SUMMARY

- Council’s involvement with refuse collection and disposal was considered to be very important by approximately 72 percent of respondents to the Customer Satisfaction Surveys carried out between 1992 and 2013. Satisfaction rates for the service received were consistently high with an average of 86.0 percent satisfaction for the kerbside recycling collection service and 80.7 percent for the kerbside refuse collection service over this period.

- Satisfaction rates for refuse collection dropped sharply (-21.3%) in the 2013 survey to the lowest level ever recorded but increased for recycling collection (+19.7%) to the highest level recorded. These trends could reflect increased expectations around levels of service in urban areas and improvements made to recycling services.

- Respondents living in most of the rural areas surveyed appeared to be satisfied with existing methods of waste disposal, although there was some support for additional provision for recycling.

- The main issues raised in surveys by urban-based survey respondents were having to pay for rubbish bags in addition to paying rates, the use of bags instead of bins and the lack of a more comprehensive bin service, although there were very mixed views about the number of bins that should be supplied.

- Survey results clearly indicate the tension between the level of service provided and the amount residents were prepared to pay. At least 1633 or 84.5 percent of submitters to the Draft Solid and Hazardous Waste Management Plan thought it was important that the cost of Council’s waste collection services be kept to a minimum. In most cases, where price was attached to a service option, survey respondents did not choose the dearest option and the price of existing services was raised as an issue in a number of surveys.

- The introduction of a two or three bin kerbside collection service to the existing Oxford kerbside collection area was considered to be important by 66.6 percent of urban respondents to the Oxford Area Community Survey 2014 and unimportant to 27.5 percent. The views of Oxford rural residents were equally for and against such a service at approximately 25 percent. The cost of such a service was not included in the question as it was in the following two surveys and this could have influenced the results.

- The introduction of a two bin service in the Ohoka Recycling Area was not generally supported by respondents to the 2013 Ohoka survey and the majority (49.0%) were satisfied with organising their own refuse in conjunction with using the recycling collection service currently provided by the Council. This result is similar to the 2006 Residential 4 Household Survey where the majority (57.2%) of respondents from the Ohoka zone did not consider it to be important for refuse collection services to be provided.
There were mixed views about whether Council-provided kerbside waste collection services should be introduced to the Ashley Township, Loburn Lea, Mandeville/Swannanoa and Fernside areas, with just about equal numbers of respondents to the 2013 Recycling and Refuse Questionnaire being for (42.4%) and against (38.9%). Residents who wanted a service to be provided preferred a refuse bag and recycling bin to a two bin service with the exception of those who lived in the Mandeville/Swannanoa area.

Although a Council-provided two bin service was preferred by the majority (50.7%) of the 138 households from the Mandeville/Swannanoa area responding to the above questionnaire, a significant number (39.1%) did not support this option. The lack of a refuse and/or recycling collection however, was identified in the 2012 Mandeville/Ohoka Community Issues Survey Report as one of the aspects residents most disliked about living in the area and ranked high in both the 2012 survey and the 2006 Mandeville Area Community Survey as one of the changes residents would most like to see occur.

The introduction of a collection service was not supported by 49.8 percent of submitters to the 2008 Draft Solid and Hazardous Waste Management Plan who lived in an unserviced area and was supported by 29.4 percent. There was some support for the provision of a recycling drop off facility (25.6%). Recycling in rural areas was also supported by other submitters to the draft plan with 72 percent of the 1932 submitters indicating that it was important for the Council to provide for recycling in more remote rural communities.

Usage rates for Council-provided kerbside recycling services were high with an average of 95.8 percent of respondents to five Customer Satisfaction Surveys indicating that they used the service. While take-up rates were lower in the Ohoka Recycling Area, the majority of respondents (79.6%) to the Ohoka questionnaire indicated they used the service.

Having choices about how waste was collected was considered to be important and 60.3 percent of respondents to the Draft Solid and Hazardous Waste Management Plan thought it was important to support local private operators. Approximately 40 percent of respondents to the 2013 and 2010 Customer Satisfaction Surveys had their refuse collected by a private operator. Collection rates for green waste were much lower with less than 20 percent of respondents to the 2013 and 2010 Customer Satisfaction Surveys and the Oxford Area Community Survey engaging a private operator to provide this service.
1. INTRODUCTION
Community responses to 16 household surveys carried out within the District over the past decade or so have been analysed in an attempt to determine patterns in attitudes and behavior with regard to various aspects of waste management. Further details are provided about the characteristics of each survey in section 7.

Additional information has been collected in various surveys about satisfaction with and use of the District’s Transfer Stations, the type and amount of materials recycled by respondents and participation in home composting, but these topics have not been included in this paper.

2. COUNCIL LEVELS OF SERVICE
The Council’s four rubbish collection areas are urban (Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Woodend), Oxford, Cust and rural and recycling services are provided to approximately 75 percent of the properties in the District.

Up until 2000 the Council included a charge in the rates for a year’s supply of rubbish bags and 52 bags were delivered to each property. There were no restrictions on the number of bags residents could put out for collection each week and additional bags could be purchased at a reasonably low price. Recycling services were not provided by the Council.

When the Council changed to a weekly kerbside crate collection in 2000, the annual amount charged in the rates for rubbish collection was reduced from nearly $100 to just over $70 and the price of bags was increased to partially cover the costs of collection and disposal.

Since then bag prices have gradually increased to the current price of $2.50 per bag. The targeted rate has been kept at around the same level and currently sits at $75.50 per annum. There is still no limit on the number of bags that can be put out for collection each week and as the price of the bags fully covers the cost of the service there is no cross-subsidy between those ratepayers using a lot of bags and those using less.

The Ohoka Kerbside Recycling Collection Service differs from the Council’s standard level of service in that refuse is not collected as well as recyclables. The targeted rate for this service is lower as a consequence and currently sits at $71.50 per annum.

In April 2011, the Council replaced the 70 litre recycling crates with 240 litre wheelie bins and reduced the collection to a fortnightly service. This allowed 70 percent more recycling to be collected at no additional cost and reduced the amount of roadside litter. The refuse bag collections were continued as they were seen to be a useful and practical way to ensure user-pays disposal and encourage residents to recycle more.

3. ATTITUDES TOWARDS KERBSIDE COLLECTION SERVICES

3.1 New Dwelling Survey 2013/14 Preliminary Report 2014
Respondents to the 2013/14 New Dwelling Survey were asked what they disliked the most about living in the Waimakariri District. Respondents from all areas were concerned about the high cost of rates and the lack of services provided, particularly the cost of rubbish bags and the lack of bins for refuse and green waste.
3.2 Kerbside Refuse Collection Service – Household Survey for Ohoka Recycling Area 2013

In 2013, a survey of households located within the Ohoka recycling area was undertaken to obtain feedback on the introduction of waste collection services, in addition to the fortnightly recycling collection service that was provided.

Of the 49 respondent households, 49.0 percent indicated they were happy to organise their own refuse and continue with the recycling service provided by the Council. Of the remaining respondents, 30.6 percent indicated they would be interested in a Council-provided refuse bag and recycling bin service. The remaining 20.4 percent of respondents did not indicate a preference.

Respondents were asked if they would prefer a two-bin service (refuse and recycling) to a refuse bag and recycling bin service at a cost of approximately $250-$300 per year. The majority (59.2%) said no, 36.7 percent said yes and 4.1 percent did not respond to the question. The exception to this was Mill Road where just over half (53.3%) of respondents preferred a two bin service.

3.3 Recycling and Refuse Questionnaire 2013

In 2013, a survey of all the households located in the Ashley Township, Loburn Lea, Mandeville/Swannanoa and Fernside was undertaken to obtain feedback on the introduction of waste collection services.

Of the 385 respondent households, 42.4 percent indicated they would like some form of Council-provided service and 38.9 percent indicated they would prefer to organise and pay for their own refuse and recycling. The remaining 18.7 percent chose not to respond to the question.

Of those who wanted a service to be provided, 70.6 percent of respondents preferred a recycling bin and refuse bag collection and 29.4 percent preferred a fortnightly recycling bin collection.

Respondents were asked if they would prefer a two-bin service (refuse and recycling) to a refuse bag and recycling bin service at a cost of approximately $250-$300 per year. The majority (46.5%) said no, 40.0 percent said yes and 13.5 percent did not respond to the question.

The exception to the above was the Mandeville/Swannanoa area where 50.7 percent of respondents wanted a Council-provided wheelie bin service, 39.1 percent did not and 10.2 percent chose not to respond.

3.4 Oxford Area Community Survey 2013

In 2013, respondents to the Oxford Area Community Survey were asked to indicate how important the introduction of a two or three bin kerbside collection service (separate bins for rubbish, recycling and garden/food waste) within the existing kerbside collection area was to their household.

Over half (51.4%) of respondents thought it was important for a two or three bin kerbside collection service to be introduced in the existing kerbside collection area and of these, 34 percent thought it was very important. Over a quarter of respondents (26.7%) thought it was not important for such a service to be provided.

There was a higher level of support for the bin service from those respondents living within the urban area and therefore within the existing kerbside collection area. More than half of the
urban respondents (66.6%) thought it was important as opposed to a quarter (25.8%) of those respondents living in the rural area and therefore outside of the collection area. The percentages of respondents who thought it was unimportant for such a service to be introduced was similar at 27.5 percent (urban) and 25.3 percent (rural), however a significant number of rural respondents did not answer the question (48.9%) compared with those from the urban area (5.8%).

Some respondents to the Oxford Survey commented that they wanted bins instead of bags and others were either concerned about the price of bags or didn’t think they should have to purchase them as they paid rates.

3.5 Pegasus Community Issues Survey 2013

Respondents were asked what they disliked the most about living in Pegasus Town. A small number of respondents were concerned about the level of Council rates and the lack of services provided including no green waste removal and having to pay separately for rubbish bags. There were a number of requests in the ‘changes respondents most wanted to see occur’ section, for a three-bin rubbish collection, including a green waste collection.

3.6 Woodend Community Issues Survey 2013

Respondents were asked what they disliked the most about living in the Woodend area. A few respondents disliked the difficulties they experienced with waste collection services. An improved refuse collection service ranked 10th out of the 11 changes respondents most wanted to see and was mentioned by 2.4 percent of respondents. The changes requested included being able to buy Council rubbish bags in Woodend and a three bin or green waste collection service.

3.7 Customer Satisfaction Surveys 1992 - 2013

Respondents to the 1992, 2007, 2010 and 2013 Customer Satisfaction Surveys were asked how important they thought it was for Council to be involved in a range of specified activities.

Refuse collection and disposal was consistently rated as ‘very important’ for the Council to be involved with, by nearly three-quarters of respondents across all the surveys (72.0 %-1992, 72.6%-2007, 73.1%- 2010, 72.7%-2013).

3.8 Mandeville/Ohoka Community Issues Survey Report 2012

In 2012, respondents to the Mandeville/Ohoka Area Community Survey were asked what changes they would most like to see occur in their local area. A refuse and/or recycling collection service ranked 2nd out of 9 changes with 12.0 percent of respondents listing this as an unprompted response. This was slightly less than the percentage of respondents who suggested this in the 2006 Mandeville Area Survey (15.6%) although the ranking had moved up one.

The absence of refuse and recycling collections was also listed as one of the things 7.4 percent of respondents disliked the most about living in the Mandeville/Ohoka area. This ranked 5th out of a list of 7 ‘dislikes’ and was a change from the 2006 survey where it did not feature.

3.9 Residential 2 Subdivision Report 2012

Waste collection services were not identified as an issue in the Residential 2 Subdivision Survey to the same extent they were in the rural-based community issues surveys. Some respondents living in the Oaks subdivision in Rangiora requested a change from plastic rubbish bags to the three bin service used by the Christchurch City Council.
3.10 Report on Responses to Questions and Assessment of Options for Kerbside Collection Service 2008

In 2008, the Council released a draft Solid and Hazardous Waste Management Plan for consultation under the Local Government Act 2002 Special Consultative Procedure. A summary of the draft plan was sent to all ratepayers in the District along with a submission form which contained questions seeking feedback on preferences for Council-provided kerbside collection services.

Submissions were received from Rangiora (44%), Kaiapoi (26%), Woodend (6%), Oxford (5%) and the rest of the District (19%).

Over 80 percent of the 1932 submitters received a Council kerbside collection service and 15 percent lived in an unserviced area.

Of the 290 submitters whose properties did not receive Council collection services, 49.8 percent indicated they did not want these services extended to their area and 29.4 percent wanted some form of kerbside collection. Over a quarter (25.6%) of these respondents were interested in the provision of a recycling drop-off facility.

Of those living in an unserviced area and who wanted a kerbside collection, 56.5 percent preferred a kerbside recycling collection only and 43.5 percent preferred a full kerbside collection service.

Of the 1566 submitters from serviced areas, 53 percent rated options 1 (rubbish bag and recyclables crate collected weekly) and 2 (rubbish bag collected weekly and recycling wheelie bin collected fortnightly) as either their first or second preferences for levels of service. None of the other five options listed attracted a comparable level of support.

Of the 1932 submitters, 72 percent thought it was important for the Council to provide for recycling in more remote rural communities.

3.11 Residential 4 (Rural Residential) Zone Household Survey 2006

In 2006, 73.2 percent of respondents to the Residential 4 Zone Household Survey thought it was either very important or quite important to have refuse collection services in Residential 4 Zones. Just under a quarter of respondents (23.9%) did not think it was important and 2.9 did not respond to the question.

A few zones stood out as having a high percentage of respondents who did not think that it was important to have refuse collection services. These included the Ohoka zones where 57.2 percent did not consider it to be important and Mandeville where 39.4 percent held similar views.

3.12 Mandeville Area Community Report 2006

In 2006, respondents to the Mandeville Area Community Survey were asked what changes they would most like to see occur in their local area. A recycling and collection service ranked 3rd out of a list of 5 improvements with 15.6 percent of respondents providing this as an unprompted response.

3.13 Small Holding Owners Survey 2006

In 2006, respondents to the Small Holding Owners Survey were asked what changes they would most like to see occur in their local area. Rubbish and/or recycling collections ranked 2nd out of a list of 7 improvements with 11.7 percent of respondents providing this as an
unprompted response. This was a similar result to that recorded in the Mandeville Area Community Report 2006.

4. SATISFACTION WITH KERBSIDE COLLECTION SERVICES

The Customer Satisfaction Surveys carried out in 2013, 2010, 2007, 2004 and 2001 asked households across the District how satisfied members were with kerbside collection services. Figure 1 shows the trends in satisfaction over this period.

Figure 1

Figure one shows that 69.8 percent of respondents receiving a kerbside refuse collection service in 2013 were satisfied with it. Dissatisfaction with the service was low at 11.5 percent.

Satisfaction with the service decreased from 82.7 percent in the first survey to a low of 78.9 percent in 2007. Satisfaction rates in the 2010 survey were the highest yet recorded at 91.1 percent but in 2013 the satisfaction rates were the lowest ever recorded at 69.8 percent.

The 2013 survey satisfaction rates for refuse collection were higher in Waikuku (76.9%), Rangiora (72.4%) and the Oxford urban area (70.0%) and lower in Kaiapoi (65.4%) and the Woodend urban area (61.5%). Satisfaction rates were considerably lower at Pegasus Town (33.3%) although the sample size was very small (15).

The majority (86.6%) of respondents from the rural areas of the District did not offer an opinion. Of the 20 respondents who did, 90 percent were satisfied.

In contrast to the decline in satisfaction rates for refuse collection, satisfaction rates for the District’s kerbside recycling service had increased in 2013 to an all-time high of 93.6 percent. The satisfaction percentages for the other surveys were in the mid to high 80’s apart from the 2010 survey where satisfaction dropped to a low of 73.9 percent.
Satisfaction with the kerbside recycling service in 2013 was very high in Rangiora (93.4%) and Kaiapoi (92.0%). Satisfaction rates in all the other urban areas of the District were above 85 percent.

Again the majority (82.6%) of respondents from the rural areas of the District did not offer an opinion. Of the 22 respondents who did, 90.9 percent were satisfied.

Respondents to the 2013 Ohoka Recycling Area Household Survey were asked how satisfied they were with their existing kerbside recycling service. Satisfaction was high with 75.5 percent of respondents being satisfied and only 2.1 percent dissatisfied. The remaining 22.4 percent of respondents did not offer an opinion. The satisfaction rate was consistent with those from the Customer Satisfaction Surveys.

5. USE OF KERBSIDE RECYCLING COLLECTION SERVICES

The Customer Satisfaction Surveys asked respondents how frequently, on average, members of their household used the Council’s kerbside recycling service. Table 1 shows their responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or 3 times a month</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never/no response</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows a very high percentage of respondents used the recycling services provided. User rates were in the mid-90 percent range over the five surveys (94.3%-2001, 94.7%-2004, 97.1%-2007, 96.2%-2010, 96.8%-2013) and non-use rates were consistently less than 6 percent.

The most common frequency rate in all the surveys, apart from the 2013 survey, was once a week. The percentage of respondents using the District’s kerbside recycling service once a week in 2010 at 74 percent was 6.7 percent higher than that recorded in 2007 and 25.7 percent higher than the first survey in 2001. In 2011, the recycling service provided changed from a weekly crate to a fortnightly wheelie bin and the results shown in the 2013 column in table 1 reflect this change.

Respondents to the Household Survey for the Ohoka Recycling Area were asked the same question and 79.6 percent of respondents indicated that they used the Council-provided kerbside recycling collection service. The remaining 20.4 percent indicated they never used it or failed to respond to the question. These use rates were lower than those recorded in the Customer Satisfaction Surveys.

Of those Ohoka residents who used the service, 73.5 percent indicated that they used it on a fortnightly basis, 4.1 percent used it once a month and 2.0 percent less than once a month. The ranking of these frequencies are similar to those recorded in the Customer Satisfaction Surveys.
6. ATTITUDES TOWARDS AND USE OF PRIVATELY OWNED WASTE COLLECTION SERVICES

Respondents to the Draft Solid and Hazardous Waste Management Plan questionnaire were asked to indicate the importance they attached to being able to choose for themselves how their waste was collected. Over half the submitters (69.9%) thought it was important, 18.1 percent did not see it as being important and 12.0 percent offered no opinion.

Respondents were also asked how important they thought it was to support local waste collection operators. Submitters were more divided on this issue than some of the other issues canvassed with 60.3 percent of respondents considering locally operated waste collection services to be important, 26.9 percent considering it not to be important and 12.8 percent offering no opinion.

Respondents to the 2010 and 2013 Customer Satisfaction Surveys were asked to indicate if they had their refuse and/or green waste collected by a contractor/bin service and if so, how frequently they did this.

Privately-operated refuse collection services were used by less respondents to the 2013 survey (46.3 %) than the 2010 survey (51.8%) but more respondents had their refuse collected by a private operator than those who didn’t (43.3%-2013, 41.1%-2010).

Privately-operated green waste collection services were used by slightly more respondents to the 2013 survey (20.4 %) than the 2010 survey (17.5 %). However many more respondents (66.3%-2013, 68.6%-2010) didn’t have their green waste collected by a private operator than those who did and twice as many respondents had their refuse collected privately than those who had their green waste collected.

Respondents to the Oxford Area Community Survey 2013 were asked whether they had their garden waste collected by a contractor/bin service and if so, how often. Response rates were similar to those from the Customer Satisfaction Surveys with 18.6 percent indicating that they did and 66.5 percent indicating that they didn’t.

Respondents to the 2010 and 2013 Customer Satisfaction Surveys and the Oxford Area Community Survey predominantly had their green waste collected by a private operator about every two to three weeks. This frequency also applied to refuse collection.

7. SURVEY DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2 Summary of survey characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Area Community Survey 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Dwelling Survey 2013/14 Preliminary Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerbside Refuse Collection Service-Household Survey For Ohoka Recycling Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2: Summary of survey characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recycling and Refuse Rural Questionnaire</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2013 Customer Satisfaction Survey</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pegasus Community Issues Survey 2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandeville/Ohoka Community Issues Survey 2012</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Woodend Community Issues Survey 2012</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council (Customer Satisfaction) Survey 2010</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report On Responses To Questions And Assessment Of Options For Kerbside Collection Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential 4 (Rural Residential) Zone Household Survey 2006</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer Satisfaction Survey 2007</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandeville Area Community Report 2006</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small Holding Owners Survey 2006</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer Satisfaction Survey 2001</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>