

2019 Annual Customer Satisfaction Survey Report

The annual Customer Satisfaction Survey was conducted by the independent company ARP Research and interviewers were based across all 16 HWRCs on the weekends of 2nd-3rd, 9th-10th and 16th-17th of March 2019. Surveys were conducted by face to face interviews with residents whilst on site with a minimum of 60 interviews at each. The total survey sample of 1,083 gives a theoretical sampling error of +/- 3.0% at the 95% confidence level. A full version of the report can be found in the appendix.

The table below shows overall satisfaction results (which takes into consideration all of the categories) for each HWRC in Merseyside and Halton compared to previous years:

HWRC	Overall Satisfaction 2019		Overall Satisfaction 2018	Overall Satisfaction 2017	Overall Satisfaction 2016
Bidston	100%	-	100%	100%	100%
Clatterbridge	96%	-	96%	97%	97%
Huyton	100%	-	100%	99%	100%
Johnsons Lane	100%	-	100%	100%	99%
Kirkby	100%	-	100%	100%	100%
Newton-le-Willows	97%	↓	98%	100%	100%
Old Swan	100%	-	100%	100%	100%
Otterspool	99%	-	99%	99%	100%
Picow Farm	100%	-	100%	99%	100%
Rainhill	99%	↓	100%	98%	100%
Ravenhead	100%	↑	99%	99%	100%
Sefton Meadows	100%	-	100%	100%	100%
South Sefton	100%	-	100%	100%	99%
Formby	100%	-	100%	100%	100%
Southport	100%	-	100%	100%	100%
West Kirby	100%	-	100%	100%	100%

Overall Satisfaction

In 2018.19 the level of satisfaction with the HWRCs overall remained very high at 99%, including 85% of those who said they were 'very satisfied'. Although the overall satisfied level remains unchanged, if we delve deeper into the responses we can see that there was a slight reduction in those who were 'very satisfied', 85% v 90% in the year previous and this pattern continued across most of the other survey results. It is, however, important to understand that the survey fieldwork was conducted during a sustained period of inclement weather, which is likely to have been a factor because it would have made every aspect of using the sites slightly harder for customers and staff alike. Indeed, very few respondents were actively dissatisfied, and this had not changed since 2018 which is pleasing to see.

Information

There has been little change in the proportion of respondents that had tried to find out information about the HWRCs during the previous 12-month period (18%). Most of the information requests were online, the majority through the local council website (33% of total contacts), 9% for Veolia's website, 10% of contacts went direct to the MRWA website and the remainder were unspecified third parties such as search engines (34% of contacts).

The most popular source of information was the local council with over 90% being satisfied with both the ease of access and the accuracy of the information. Only four respondents were dissatisfied with the accuracy, one of whom cited incorrect opening hours and another claiming the information was confusing. Respondents who went to MRWA to get their HWRC information were 88% satisfied with both the ease of finding the information and its accuracy. Two out of the three respondents that were dissatisfied with the accuracy referred to incorrect information about permits, whilst another found the information was confusing or vague. For the Veolia website, nine out of ten respondents were satisfied with how easy it was to find what they were looking for (92%) and 88% with its accuracy. With regards to the accuracy of information received, only two respondents were dissatisfied and in both cases said the reason for this was incorrect information about permits.

It is interesting to note that a large proportion of respondents said they got their information from third-party sources; it is likely that this was via a web search as a number of interviewers recorded 'Google' as their answer.

Improvements to HWRCs

As in 2018 the main improvements that visitors noted were the sites were better organised and laid out (12%) and/or cleaner (11%). The site maintenance and infrastructure programme carried out during 2018 has been reflected in the respondents answers with 30% noticing some form of improvement in the site they visited compared to 24% in 2018. Respondents were also given the opportunity to specify in their own words what improvements they would most like to see. Better access to both skips and the site itself, as well as improved traffic flow and parking were the most common responses. There was also relatively frequent mention of paint recycling.

Choosing and Accessing a Site

When site visitors were asked how satisfied they were with the ease of getting to the site, the lowest ratings were for the external signposting and the ease of accessing the site from the road, although in both instances only 5% of the sample were actively dissatisfied. As we have seen in previous years and would expect, the length of queues was the lowest rated of the core overall questions (92%, down from 94%), with a fall in 'very' satisfied responses from 73% in 2018 to 68% in 2019.

Behaviour on Site

The reasons given for using the site have remained stable for the last seven years, with most visitors using the facility because the rubbish they had was too bulky for the normal refuse collection (41%), however this was notably lower than the 56% who said the same in 2018. This may be because of some minor changes to this question in 2019, including the addition of two new options, one being "to recycle as much waste as I can", which was a reason given by just over a third of respondents.

When asked if they had used the non-recyclable general waste container, around two out of five respondents said they had during their visit. We then followed up by asking what material they had deposited in the non-recyclable general waste container and general household waste (including food) was the primary item placed in the general waste containers (50%). Interestingly, more than one in seven disposed of some form of plastic item, followed closely by one in ten who put polystyrene in the general waste container.

We then asked respondents to tell us why they had used this container and three quarters claimed there was no recycling container for the material(s) they had brought whilst one in seven admitted to not wanting to separate out their waste before disposing of it.



When asked about the arrangements for separating and disposing of their waste once they arrived on site all ratings were at least 94% positive, with at least 77% of customers 'very satisfied'.

Site Staff

It was positive to find virtually all (99%) of the site visitors remained satisfied with the helpfulness of the staff. Similarly, virtually everyone who answered claimed to be happy with the ability of staff to answer their queries, their politeness, and ease of identification.

Overall across all sites more than half of all respondents had engaged with a member of staff (53%), the greatest amount of contact with staff happened at Old Swan, Bidston and Otterspool (all over 75%).

The proactive engagement of our employees has been echoed in the results as contact initiated by a member of staff to discuss materials and therefore provide direction to the right container is the most common reason for engagement. The biggest change since 2018 was customers asking about which container to use (34%, up from 22%).

Reason for speaking to staff

% Base 576 | Respondents who had spoke with a member of staff. More than one answer allowed.

