11	10	4	17	11	13	13	8	7	7	10	12	10	10	14	12	11	8	6	9	13	22	4	21
C. Change to on-request service with a limit of 2m3 uncontained, loose waste. Costs would continue to be included in Council rates.	8	6	11	9	12	6	8	11	8	5	4	7	9	8	9	8	9	8	11	7	9	8	2	12	1
D. Change to on-request service with limit of 2m3 uncontained, loose waste (as per option C) but with a user pays pricing model.	8	11	4	4	5	7	4	6	11	7	18	8	7	10	6	4	7	8	5	3	7	8	11	12	10
E. Change to a skip bin on request with a limit of 2m3. Costs would continue to be included in Council rates.	19	17	21	22	6	20	25	14	17	8	19	22	16	20	22	12	12	19	19	10	20	23	9	13	21
F. Change to a skip bin on request with a limit of 2m3 (as per option E) but with a user pays pricing model.	12	14	9	0	14	17	8	9	14	18	14	15	9	13	10	12	10	13	2	0	10	11	11	20	20

Q. The City held a Community Panel Session to discuss in detail different service options and to refine the options for wider community consultation. This discussion resulted in six options for hard bulk waste collections. We would like to understand which options you prefer. Please RANK your preferred choices by placing a number from 1 to 6 in each box. 1 = most preferred and 6 = least preferred.

Base: All respondents, excludes 'no response' (n = varies)

Ranking of Bulk waste options | Least preferred

Community variances

Community Variances

% Least preferred

	Total	Random	Opt in	East Perth	Highgate	Leederville	Mt Hawthorn	Mt Lawley	North Perth	West Perth	Perth	Male	Female	18-39 years	40-54 years	55-69 years	70+ years	Home owner	Renting / other	House, large lot	House, medium lot	House, small lot	Duplex / villa / unit	Townhouse	Apartment
A. Retain current bulk hard waste collection service – an annual, scheduled service with costs included in Council rates.	14	17	11	18	12	23	12	15	14	5	18	15	14	16	14	12	11	15	8	2	14	18	4	19	16
B. Retain current service but introduce limit on amount of waste and time waste permitted on the verge.	10	8	11	4	5	8	8	11	15	7	5	12	7	10	10	7	8	10	6	16	10	9	6	10	5
C. Change to on-request service with a limit of 2m3 uncontained, loose waste. Costs would continue to be included in Council rates.	5	6	3	0	17	2	4	3	5	4	9	5	5	5	4	5	6	6	2	2	4	3	2	9	16
D. Change to on-request service with limit of 2m3 uncontained, loose waste (as per option C) but with a user pays pricing model.	19	16	23	18	8	17	22	23	21	21	13	21	18	22	20	14	10	19	18	10	20	21	14	19	24
E. Change to a skip bin on request with a limit of 2m3. Costs would continue to be included in Council rates.	10	12	7	0	3	2	13	4	8	27	16	10	10	10	10	11	11	10	7	17	9	9	18	9	11
F. Change to a skip bin on request with a limit of 2m3 (as per option E) but with a user pays pricing model.	42	40	44	61	55	48	41	45	38	36	40	36	46	37	41	52	53	39	60	54	43	41	57	35	29

Q. The City held a Community Panel Session to discuss in detail different service options and to refine the options for wider community consultation. This discussion resulted in six options for hard bulk waste collections. We would like to understand which options you prefer. Please RANK your preferred choices by placing a number from 1 to 6 in each box. 1 = most preferred and 6 = least preferred.

Base: All respondents, excludes 'no response' (n = varies)

Reasons for ranking | Most preferred

<p>A. Retain current bulk hard waste collection service – an annual, scheduled service with costs included in Council rates.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows waste to be repurposed • Scheduled service, same time for everyone, can plan around it • Skip bins are unsuitable (take up too much space, discourage recycling, encourage fly tipping) • Is effective / efficient / has been shown to work / works in other places
<p>B. Retain current service but introduce limit on amount of waste and time waste permitted on the verge.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourages people to reduce their waste (sell / give items away, recycle etc) • Allows waste to be repurposed • Scheduled service, same time for everyone, can plan around it
<p>C. Change to on-request service with a limit of 2m3 uncontained, loose waste. Costs would continue to be included in Council rates.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexibility, can be arranged when it suits the individual • Encourages people to reduce their waste (sell / give items away, recycle etc) • Convenience / accessibility
<p>D. Change to on-request service with limit of 2m3 uncontained, loose waste (as per option C) but with a user pays pricing model.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefer user pays option (will reduce rates, better for people with less waste) • Encourages people to reduce their waste (sell / give items away, recycle etc) • Flexibility, can be arranged when it suits the individual • I don't use the service (often), don't create a lot of waste
<p>E. Change to a skip bin on request with a limit of 2m3. Costs would continue to be included in Council rates.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limits amount of waste out on verge (unsightly, messy, disruptive, damage to verges) • Flexibility, can be arranged when it suits the individual • No additional cost / included in rates
<p>F. Change to a skip bin on request with a limit of 2m3 (as per option E) but with a user pays pricing model.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefer user pays option (will reduce rates, better for people with less waste) • Encourages people to reduce their waste (sell / give items away, recycle etc) • Limits amount of waste out on verge (unsightly, messy, disruptive, damage to verges)

Q. Thinking about the option you ranked #1, why is this your most preferred option?

Base: All respondents, excludes 'no response' (n = varies)

Reasons for ranking | Least preferred

<p>A. Retain current bulk hard waste collection service – an annual, scheduled service with costs included in Council rates.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncontained waste creates mess, makes the streetscape look bad • Creates waste, encourages people just to throw things out • Don't want to pay for others' waste, prefer user pays system
<p>B. Retain current service but introduce limit on amount of waste and time waste permitted on the verge.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No accountability, control of what people put out • There shouldn't be limits on amount of bulk rubbish • Uncontained waste creates mess, makes the streetscape look bad
<p>C. Change to on-request service with a limit of 2m3 uncontained, loose waste. Costs would continue to be included in Council rates.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't want to pay for others' waste, prefer user pays system • On demand will lead to mess year round • No accountability, control of what people put out
<p>D. Change to on-request service with limit of 2m3 uncontained, loose waste (as per option C) but with a user pays pricing model.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree with user pays - will be too expensive, inequitable • Cost should be included in rates, rates are already high • Encourages illegal dumping and "fly tipping" (unfair if user pays)
<p>E. Change to a skip bin on request with a limit of 2m3. Costs would continue to be included in Council rates.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't want to pay for others' waste, prefer user pays system • I never / rarely use it, differences in levels of use • Creates waste, encourages people just to throw things out
<p>F. Change to a skip bin on request with a limit of 2m3 (as per option E) but with a user pays pricing model.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourages illegal dumping and "fly tipping" (unfair if user pays) • Disagree with user pays - will be too expensive, inequitable • Cost should be included in rates, rates are already high

Q. Thinking about the option you ranked #6, why is this your least preferred option?

Base: All respondents, excludes 'no response' (n = varies)



www.catalyse.com.au

Office 3, 996 Hay Street, Perth WA 6000

PO Box 8007, Cloisters Square WA 6850

Phone +618 9226 5674

Email: info@catalyse.com.au

ABN 20 108 620 855

MARKYT 