Consultation on Changes to Household Waste Collections

Analysis of Responses

November 2025

Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba

Contents

Executive Summary

Introduction

The Scottish Government held a public consultation seeking views on a proposal to introduce a mandatory kerbside textile collection and revise the rural food waste collection exemption. It ran from 25 March 2025 until 17 June 2025. The aim of the consultation was to guide the co-design of a new statutory Code of Practice for household waste and recycling services in support of Scotland's circular economy objectives.

The consultation included 14 closed questions and 17 open questions. Open questions often asked respondents to explain their answer to the corresponding closed question. The final section, comprised entirely of open questions, asked respondents to consider the proposals' impacts on specific groups. In total, 60 consultation responses were received from 26 individuals and 34 organisations.

Household collection of textiles

Respondents were divided on the efficiency and accessibility of current textile recycling provisions, with 42% believing the existing system is efficient and 44% believing it is not. In terms of accessibility, 50% felt existing options were accessible, while 42% did not. Local authorities and waste management organisations were more likely to consider the current systems efficient and accessible, while individuals and reuse/resale organisations were more critical of the current system.

Respondents who provided feedback at the open question indicated a desire for more textile banks, improved maintenance of drop-off points, and enhanced public awareness about recycling options. Some respondents also suggested clearer information on what textiles can be recycled and the introduction of Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) schemes. Some respondents, predominantly organisations, reaffirmed their closed question response, suggesting that the current systems for textile recycling were working effectively.

A majority of respondents (61%) believed that a household collection of textiles would be beneficial, with stronger support among individuals (69%) than organisations (54%). All waste management organisations believed that the household collection of textiles would be a benefit. At the open question, respondents mentioned positive effects of such a change, such as anticipated increases in recycling participation and environmental benefits, such as reduced landfill use and lower emissions. However, respondents also identified concerns and barriers, such as the increased cost for local authorities, potential adverse effects on charity and reuse shops due to people recycling textiles rather than donating, and the risk of contamination or downgrading of textile quality.

There was less support for providing kerbside textile collection as a statutory service. Only 37% of respondents supported the idea, whereas 53% were opposed or strongly opposed. Individuals were more likely to be in favour (62%) than organisations (14%). Respondents raised concerns over the financial implications for local authorities, space constraints for households to store additional bins, and operational challenges, especially for rural and island communities. Other suggestions mentioned by smaller numbers of respondents

included a desire to prioritise reuse over recycling, ensuring consistent practices across Scotland and initiating schemes like EPR or third-sector partnerships.

There was broad support (83%) for requiring local authorities to provide textile recycling facilities at Household Waste Recycling Centres as an alternative to kerbside collection. Respondents emphasised the importance of accessibility and highlighted the role of clear public communication and education campaigns to maximise the effectiveness of any changes to services. An alternative suggestion proposed by a few throughout the consultation was for increase in textile collection banks in communal space, such as supermarket carparks.

Almost all respondents (92%) anticipated barriers to implementing statutory kerbside textile collection, a concern shared by all organisations that answered. Many respondents reiterated concerns mentioned in earlier questions, such as increased costs for local authorities, potential negative impacts on charity and reuse shops, risks of contamination and downgrading of textile quality, and limited infrastructure, particularly in rural and island locations.

Rural Food Waste Exemption

Half of those who responded to the consultation were based in areas with a rural food waste exemption. Respondents were split on whether to keep the exemption (32%), remove it (34%), or pursue alternative approaches (34%). Of those answering, 69% indicated a likelihood to opt-in to a local authority kerbside food waste collection were it to be offered. When asked what practices respondents currently use, 14% use at-home composting to handle their food waste, no respondents take it to a local recycling centre, and 86% use another method, including using the general waste.

Those who provided further detail at the open questions raised concerns about the costs, both financial and in terms of resources, of removing the exemption. Others raised questions about the efficiency concerns that prompted the food waste exemption and asked for further information about whether removing the exemption would justify the carbon and energy costs of collecting it. Other reasons mentioned for keeping the exemption included concerns that removing it would overly burden communities in remote and rural areas, as there is limited access to waste and recycling resources. Those in favour of removing the exemption felt that it could benefit the environment, drive infrastructure and technological development, and provide rural communities with other ways to dispose of food waste.

Respondents also suggested updating the existing rural classification. Reasons for this included concerns that some larger towns were still classed as rural and included in the exemption, and that advances in technology could make it easier to collect food waste from areas that had previously been more challenging. Other ideas included investing in home composting, offering flexible collection frequencies, and expanding community-based food redistribution.

Assessing the impact of the proposal

Respondents highlighted the following impacts on the different groups prompted in the consultation:

- Most respondents anticipated no specific impact on equalities, though positive impacts on accessibility of kerbside collection for disabled or older people were noted.
- Business and regulation concerns were centred on increased operational and financial burdens for local authorities and concerns around the business models of charity and reuse shops.
- The anticipated impact on children's rights and wellbeing was minimal, though some suggested possible environmental benefits or negative effects on access to affordable clothing and toys.
- For island communities, high haulage costs and limited local infrastructure could make new requirements disproportionately challenging, though some suggested it could provide an opportunity for investment in local solutions.
- Views on environmental impacts were mixed, with some respondents anticipating increased benefits from recycling while others were concerned that increased vehicle emissions, infrastructure shortfalls, and the undermining of reuse could have a negative overall impact.

Conclusions

Support for the proposals was mixed. While some respondents felt that the proposals could enhance accessibility and benefit the environment, others raised concerns about the cost, resource allocation, practicality, and unintended negative impacts. Clear communication and investment in infrastructure were mentioned by respondents as considerations alongside the policy proposals.

The responses provide valuable evidence and insight that the Scottish Government can use when undertaking any next steps to develop the proposals. Based on the responses, this could include further engagement with stakeholders, collecting additional information about the practical and financial implications of the proposed changes and updating impact assessments with relevant evidence provided by respondents.

1. Introduction

Background

The Scottish Government has set out a clear and ambitious agenda to accelerate the transition to a circular economy, recognising the environmental, social, and economic benefits of reducing waste and making better use of resources. In close collaboration with stakeholders, the Scottish Government is co-designing a new statutory Code of Practice for household waste and recycling services. This Code will replace the current voluntary code, set out the duties of local authorities, and aim to ensure a consistent, high-quality approach to service delivery across Scotland.

A public consultation gathering evidence and perspectives to inform the development of the revised Code of Practice opened on the 25 March 2025 and closed on the 17 June 2025. The findings will support the Scottish Government in refining its strategic approach and addressing implementation challenges.

The consultation focused on two areas that may be incorporated into the new Code: the introduction of mandatory kerbside textile collections and the rural food waste collection exemption. These have been identified due to their significant carbon impacts and the need to balance environmental benefits with operational and financial feasibility. The consultation also sits alongside a Call for Evidence on extending the biodegradable municipal waste landfill ban, which is due to come into effect at the end of 2025. Responses to the consultation and the Call for Evidence have been analysed and reported upon separately.

Public consultations invite everyone to express their views; individuals and organisations interested in the topic are more likely to respond than those without a direct or known interest. **This self-selection means the views of respondents do not necessarily represent the views of the entire population.**

Respondent profile

In total, 60 consultation responses were received[1]. Almost all were submitted via the online consultation platform, Citizen Space. Those received in an alternative format, for example, an email or PDF document, were reviewed separately by the research team.

Individuals provided 26 responses to the consultation; the remaining 34 responses were from organisations. To aid analysis, organisations were grouped according to the nature of their work. Table 1 shows the number of each type of respondent.

[1] One individual responded to the consultation twice. These responses have been merged, with quantitative responses taken from the latest submission.

A further six respondents provided responses to the Call for Evidence only. As this is being analysed separately, these six responses were removed from the consultation analysis.

Table 1: Respondent profile

	Number of respondents	% of total sample
Individuals	**24**	**40**
Organisations	**36**	**60**
Local Authority	14	23
Waste Management	8	13
Reuse and Resale	7	12
Public Body	3	5
Environmental Nonprofit	2	3

Analysis approach

The Lines Between was commissioned to provide a robust, independent analysis of the responses to the public consultation. The main purpose of consultation analysis is to understand the full range of views expressed, and, where possible, using closed questions, to quantify how many respondents hold particular views. This report provides a thematic analysis of responses based on the analysis approach outlined below.

Reflecting the number and knowledge of respondents, it is impossible to detail every response in this report; some, especially organisations, shared lengthy submissions reflecting their specific subject matter expertise. These responses are referenced where possible. Full responses to the consultation, where permission for publication was granted, can be found on the Scottish Government's consultation website.

Similarly, the technical nature of some of the proposals outlined in the consultation means it is impractical to fully repeat or explain these within this report. Further information on the proposals can be found in the consultation paper.

Quantitative analysis

The consultation included 14 closed questions. Not all respondents answered every question. To compare across sub-groups, this report presents the results of the closed questions **based on those who answered each question**. For clarity, each table shows:

- The percentage of respondents **from the total sample** of 60 respondents who selected each response (grey row).
- The number and percentage response **among those who answered each question**, broken down by individual and organisation responses (rows including and under "All answering").

A full results table for each question can also be found in Appendix A. Please note that the row percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

Qualitative analysis

Qualitative analysis identifies the key themes across responses to each question. The research team developed a draft coding framework based on a review of the consultation

questions and a sample of responses. During the coding process, new codes were created if additional themes emerged.

When reviewing the qualitative analysis in this report, we would ask the reader to consider:

- Where differences between the views of individuals and organisations were evident in qualitative responses, these have been noted. If no specific differences are highlighted, then a theme was raised by a mix of respondents.
- Many respondents repeatedly raised the same issues or suggestions at multiple questions, regardless of the specific focus of the question. These views are all included in this report, but analysts exercised judgment about the most relevant place to include each theme to avoid repetition.
- Where a response received via email or in a PDF document contained information that did not align with specific questions, analysts exercised judgment about the most relevant place to include this material for analysis purposes.
- In a few instances, qualitative comments from individuals do not align with their response to the quantitative questions. For example, a respondent may agree in principle but use their open comment to caveat their agreement or suggest an alternative approach.
- Where appropriate, quotes from a range of the 60 consultation responses are included to illustrate key points and provide useful examples, insights and contextual information.
- Two sets of organisations, amounting to five organisations in total, provided similarly worded responses. This is not unusual, as organisations often publish their response before the consultation closes, allowing others to refer to it. For analysis purposes, each response was treated separately and the full content of all responses was analysed.

Weight of opinion

This report presents the themes identified in responses from most to least commonly mentioned. All themes, including views shared by small numbers of respondents, are covered; a view expressed by a very small number of participants is not given less weight than more general comments shared by a majority. Similarly, all responses have an equal weighting. We recognise this means a response from an individual has the same weight as the response from an organisation which may represent many members, but this approach ensures all views are presented.

Qualitative analysis of open-ended questions does not permit the quantification of results. However, to assist the reader in interpreting the findings, a framework is used to convey the most to least commonly identified themes in responses to each question:

- Many respondents, 20 or more respondents, a prevalent theme.
- Several respondents, between 12 and 19 respondents, a recurring theme.
- Some respondents, between five and 11 respondents, another theme.
- A few / a small number, fewer than five respondents, a less common theme.

- Two/one respondents; a singular comment or a view identified in two responses.

2. Household Collection of Textiles

Chapter 2 analyses respondents' views on whether to make kerbside collection of textiles a mandatory service by local authorities. The consultation paper notes that no local authority in Scotland currently accepts textiles for household kerbside recycling collection. Residents around Scotland currently use recycling centres, third sector recycling banks, donations to charity and reuse shops or resale websites, among others, to dispose of unwanted household textiles. Textiles that are hard to recycle are put into landfill, which, according to the consultation paper, "are a major source of waste sector emissions".

This section asked respondents to provide views on 11 questions in open and closed formats. Respondents were asked about their current and future textile recycling options and preferences, and any potential benefits and barriers related to proposed changes to the current system. This chapter also includes respondents' suggestions for alternative approaches.

Q1a. Do you consider your current options for textile recycling to be efficient?

Respondent type	n=	% Yes	% No	% Don't know	% No answer
All respondents	60	37	38	12	13
All answering	**52**	**42**	**44**	**13**	**-**
Individuals	26	35	54	12	-
Organisations	26	50	35	15	-
- Local Authority	14	64	21	14	-
- Waste Management	3	67	0	33	-
- Reuse and Resale	7	14	71	14	-
- Public Body	2	50	50	0	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	0	-	-	-	-

Overall responses were split as to whether current options for textile recycling are efficient. Among those answering, 42% believe they are efficient and 44% believe they are not, while 13% were unsure. Organisations were more likely than individuals to feel that current options are efficient (50% compared to 35% respectively), whereas individuals were more likely to think current options were inefficient (54% compared to 35% of organisations). Local authorities and waste management organisations were more likely to describe current measures as efficient (64% and 67%, respectively), whereas reuse and resale organisations were more likely to feel they were not efficient (71%).

Q1b. Do you consider your current options for textile recycling to be accessible?

Respondent type	n=	% Yes	% No	% Don't know	% No answer
All respondents	60	43	37	7	13
All answering	**52**	**50**	**42**	**8**	**-**
Individuals	26	38	58	4	-
Organisations	26	62	27	12	-
- Local Authority	14	71	14	14	-
- Waste Management	3	100	0	0	-
- Reuse and Resale	7	29	57	14	-
- Public Body	2	50	50	0	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	0	-	-	-	-

Again, among those answering Q1b, views were mostly split: 50% believed that current options for textile recycling are accessible, 42% felt they were not, and 8% were unsure. Organisations were more likely than individuals to consider the current options as accessible (62% compared to 38%, respectively). All respondents from waste management organisations believed that current options are accessible, as did 71% of local authorities, compared to 29% of reuse and resale organisations.

Q1c. If you do not consider your current options for textile recycling to be efficient and/or accessible, what improvements would you recommend?

More textile banks

Two thirds of respondents suggested improvements at the open question; this included respondents who felt that existing options were either efficient or accessible at the closed questions but still felt they could be improved.

Several respondents felt that providing more textile banks or drop-off locations to communities could improve textile recycling uptake by making it more efficient and accessible for people. A few individuals mentioned that they felt clothing banks were inaccessible as they were difficult to travel to. One individual suggested putting textile banks in highly accessible areas, such as community centre car parks.

"Increase collection options: Expanding collection points and providing more drop-off locations for householders can significantly enhance accessibility. This includes considering kerbside collection to make recycling more convenient." – NHS Scotland

Respondents frequently commented that existing textile banks were not well maintained. Some complained that the banks were regularly overfilled, which made adding further donations more difficult or impossible. There was also a recommendation that banks or

community bins be kept in better condition to ensure that the textiles meant for recycling are protected from bad weather, for example.

Public awareness campaigns

Some respondents felt that the public needed more information about the quality and types of items that are recyclable, where they can be taken and what happens to those items when they are recycled. Scotland Excel suggested that this could be done through a government campaign, and NHS Scotland suggested that the fashion industry participate by informing their customers about reuse and recycling options.

A few respondents noted their concern with the possibility of contaminated textiles being left at textile banks, which may impact the onward recycling of textiles in banks.

Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR)

Placing the responsibility on producers and manufacturers to create accessible, efficient and sustainable methods of recycling and reuse for textiles used in their products was mentioned by some respondents across local authorities, reuse and resale organisations, an environmental nonprofit and an individual.

> "LARAC would like to see a UK-wide Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) scheme introduced for textiles, similar to what has been brought in for packaging, to drive the industry in designing more recyclable products and investing in infrastructure for accepting, processing and recycling these items." - LARAC
>
> "The most useful system would start with the producers, who should be ensuring that only high-quality, repairable and recyclable items are put into the market. They are best placed to then run a take back service, ensuring that materials are returned to their point of sale/production and treated appropriately." - Orkney Islands Council

ApparelXchange CIC (Community Interest Company) suggested using a mandatory postal take-back scheme, and Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar, among others, noted that the EU is introducing mandatory textile EPR schemes.

Kerbside collection

Some respondents supported kerbside collection to improve accessibility. Of these, almost half did not provide further details as to why they supported kerbside collection. Among those who did, two individuals suggested combining textile collection with another type of bulky waste collection for efficiency.

Collaboration

Greater collaboration between key stakeholders, including local authorities, the third sector and central government, was recommended by some respondents. Suggestions for collaboration included collection bags and recycling services being provided by charities, and local authorities providing transport and promoting clothes donations within their communities. Two local authorities highlighted that charities in their area planned to stop collections from textile donation banks. While this was seen as potentially detrimental, it was also suggested that it could lead to greater collaboration or the use of existing charity shop recycling and reuse by the local authorities.

The Salvation Army Trading Company Ltd and the Charity Retail Association suggested local authorities do more to support charity shops, such as providing people in their areas with bookable collection services. They also felt that the current policy disadvantaged charity shops, as waste management services were paid to handle textiles that are not appropriate for reuse, whereas charity shops did it for free. A few other respondents expressed the view that charity shops needed more support in managing donated clothing that is not reusable

Satisfaction with existing processes

Some respondents, predominantly organisations, suggested that the current systems for textile recycling were working effectively. These respondents felt there are several options available to people looking to recycle their textiles, from charity shops to resale websites, and it was unnecessary to change the existing system.

> "The current system includes various options. Members of the public can take unwanted textiles to charity shops, drop off at textile banks at locations such as supermarket carparks and via direct, ad-hoc charity collections from households (via bags posted through the door that are later collected). There are also online options such as resell and local share sites. In addition, local authorities will generally offer the opportunity to dispense at household waste recycling centres." – Scotland Excel

Lesser mentioned themes

The following themes were mentioned by a small number of respondents:

- Calls for greater investment, including funding for advanced sorting technologies or chemical methods for recycling textiles.
- Focus instead on reducing and reusing textiles, as a few respondents felt that reducing the need for recycling would be the best option.
- Enforcing legislation to ensure that people are not stealing donated textiles from community textile banks or illegally soliciting them from residents.

Q2. Do you believe household collection of textiles would provide benefits to householders?

Respondent type	n=	% Yes	% No	% Don't know	% No answer
All respondents	60	55	20	15	10
All answering	**54**	**61**	**22**	**17**	**-**
Individuals	26	69	23	8	-
Organisations	28	54	21	25	-
- Local Authority	14	43	21	36	-
- Waste Management	4	100	0	0	-
- Reuse and Resale	7	43	29	29	-
- Public Body	3	67	33	0	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	0	-	-	-	-

Of those answering, 61% agreed that household collection of textiles would benefit householders, 22% did not, and 17% were unsure. Individuals were more likely than organisations to see benefits in household collection (69% compared to 54%). Waste management organisations all agreed that households would benefit, as did 67% of public bodies, compared to 43% of local authorities and reuse and resale organisations.

Q3. What potential benefits do you consider household collection of textiles would provide to householders?

Increased participation

Three quarters of respondents answered Q3. Of those, the most common benefit, highlighted by many respondents, was that household participation in textile recycling could increase. Respondents felt that people would be less inclined to put textiles into landfill waste, as no travel would be required to recycle textiles, and it would be more accessible for people who were unable to get to charity shops or other donation centres.

"Kerbside collection simplifies the recycling process for residents, likely increasing participation and reducing textile waste to landfill/incineration." – Stirling Council

A few respondents felt it could positively change people's perspectives on recycling, encouraging those who may not otherwise have recycled.

Positive environmental impact

Some respondents expressed a view that household collection of textiles could positively impact the environment by reducing textiles being sent to landfill. A few respondents provided further explanation as to why they believe this, including that it could:

- decrease greenhouse gas emissions by removing textiles from residual waste.
- remove those textiles comprised of polymers from incineration.

- decrease the carbon emissions from those who drive to recycling centres.

"Most textiles now are fossil fuel based (polymer) so we need a better option than burning for energy as the Energy Trading Scheme will come in force too. Which is a good thing we must move away from fossil fuel and find way to reuse what resource we already have in circulation." - Individual

Negative impacts

Although not directly answering the question, many respondents raised concerns or highlighted potential negative impacts of household collection at this question. As Q9 asks respondents to consider barriers and unintended consequences, negative impacts listed at Q2 have been included in the analysis of responses to Q9.

Q4. Do you believe household collection of textiles should be a service supplied by local authorities? A mandatory service would be a statutory requirement for all local authorities in Scotland to collect textiles separately as part of their waste collection services at household kerbsides. This may require a separate household recycling bin.

Respondent type	**n=**	**% Strongly agree**	**% Agree**	**% Neither Agree nor Disagree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% No Answer**
All respondents	60	18	15	8	20	28	10
All answering	**54**	**20**	**17**	**9**	**22**	**31**	**-**
Individuals	26	35	27	8	15	15	-
Organisations	28	7	7	11	29	46	-
- Local Authority	14	0	14	0	36	50	-
- Waste Management	4	0	0	25	50	25	-
- Reuse and Resale	7	0	0	29	14	57	-
- Public Body	2	50	0	0	0	50	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	1	100	0	0	0	0	-

Respondents were more likely to disagree that household collection of textiles should be a service supplied by local authorities, with 53% of those answering disagreeing or strongly disagreeing (22% and 31% respectively). In contrast, 37% of those answering agreed or strongly agreed (17% and 20%, respectively). While individuals were more likely to agree (62% in total), organisations were more likely to be unsure or disagree (11% were unsure, 29% disagreed, and 46% disagreed strongly). All organisations that answered either disagreed or were unsure, except two local authorities, one public body and one environmental nonprofit.

Concerns with the proposal

Just over three fifths of respondents expanded upon their quantitative responses at Q4. Many respondents did not believe that household collection should be a service supplied by the local authorities, expressing a range of reasons for this view. These concerns were also raised at Q2, which asked about the benefits of household collection, and at Q9, where the barriers and unintended consequences of household collection are explored. Concerns raised at Q4 by some respondents included the negative impact that household recycling may have on charity shops and resale markets, and the increased costs that may be incurred by local authorities. These are described in greater detail at Q9.

Agreement with the proposal

At the open question, some who agreed with the proposal at the quantitative question provided caveats to their agreements or highlighted concerns in their detailed responses, as listed above and described in more detail at Q9. Two respondents simply agreed with the proposal, but did not provide further details why.

Unnecessary

A few respondents felt that household collection would complicate currently functioning systems. These respondents felt the current options – collection banks, charity shops, third sector collections, recycling centres and resale websites – were working well. Aberdeenshire Council felt that the collection of textiles by service providers and collection points allowed textiles to be recycled without local authority input.

> “This collection service means no bulking of textiles by a local authority which runs the risk of material getting wet/dirty at waste transfer stations due to the many streams of waste that the local authority has to collect and bulk. In the instance of textile collections, where the material stream has to be kept dry and clean, there is less risk of contamination and downgrading of the material stream by keeping this a service provided by the textile trade and not involving the local authorities.” Aberdeenshire Council

Other suggestions

As mentioned in Q1, some respondents suggested legislating for an Extended Producer Responsibility scheme rather than creating new processes for household textile collection provided by local authorities. Respondents felt this would help ensure producers consider the composition of textiles and how their products can be reused.

A few respondents suggested that greater modelling would be needed to assess the costs and implications of introducing a mandatory household collection service.

Q5. If collections of textiles from households are not a service supplied by local authorities, do you think there should be a requirement for all local authorities to offer textile recycling through Household Waste Recycling Centres or other bring facilities?

Respondent type	n=	% Yes	% No	% Don't know	% No answer
All respondents	60	73	8	7	12
All answering	**53**	**83**	**9**	**8**	**-**
Individuals	26	88	8	4	-
Organisations	27	78	11	11	-
- Local Authority	14	86	14	0	-
- Waste Management	4	50	0	50	-
- Reuse and Resale	6	83	0	17	-
- Public Body	2	50	50	0	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	1	100	0	0	-

Respondents supported the proposal that all local authorities should be required to offer textile recycling through Household Waste Recycling Centres or other bring facilities. Among those answering, 83% were in favour, 9% were against, and 8% unsure. Individuals and organisations were both supportive, with 88% and 78%, respectively, in favour. Support was higher among local authorities (86%) and reuse and resale organisations (83%), compared to 50% among waste management organisations and public bodies who answered.

Agreement with the proposal

Just over half of respondents left an open comment at Q5. Of those responding, several agreed with the approach of local authorities offering textile recycling through Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) or other bring facilities, including many local authorities. While some respondents did not expand on why they agreed, others felt that textile recycling at HWRCS was already common practice in many places and should be standardised across Scotland.

Considerations for implementation

Some respondents who agreed with this approach provided other considerations and caveats. A few felt that local authorities should provide the service through HWRCs or similar facilities, but advocated for public awareness campaigns or coordinated strategies between local authorities and the third sector or resale shops, which focused on promoting the reuse of textiles before they are recycled. Two respondents asked for more transparency on how textiles given to recycling centres are processed.

"Yes, but the focus should be on reuse first and recycling second. To promote reuse, local authorities should be encouraged to partner with charities that are able to offer a resale route within the UK for re-wearable clothing." - Salvation Army Trading Company Ltd

Consideration of the charity and resale sector

Some respondents supported this approach as they felt it would maintain a source of reusable textiles for charity shops and circular economy enterprises compared to kerbside collection. Conversely, a few others raised concerns that people may overuse the recycling centres to the detriment of reuse shops. As noted above, they suggested that a preference for reuse be made clear to people to ensure good-quality textiles are not unnecessarily recycled.

Costs for local authorities

A few respondents felt that offering textile recycling through HWRCs was preferable to kerbside collection as it would be less costly or resource-intensive for local authorities. However, ApparelXchange CIC noted that this approach could be beneficial if local authorities could partner with resale or charitable organisations to service the textile collection areas of HWRCs.

In contrast, Orkney Islands Council raised an issue with the costs associated with onward recycling facilities due to low demand and physical distance from processing plants.

> "The provision of containers also presupposes access to onward reprocessing facilities, which would be challenging for a small rural area like Orkney, given both the relatively low volumes of material that are likely to be collected and the distance from the reprocessing markets. Without an EPR scheme, the costs of this would be unaffordable." – Orkney Islands Council

Accessibility concerns

Access to HWRCs was a concern raised by a few respondents due to either remote location or physical difficulty in accessing the centres.

> "Our local recycling centre is 60 miles and a ferry journey away (Shetland and this applies to several thousand residents). People would be reluctant to take their textiles there. As well as local charity shops, there are options on the islands to deposit textiles in textile banks." - Yell for Cancer Support Charity Shop

A few others felt that local authorities should decide on statutory services as they are best placed to understand what is feasible and economically viable in their areas.

Q6. What is the estimated number of textile items you recycle/dispose of each year?

Respondent type	n=	% 1-5	% 6-15	% 16-30	% 31-50	% > 50	% I do not recycle my textiles	% Don't know	% No Answer
All respondents	60	10	17	18	3	12	3	12	25
All answering	**45**	**13**	**22**	**24**	**4**	**16**	**4**	**16**	**-**
Individuals	26	15	31	27	8	8	8	4	-
Organisations	19	11	11	21	0	26	0	32	-
- Local Authority	10	10	10	20	0	30	0	30	-
- Waste Management	3	0	0	0	0	33	0	67	-
- Reuse and Resale	4	25	0	50	0	25	0	0	-
- Public Body	2	0	50	0	0	0	0	50	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Three quarters of respondents answered Q6. Of those answering, respondents most commonly recycle between 6 and 30 textile items a year, with 22% recycling between 6 and 15 pieces and 24% recycling between 16 and 30. Individuals mostly recycled between 1 and 30 items annually, although 8% did not recycle, 8% recycled over 50, 8% recycled between 31 and 50, and 4% were unsure how many textiles they recycled annually.

Certain organisations were more likely to be unsure about their annual textile recycling, with 67% of waste management organisations and 50% of public bodies saying they did not know.

Q7. What services are currently available in your local authority area to recycle or dispose of textiles?

Respondent type	n=	% Local Textile Bank in supermarket / car park	% Charity Shops – In Store	% Charity Shops – Household Collection	% Household Waste Recycling Centre
All respondents	**60**	**75**	**78**	**43**	**63**
Individuals	26	85	92	31	65
Organisations	34	68	68	53	62
- Local Authority	14	93	93	64	86
- Waste Management	8	38	38	38	38
- Reuse and Resale	7	57	57	43	43
- Public Body	3	67	67	67	67
- Environmental Nonprofit	2	50	50	50	50

Q7 provided respondents with a list of services and asked them to select all the services that were currently available in their local authority area. The multiple-choice nature of this question means the table above is based on all respondents.

Among all respondents, 78% have access to charity shops that accept in-store donations, 75% can access local textile banks in supermarkets or car parks, 63% have access to household waste recycling centres, and 43% are offered household collection services for charity shops.

Individuals were more likely to have access to in-shop charity donations (92%) than to a charity shop's household collection service (31%), and 85% had access to textile banks. Fewer respondents had Household Waste Recycling Centres available in their area (65%).

Organisations had relatively equal access to all the services asked about, with 68% having access to textile banks, 68% having access to in-store charity shops, 62% having household waste recycling centres in their local authorities, and 53% having access to charity shop household collection services.

Q8. What services do you currently use in your local authority area to recycle or dispose of textiles?

Respondent type	n=	% Local Textile Bank in supermarket / car park	% Charity Shops – In Store	% Charity Shops – Household Collection	% Household Waste Recycling Centre	% Other
All respondents	**60**	**37**	**52**	**10**	**25**	**25**
Individuals	26	50	85	15	35	23
Organisations	34	26	26	6	18	26
- Local Authority	14	43	36	14	36	36
- Waste Management	8	0	0	0	0	25
- Reuse and Resale	7	29	43	0	0	14
- Public Body	3	33	33	0	33	33
- Environmental Nonprofit	2	0	0	0	0	0

Q8 provided respondents with the same range of services and asked which they currently use in their local authority area. The multiple-choice nature of this question means the table above is based on all respondents.

Among all respondents, more than half use in-shop charity store donations (52%), and just over a third (37%) use textile banks. Recycling centres (25%) and a charity shop household collection service (10%) are less used. A quarter of respondents (25%) noted they used another service, with details provided in the open responses (see below). Individuals were more likely than organisations to use all services, although organisations were slightly more likely to use other forms of recycling, with in-store donations to charity shops being particularly common among individuals (85%).

Other services

Three in ten respondents left an open comment at Q8. Alongside the services already asked about in the closed element of Q8, respondents provided further details about how they recycle or dispose of their textiles. These included, from most to least prevalent:

- Other community-benefitting options, such as wardrobe libraries e.g. Revolving Wardrobe. One individual mentioned using their community textile banks to raise money for the local community, but did not explain how.
- Resale websites, such as Gumtree, Facebook Marketplace, eBay, or Vinted, or websites to distribute free things, like Freecycle.
- Personal reuse, such as repurposing textiles, passing along to family or friends or passing along to local crafting clubs.
- General waste for items that cannot be donated.
- Personal compost bin.

Q9. Do you foresee any barriers or unintended consequences to local authority collection of textiles at the kerbside becoming a statutory service?

Respondent type	n=	% Yes	% No	% Don't know	% No answer
All respondents	60	80	5	2	13
All answering	**52**	**92**	**6**	**2**	**-**
Individuals	26	85	12	4	-
Organisations	26	100	0	0	-
- Local Authority	13	100	0	0	-
- Waste Management	5	100	0	0	-
- Reuse and Resale	5	100	0	0	-
- Public Body	2	100	0	0	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	1	100	0	0	-

Among those answering, almost all (92%) anticipated barriers or unintended consequences to the proposal, 6% believed there would be none, and 2% were unsure. All organisations responding believed there would be unintended consequences, compared to 85% of individuals.

Just under 9 in 10 respondents left an open comment in response to Q9. Many respondents had already raised potential barriers and negative impacts in response to other questions in this section of the consultation, particularly at Q2 and Q4. To minimise repetition, the analysis below includes comments from other questions reflecting unintended consequences. Where themes were unique to other questions, it has been noted in the analysis.

Increased costs

Many respondents, including most of the local authorities and public bodies responding to the consultation, highlighted potential increased costs to the local authority as an unintended consequence or barrier associated with kerbside collection becoming a statutory service. Respondents highlighted that any new scheme would likely require new bins for households, increased manpower and collection vehicles, and increased organisational and management resources. Respondents expressed the view that local authorities are currently under financial stress and were concerned that a new service could be unaffordable or lead to reductions in other services.

"The high cost of collection of textiles for dispersed populations across the Highland Council area, would be unlikely to yield an economy of scale that would justify the investment in time and infrastructure. In addition, there are significant live issues with the secondary textiles market, which would produce issues for Councils to access, procure and to maintain stable affordable offtake arrangements." – The Highland Council

Impact on charity and reuse shops

Reiteration of the concern about the impact of textile recycling changes on the charity and reuse sector was mentioned by many respondents at Q9 and throughout the questions in this section. Respondents felt that a kerbside textile collection could decrease the amount of textiles donated to shops, as reusable textiles may be put in a household recycling bin if it is seen as easier than taking them to a charity shop or donation bank. It was noted that this could decrease the income of these shops and may also impact people who depend on charity shops to buy good quality second-hand clothing and home goods.

> "It will deprive local charities of much-needed donations. Charities are already struggling to provide a sticking plaster for inadequately provided Government services, and many people are living in poverty." – Individual
>
> "We believe there is ample opportunity for residents to re-use and recycle textiles through textile banks, charity shops, market place and other online platforms to sell old items keeping them in direct use and extending the life of them. [Local Authorities] do not have the ability to sort and sell, so this may result in good quality items being sent for recycling as opposed to re-use, which should be the preferred option given it's position in the waste hierarchy." – Moray Council

Others felt this issue could also present challenges for nonprofit and community projects created to promote the circular economy through textile resales. Again, respondents thought this would impact not only the income of these third-sector organisations but also the communities they support and the people who use the resale services.

Quality of textiles being recycled

Some respondents mentioned concerns that household collection could result in higher-quality textiles being mixed with unusable textiles, making them unsuitable for recycling or reuse. They felt households may stop separating their textiles due to the ease of using a kerbside bin, which would create greater textile waste. Some raised a concern that this would lead to a perspective shift, where people habitually stopped donating or looking into reuse options for their textiles.

> "Kerbside collection increases the risk that higher quality textiles will be disposed of at kerbside due to increased convenience, [which] may see it mixed with poorer quality material, reducing the likelihood that the higher quality material could be recycled. It may also reduce these items being sent for reuse or repair. Additionally, charities and organisations currently in receipt of these types of items risk seeing a drop in donations and, as such, income." – LARAC

Some respondents advocated for clear communication about what can be recycled, where textiles end up, and promotion of options associated with the circular economy, such as resale and reuse organisations, as a way to combat potential misuse of kerbside bins. A few respondents also felt that standardising practices across local authorities would help clarify the aims and goals of any new statutory services.

"Consideration should be given to the type and quality of textiles residents will be advised to deposit in kerbside collections, and a clear message on the purpose of kerbside collections being recycling. This could be an opportunity to engage with residents around repair and reuse, extending the life of textiles, and other options to consider before recycling. This could also help decrease adverse impacts for third sector/charities and ensure textiles are kept in use at their highest value and higher up the waste hierarchy, before reaching the recycling point." – Glasgow City Council

Space concerns

Throughout the consultation, some respondents raised concerns about the space households would need to store another bin. This concern was not only for the individuals housing the bins but also for the fact that too many bins on a street could impede accessibility for pedestrians, people who need accessibility tools and vehicles, and families with prams. One individual mentioned concern that if bags were used rather than bins, they could be stolen.

Other concerns and barriers

Small numbers of respondents raised lesser-mentioned concerns and barriers. These included the potential for limited uptake, as a few respondents felt a household collection service was unnecessary, and concerns that increases in consumerism could be driven by the increased ease of disposal of unwanted textiles.

At Q2, a small number of respondents highlighted that a lack of infrastructure to manage recycling could negatively impact the rollout of recycling plans and proposals. They suggested that household collection should not be offered until there are mechanisms for sorting and processing the collections to enable effective recycling once collected.

Q10. If your local authority offered household collection of textiles, how likely are you to utilise this service?

Respondent type	n=	% Very likely	% Somewhat likely	% Somewhat unlikely	% Very unlikely	% Not sure	% No Answer
All respondents	60	27	12	3	17	7	35
All answering	**39**	**41**	**18**	**5**	**26**	**10**	**-**
Individuals	26	50	23	4	19	4	-
Organisations	13	23	8	8	38	23	-
- Local Authority	6	17	17	0	33	33	-
- Waste Management	1	0	0	0	0	100	-
- Reuse and Resale	4	0	0	25	75	0	-
- Public Body	2	100	0	0	0	0	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	0	-	-	-	-	-	-

At Q10, 59% of respondents who answered indicated that they were likely to use a household collection service offered by local authorities, with 41% very likely and 18% somewhat likely to do so. Given the focus on household collection, twice as many individuals answered the question as organisations. Almost three quarters of individuals (73%) indicated they were likely to use the service (50% very likely and 23% somewhat likely). In contrast, 23% of individuals were unlikely (4% somewhat unlikely and 19% very unlikely), and 4% were unsure.

Q11. Do you have any additional views, regarding household collection of textiles or what you would expect a useful service to look like?

Public education and clear communication

Just under two thirds of respondents provided additional views at Q11. Of those, the most common theme, mentioned by some respondents, was a suggestion that clear communication from local authorities or the Scottish Government would be needed to educate people about any new recycling procedures and the best ways to dispose of unwanted textiles. A few respondents also suggested that more information about the negative impacts of fast fashion could be helpful.

"A successful kerbside textile collection service should include clear guidelines for residents on what textiles are acceptable, regular collection schedules to encourage consistent participation, public education campaigns, collaboration with charities and other recycling organisations." – Stirling Council

Increased investment in circular economy

Promotion and support for reuse and repair options for textiles was called for by some respondents. Suggestions included further promotion through education and communications as mentioned above, but also by using existing infrastructures. LARAC, for example, suggested that HWRCs could be used to support textile repair and reuse programmes. ApparelXchange CIC suggested that this be built in partnership with local authorities.

"If there is a responsibility for a local authority to provide this type of service, they really must consider how this is done in partnership, contracted out to local organisations. The potential social and environmental impact of a service by a responsible social circular enterprise would reap huge rewards for any local authority, driving circularity, net zero, social impacts and utilising resources which benefit our communities. I also think local authorities as large as Glasgow, working with others, should be advancing the opportunity towards material sorting in Scotland. While I am aware of private sector textile reuse/recyclers already looking at this next investment, it is not in Scotland." - ApparelXchange CIC

Other suggestions

Some respondents supported introducing EPR schemes to combat textile waste, which was described in greater detail at Q1. As described in Q9, a concern about the costs

associated with a new statutory service, particularly for local authorities, was raised again by a few respondents at this question.

Other considerations and suggestions mentioned by a small number of respondents are listed here from most to least prevalent:

- A call for recycling and collection policy standardisation across Scotland, which was also supported by Dundee City Council and CIWM Scotland, who recommended a common standard with best practices, such as a position paper written by EuRIC entitled "Textiles Handling & Sorting Specifications - For re-use and recycling of used textiles".
- A suggestion to offer a range of different services, such as increased recycling banks and some kerbside collection, collection of textiles alongside other types of waste, like bulky waste, or charging for textile waste collection as with garden waste in some local authority areas.
- A request for further clarification of the purpose of the proposed textile collections.
- Reconsideration of proposed statutory textile recycling services once the deposit return scheme is introduced and the impacts of that change are understood by local authorities.
- Understanding of mitigation procedures to stop theft of textiles from textile banks when the textile prices are high.

3. Rural Food Waste Exemption

This chapter analyses responses to questions on the Scottish Government's proposals to change the current rural food waste collection exemption. The Environmental Protection Act of 1990 required all Scottish local authorities to provide segregated food waste collection for households, and food businesses consistently producing 5 kg or more food waste a week must also segregate this from general waste and present it for separate collection. However, an exemption was included for rural areas to ensure that food waste collection was efficient, minimising any detrimental environmental impacts from the waste collection service. Rural exemptions were based both on population density and proximity to waste treatment facilities. The consultation asked whether the exemption should continue in its current form, be changed or be removed entirely.

This section of the consultation consisted of five questions, with a mix of open and closed components.

Q1. Are you located in an area with a rural food waste exemption?

Respondent type	n=	% Yes	% No	% Don't know	% No answer
All respondents	60	32	25	7	37
All answering	**38**	**50**	**39**	**11**	**-**
Individuals	19	37	53	11	-
Organisations	19	63	26	11	-
- Local Authority	13	77	23	0	-
- Waste Management	2	0	0	100	-
- Reuse and Resale	1	100	0	0	-
- Public Body	2	50	50	0	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	1	0	100	0	-

Among those answering, half were located in an area with a rural food waste exemption, 39% were not, and 11% were unsure. Organisations were more likely than individuals to be located in an area with a rural food waste exemption (63% and 37%, respectively). Of the 13 local authorities that answered Q1, 77% were located in an area with a rural food waste exemption.

Q2. What is your preferred approach to the rural food waste exemption in the future? If other, please provide your answer here.

Respondent type	n=	% Keep it as it is	% Remove it	% Other	% No answer
All respondents	60	20	22	22	37
All answering	**38**	**32**	**34**	**34**	**-**
Individuals	17	29	47	24	-
Organisations	21	33	24	43	-
- Local Authority	12	42	17	42	-
- Waste Management	4	0	50	50	-
- Reuse and Resale	2	50	0	50	-
- Public Body	2	50	0	50	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	1	0	100	0	-

At Q2, responses were split almost evenly, with 32% of those answering preferring to keep the rural food waste exemption as it is, 34% preferring to remove it, and 34% making other suggestions. More individuals supported removing the exemption compared to organisations (47% and 24%, respectively), while more organisations suggested alternatives than individuals (43% and 24%, respectively). Local authorities were split between keeping the rural food waste exemption (42%) and making alternative suggestions (42%), with 17% preferring it is removed.

Financial and resource implications

Just over one third of respondents provided further detail at the open question. Of those, the most common theme was concern about the financial and resource implications of changing the exemption. To reduced repetition, those responses have been analysed alongside similar responses which were also the most prevalent theme at Q5.

Keep the exemption as it is

Some respondents, primarily organisations, felt the food waste exemption should be kept in its current form. They expressed the view that removing the exemption in some areas would be unviable. Respondents felt it was unacceptable to expect people living in isolated or hard-to-access areas to comply with food waste collection requirements, as it would place an unfair burden on communities with limited access to services and infrastructure, as they may need to travel long distances to collection points or depend upon infrequent or unreliable waste services. One respondent noted that both urban settings, such as flats, and extremely rural areas could present significant challenges to adhering to food waste collections if the exemption were removed.

“We fully support retaining the rural food waste exemption and the exemption for all business producing less than 5kg of food waste per week.” - Charity Retail Association

A small number of respondents raised environmental concerns about extending food waste collections to remote rural areas, noting the potential increase in carbon emissions from additional vehicle use. These comments emphasised the need to consider rurality, waste volumes, and the net carbon impact to avoid unnecessary collections that may do more harm than good.

Remove the exemption

In contrast, some respondents felt that having an exemption in place is a barrier to developing the infrastructure for food waste collection and reprocessing in areas that are currently exempt. Two respondents commented on the exemption resulting in technological advancements lagging behind, with one respondent noting that separate food waste collection can be achieved using a dedicated section in a collection vehicle, avoiding the need for an additional vehicle and reducing associated carbon impacts.

> "Collection systems and vehicles have evolved since the introduction of the exemption" - Dundee City Council

A few respondents raised concerns about how locations are classified as exempt, suggesting that some areas that are currently exempt should not be. For example, one noted that in Moray, some large commercial settings are exempt because they are in rural areas, despite generating substantial volumes of food waste.

> "For businesses, there are many areas that are currently exempt from food waste collections, that both produce significant quantities of food waste and have access to a collection system (i.e. there is a service provided nearby). The current exemption is used as an 'excuse' to not treat this material higher up the waste hierarchy. Removal of this exemption would ensure this food waste will be captured and recycled" - REA - Renewable Energy Association

Resource Management Association Scotland supported a consistent requirement for segregated food waste collection across Scotland, noting that it would enable national-level campaigning and messaging to drive behavioural change, improve participation, and reduce contamination.

Composting

Some respondents proposed composting as an alternative to food waste collection in exempt areas. One respondent noted that many rural households have the space to manage food waste through methods such as closed-bin[2] or hot-box composting[3], and that promoting these practices could reduce the need for formal collection services. Others highlighted that rural areas often benefit directly from the outputs of composting – such as fertilisers and soil improvers – and should be supported to contribute to and make use of these processes locally.

[2] This refers to a composting method within a sealed bin, retaining heat and moisture, preventing smells and enabling faster decomposition.

[3] This uses a more insulated bin to promote faster decomposition than a traditional compost bin

Alternative suggestions

Some respondents proposed alternative suggestions for collecting or using food waste. These included:

- Combining services for efficiency with two respondents recommending integrating food waste collection with other services, such as textile collection, to improve efficiency and reduce logistical challenges.
- Improved household practices as one respondent calling for better separation of food waste from residual waste at the household level.
- Flexible collection frequency with another respondent suggesting that collection frequency be tailored to local needs, noting that weekly collections may not be necessary in all areas.

Another suggestion was reducing food waste through redistribution and community-based initiatives.

> Vans collecting fruit and vegetables close to their use-by date could be collected from local supermarkets and grocer shops and delivered to local hubs to be given away free to those in need or used to provide healthy community meals. - Individual

Mandatory collection of food waste from commercial sources that generate significant volumes was called for by one organisation:

> “Dependant on rurality, tonnage & carbon impact (we shouldn't be collecting just for the sake of it in extremely rural areas). That being said, we believe there should be consideration for compulsory collection of commercial food waste production when in large volumes. - Perth and Kinross Council

Two respondents called for a Scotland-wide review of the exemption criteria, emphasising the importance of modelling the net carbon impact of any proposed changes before implementation.

Q3. If your local authority were to offer a kerbside food waste collection service, would you be likely to opt-in?

Respondent type	n=	% Very likely	% Somewhat likely	% Somewhat unlikely	% Very unlikely	% Not sure	% No Answer
All respondents	60	28	2	0	3	10	57
All answering	**26**	**65**	**4**	**0**	**8**	**23**	**-**
Individuals	14	71	7	0	14	7	-
Organisations	12	58	0	0	0	42	-
- Local Authority	7	43	0	0	0	57	-
- Waste Management	1	0	0	0	0	100	-
- Reuse and Resale	1	100	0	0	0	0	-
- Public Body	2	100	0	0	0	0	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	1	100	0	0	0	0	-

Among those answering Q3, 69% were likely to opt-in to a food waste collection service if their local authority were to offer it (65% very likely and 4% somewhat likely). Conversely, 8% were very unlikely to opt-in, and 23% were unsure. Individuals were likely to opt-in with 71% being very likely and 7% being somewhat likely. Organisations were either very likely to opt-in (58%) or unsure (42%). Of the seven local authorities who responded, 3 (43%) indicated they would be very likely to opt-in and 4 (57%) were unsure.

Q4. If you live or operate a business in an area in which the rural food waste exemption is used, what do you currently do with your food waste? If other, please provide your answer here.

Respondent type	n=	% At-home composting	% Take it to the local recycling centre	% Other	% No answer
All respondents	60	5	0	30	65
All answering	**21**	**14**	**0**	**86**	**-**
Individuals	8	25	0	75	-
Organisations	13	8	0	92	-
- Local Authority	10	10	0	90	-
- Waste Management	1	0	0	100	-
- Reuse and Resale	1	0	0	100	-
- Public Body	1	0	0	100	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	0	-	-	-	-

One third of respondents answered Q4. Of those answering, 14% currently use at-home composting to handle their food waste, no respondents take their food waste to a local recycling centre, and 88% use another method. Among individuals who answered, 25% use at-home composting and 75% another method. Of the organisations that answered, all except one local authority used other methods to manage food waste.

Other alternatives

One in five respondents provided further detail at the open question. In line with the focus of the question, some respondents provided examples of how they manage food waste. From most to least mentioned, these included:

- Home composting, including feeding food waste to hens, using hot-box composting for non-vegetable waste, and more general composting practices.
- Disposal of food waste in the general waste bin, either alongside residual waste or in non-recyclables.
- Minimising food waste by meal planning and avoiding overconsumption.
- Food waste is sent to an incinerator and turned into heat for the district heating.

Q5. Do you have any other views regarding the rural food waste exemption?

Just over half of respondents left a comment in response to Q5. However, the analysis below also includes comments raised at other questions in this section of the consultation, particularly Q2, where the themes aligned with those evident at Q5.

Financial implications

The most common theme at both Q2 and Q5, raised by several respondents including many local authorities and public bodies, was concern about the financial challenges of collecting and reprocessing of food waste. The costs associated with these processes were frequently highlighted, particularly in remote rural and island communities where it was felt that costs would be ‘unreasonably high’ due to the nature of the location.

Cost concerns were primarily raised by organisations rather than individuals. These challenges included:

- The need for investment in additional infrastructure, such as dedicated collection vehicles and storage facilities
- Compliance with strict contamination limits for organic waste, which may require costly monitoring and enforcement measures
- The perceived high expense of transporting waste over long distances to treatment facilities, particularly in remote or island areas where transport logistics are more complex and fuel costs are higher.
- Some highlighted that low volumes of waste and extensive collection networks make the service inefficient and costly in certain areas.

"The provision of the food waste collection service would not be cost-effective or efficient across the whole region, to collect small volumes of food waste. Services have already been reduced due to participation by members of the public being low in all areas. To increase service provision, considerable revenue budget provision would be required." – Dumfries & Galloway Council

"To remove the rural exemption altogether would mean having to provide a separate small tonnage vehicle solely for the collection of food waste separately for these 200 households which being spread across the 2,500 square miles of Aberdeenshire would not be deemed as being efficient." - Aberdeenshire Council

Some respondents were concerned that increased pressure on local authority budgets could impact other services, suggesting that Scottish Government funding would be necessary to cover the costs associated with expanded food waste collection.

Capacity and infrastructure concerns

Concerns around the capacity and infrastructure in place to collect and reprocess food waste were highlighted by some respondents at Q2 and Q5. A few respondents felt that the necessary infrastructure in some rural areas was insufficient and highlighted a lack of waste processing facilities. A few respondents mentioned the upcoming landfill ban on biodegradable municipal waste. These respondents noted that the ban could reduce disposal options and potentially increase costs for local authorities. For example, Perth and Kinross Council noted that separate food waste collections, as opposed to co-mingled food and green waste, would require investment in updated infrastructure.

At Q2, a few respondents also mentioned issues with the capacity to collect, with one suggesting that this could lead to non-compliance, i.e., households or local authorities not following the required rules or regulations for waste separation and disposal. Two respondents mentioned concerns about difficulties with reprocessing food waste and tighter controls on preventing contamination from mixing types of waste.

"Many Local authorities in Scotland currently collect comingled food and garden waste to make collections more efficient. There is concern from the market and local authorities about a potential lack of outlets and capacity, and subsequently increased disposal costs, in part due to the stricter limits on contamination (plastics) in post-consumer organic waste." - LARAC

Efficiency concerns

Some respondents questioned whether the environmental benefits of food waste recycling in remote areas would justify the carbon and energy costs of collection.

"The cost, energy and carbon footprint for collecting food waste separately from a small population spread over such a wide geographical area would far outweigh any gains. Additionally, this material would likely be collected utilising smaller containers and experience has shown that anything smaller than a 240-litre bin put at kerbside is disproportionately affected by island winds, resulting in increased litter." – Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar

A few respondents suggested that exemptions should remain in place for areas where collection is not economically or environmentally viable, and that on-site (i.e. at home) treatment using digesters may be more suitable. A few respondents noted that a one-size-fits-all approach may not be appropriate, and the carbon impact of collection should be weighed against the benefits on a case-by-case basis.

> "The current approach, which makes provision for providing differing levels of collection services is sensible. This is especially so for food waste." - The Highland Council

Shetland Council described local solutions created to combat the environmental impacts of food waste. It felt that these solutions are also efficient and offer an alternative to changing the current exemptions.

> "Our current set up with the energy from waste incinerator feeding the local district heating scheme provides a good solution to food waste, while providing heat for over 1,300 properties in Shetland." - Shetland Islands Council

Reasons to review or remove the exemption

A small number supported reviewing the current exemption area. It was suggested that rural classifications be updated and that some form of exemption be retained in remote or low-volume areas, with a focus on alternative treatment like on-site composting. Respondents suggested that some larger towns are currently included in the rural exemption and since creating the initial classification, collection systems and vehicles have evolved.

> "We are not averse to a review of the current rural exemption and, at the very least, suggest that this is more closely aligned with the updated rural classification." - Scottish Environmental Services Association

Other reasons for changing the regulations around the food waste exemption were highlighted by a small number of respondents. These included, from most to least prevalent:

- A belief that environmental goals must take precedence, and that removing the exemption is necessary to meet modern sustainability targets and reduce landfill.
- A concern that the exemption causes inequality by leaving rural residents with fewer waste disposal options and forcing them to take on personal costs to combat hygiene issues.
- Support for greater system-wide development, as it is believed that the exemption hinders progress in building better food waste collection systems and infrastructure, especially as technology and logistics have improved.

> "The rural food waste exemption is effectively a barrier to changing the behaviour of food waste producers and to developing a collection system that would provide a cost-effective food waste collection service." – Dundee City Council

Other suggestions

Some respondents provided other suggestions regarding the food waste exemption.

Less commonly mentioned suggestions made by respondents about food waste included:

- Emphasising avoiding food waste and promoting community composting.
- Introducing schemes involving local charities and local authorities to collect short-dated food to help those in poverty.
- Improving communication and environmental education to start behaviour change and empower communities to manage food waste in environmentally friendly ways.
- Combining food waste collection with other waste streams, like textiles, to improve cost-effectiveness.

4. Assessing the Impact of the Proposal

Chapter 4 presents the analysis of responses to questions which asked respondents to consider the impact of the proposals on different groups. This includes impacts on people with protected characteristics, businesses or the business sector, children's rights, island communities, the Fairer Scotland Duty and the environment.

Q1. Equality: Are there any additional likely impacts the proposals contained in this consultation may have on particular groups of people, with reference to protected characteristics?

No impact

Just under half of respondents answered Q1. The most common theme, mentioned by several respondents, was that the proposal would not impact groups of people with protected characteristics.

"We do not foresee additional impacts any sectors of the community that are able to manage their own waste materials at present and resources are available to help those that are disabled or unable to utilise existing collection arrangements to participate." - REA - Renewable Energy Association

Positive impact

A few respondents anticipated the proposals could have a positive impact on everyone, but they did not specify a specific group that would benefit. They did not provide any details as to why people would benefit or what the benefit would be.

People with accessibility concerns

A few respondents noted potential impacts for people with accessibility concerns, particularly older people or disabled people. Stirling Council suggested that people living in areas where kerbside collection may be impossible should have alternatives provided to ensure they have the same level of accessibility as those with kerbside collection.

English as a second language

Two individuals thought that people unfamiliar with the recycling procedures, particularly those who may be less confident with the English language, may find it challenging to understand the proposals due to their complexity.

Q2. Business and Regulation: Do you think that the proposals contained in this consultation are likely to increase or reduce the costs and burdens placed on any business or sector?

Impact on local authorities

Just over half of respondents answered Q2. The most common theme, mentioned by some respondents particularly local authorities, was an anticipated negative financial impact on local authorities. Most of these respondents did not provide further details at this

question, but those who did mentioned operational costs, particularly if uptake of a new service is low. One individual thought some of the cost may be recouped with a landfill tax.

> "The mandatory collection of an additional waste stream will place additional burden on local authorities, whether this is directly from households or the expansion of a public collection point network. This may require, dependent on the system adopted, and not limited to: additional or dedicated vehicles for textile collection; separate collection routes and staff; procurement of containers whether bags/boxes/other provided direct to householders or public collection units and procurement of re-processor; maintenance of public collection points (if used); any back-office system/processes to manage the collection of textiles, if direct from households e.g. booking a collection of textiles, monitoring of data, increase in number of enquiries to council call centre; [and] communications/engagement with residents." - Glasgow City Council

Further detail about financial concerns for local authorities is mentioned under Q9 of Chapter 2 (household textile collection) and Q2 of Chapter 3 (food waste).

Impact on the third sector

Some respondents suggested the proposal for household textile collection could cause a loss of income for charity shops and reuse shops due to their dependence on donated textiles, as described in Chapter 2 (household textile collection).

> "We have concerns about the impact on business models that are built on the donation of textiles for reuse, repair or remanufacturing." - Lower Impact Living (Lil) CIC

Impact on the private sector

Some respondents mentioned a positive financial impact on private sector organisations and businesses. Respondents thought that rather than paying for textile recycling or food waste collection, as some businesses currently do, the council would collect it for free.

In contrast, a few respondents felt the proposals may increase costs for waste management businesses, due to the need to separate and process food waste separately from other waste. One individual was also concerned that it may increase fly tipping if the costs to recycle increase for some businesses.

Positive impacts

A few respondents felt that a new approach to recycling textiles may provide opportunities for innovation and growth within local communities, specifically for rural and island communities.

> "There may be on-island solutions which deliver growth opportunities to Island businesses across food and textiles, as well as other waste potentially being diverted from landfill. The Council are keen to work with and support businesses within our Islands, although the net carbon impacts of these opportunities along with the potential costs would require to be modelled." - North Ayrshire Council

Q3. Children's Rights and Wellbeing Impact Assessment: Do you think that the proposals contained in this consultation are likely to have an impact on children's rights and wellbeing?

No impact

Just under half of respondents answered Q3. Most commonly, many respondents felt that there would be no impact on children's rights and wellbeing.

Environmental improvements

Improvements to the environment were mentioned by a few respondents as a positive impact on children's wellbeing. Stirling Council also mentioned the inclusion of initiatives on environmental stewardship in schools.

Access to reused toys and clothing

Two organisations highlighted a negative impact that fewer textile donations may have on families who depend on charity shop donations or reuse shops for clothing and toys.

"Many textile reuse initiatives support families on low incomes and are services upon which they rely." - Lower Impact Living (Lil) CIC

Q4. Islands Communities Impact Assessment: Do you think that the proposals contained in this consultation are likely to influence an island community significantly differently from its effect on other communities in Scotland?

Infrastructure, transportation and haulage costs

Just under half of respondents answered Q4. Several respondents raised concerns about the proposals' impact on island communities due to transportation and haulage costs. Respondents noted that without local recycling options, it would be necessary to transport recycling off the island, which could be even more expensive if there is low uptake.

"Yes. Due to the low volumes of material, increased logistical challenges and lack of viable local infrastructure, island communities are likely to face increased costs if required to introduce a collection scheme for new materials and for haulage and logistical costs, particular in proportion to the lower volumes and benefits." - LARAC

General statements on impact

Some respondents acknowledged that they thought there would be impacts, but did not provide further details as to what those impacts would be. In contrast, a few respondents felt there would be no impact, but again, they did not provide more details.

Infrastructure investment

Two respondents noted the potential for increased investment in island communities' infrastructure. They felt that the proposal may spur the development of on-island recycling and waste management facilities.

Q5. Fairer Scotland Duty: Do you think that the proposals contained in this consultation are likely to have an impact in relation to the fairer Scotland duty?

No impact

Just over one third of respondents answered Q5. Most commonly, some respondents felt the proposals would have no impact in relation to the Fairer Scotland Duty.

Charity shop donations

As mentioned at Q9 in Chapter 2, some respondents reiterated the impact that kerbside textile recycling may have on donations to charity and reuse shops. In response to this question, respondents also reiterated the impact that this could have on community members who depend on charity and reuse shops for their clothing and household textiles.

Accessibility

Two organisations felt that kerbside collection could improve the accessibility of recycling facilities for people who struggle to get to recycling centres or those who do not own cars.

Q6. Environment: Do you think that the proposals contained in this consultation are likely to have an impact on the environment?

Increased carbon footprint

Seven in ten respondents answered Q6. Several mentioned a concern about an increase in carbon emissions. Respondents felt that the kerbside collection of food waste and textiles would increase Scotland's net carbon footprint. Two main reasons were highlighted: increased haulage distances for communities without local recycling facilities and a lack of uptake undermining the benefits.

"Whilst, in principle, there could be an environmental benefit in the collection of higher volumes of textiles and the capture of food waste, this needs to be carefully considered in light of the challenges associated with implementing such a system, in particular the distance travelled by collection vehicles and then the onward transport to reprocessing centres. Ultimately, any collection system needs to be confident of a high volume of materials, otherwise there is a risk that the costs and environmental impact of the system is far higher than any potential beneficial impact." – Orkney Island Council

General positive impact

Several respondents suggested the proposal would positively impact the environment, but did not provide further details as to why. Some others mentioned that the proposals would decrease waste, which they described as generally beneficial for the environment.

Other concerns

Other concerns were raised by smaller numbers of respondents. These included, from most to least prevalent, that the proposal could:

- Undermine the waste hierarchy by promoting recycling over reuse when reuse is better for the environment and community.

- Lead to an increase in fly-tipping, littering and waste-related crimes.
- Benefit from a complete Environmental Impact Assessment.
- Lead to dangerous persistent chemicals in textiles getting into the environment if recycling processes do not handle textiles correctly.

"There is a serious risk that the proposals for kerbside textile collections from households will harm the environment by diverting used clothing away from reuse and towards recycling or incineration." - Charity Retail Association

Final comments: Do you have any other comments that you would like to make, relevant to the subjects of this consultation, that you have not covered in your answers to other questions? - Please provide your answer here.

One in ten respondents left a comment at the final question. However, these comments reiterated points noted in prior questions:

- Cost implications for local authorities, as described in Q9 of Chapter 2 and Q5 of Chapter 3.
- Negative impact on charity shop donations, described in more detail at Q9 in Chapter 2,
- The continued importance of clear communication and community education, as described in Chapter 2 at Q11.

5. Conclusions

A range of individuals and organisations with varied knowledge and experiences responded to the consultation, sharing their views on potential changes to textile recycling and the rural food waste exemption. This report provides a high-level summary of the consultation responses. For more details, readers are encouraged to read individual responses, where permission was given for publication, via the Scottish Government's consultation website.

The proposals presented in the consultation often received mixed reactions from respondents. While 61% of respondents felt that kerbside collection of textiles would benefit households, only 37% supported a proposed household collection service provided by local authorities.

Fewer respondents answered questions about the rural food waste exemption, and only half of those who did were located in an area that is currently exempt. However, views were similarly divided on the future of the rural food waste exemption, with 32% of those answering preferring to keep it as it is, 34% preferring to remove it, and 34% making other suggestions, such as amending the rural classification which was detailed by respondents in their qualitative responses.

While support for the proposals was mixed, respondents raised similar concerns about both proposals throughout their responses. These included concerns about the negative financial impact of the proposals on local authorities, with both individuals and organisations questioning whether increased costs for waste collection and recycling may have a knock-on effect on other local authority services. There was also concern about the lack of infrastructure available to recycle textiles and process food waste, particularly in rural and island communities.

Another concern, specifically related to textile recycling, was the potential negative impact that household collection could have on charity shops and reuse and resale organisations. Respondents highlighted that the proposals could impact these organisations' ability to raise funds, have negative consequences on the circular economy by diverting waste from reuse to recycling, and affect people who use charity shops for lower-cost textiles.

However, negative impacts on the groups highlighted in the consultation—people with protected characteristics, businesses or the business sector, children, and island communities—were thought to be minimal. Some respondents highlighted positive impacts on the environment throughout the consultation.

By exploring how waste services are currently used, the consultation allowed respondents to describe a range of both positive and negative impacts of changes to textile recycling and the rural food waste exemption. The responses provide valuable evidence and insight that the Scottish Government can use when undertaking any next steps to develop the proposals. Based on the responses, this could include further engagement with stakeholders, collecting additional information about the practical and financial implications of the proposed changes, particularly on the reuse and resale sector and local authorities, and updating impact assessments with relevant evidence provided by respondents.

The Scottish Government has already indicated that further engagement and consideration of these matters will be taken forward through the co-design of the new household recycling Code of Practice.

Appendix A: Quantitative Analysis

The consultation included 17 closed questions. This appendix details the responses to these questions.

Not all respondents answered every question. Some may not have answered as they hold no strong view on the question, or it may not relate to their area of knowledge or expertise. Where those who did not answer the closed questions expressed a view in their open comments, this has been noted in the qualitative analysis.

To allow comparisons across sub-groups, the tables below present the results of the closed questions **based on those who answered each question**.

For clarity, each closed question shows:

- The number of respondents who answered each question out of the total sample of 60 (column “n=”).
- The percentage of respondents **from the total sample** of 60 respondents who selected each response (grey row).
- The percentage response **among those who answered each question**, broken down by individual and organisation responses and by type of organisation (rows including and under “All answering (%)”.

Please note that the row percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

Part One: Household Textile Collection

Q1a. Do you consider your current options for textile recycling to be efficient?

Respondent type	n=	% Yes	% No	% Don’t know	% No answer
All respondents	60	37	38	12	13
All answering	**52**	**42**	**44**	**13**	**-**
Individuals	26	35	54	12	-
Organisations	26	50	35	15	-
- Local Authority	14	64	21	14	-
- Waste Management	3	67	0	33	-
- Reuse and Resale	7	14	71	14	-
- Public Body	2	50	50	0	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	0	-	-	-	-

Q1b. Do you consider your current options for textile recycling to be accessible?

Respondent type	n=	% Yes	% No	% Don't know	% No answer
All respondents	60	43	37	7	13
All answering	**52**	**50**	**42**	**8**	**-**
Individuals	26	38	58	4	-
Organisations	26	62	27	12	-
- Local Authority	14	71	14	14	-
- Waste Management	3	100	0	0	-
- Reuse and Resale	7	29	57	14	-
- Public Body	2	50	50	0	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	0	-	-	-	-

Q2. Do you believe household collection of textiles would provide benefits to householders?

Respondent type	n=	% Yes	% No	% Don't know	% No answer
All respondents	60	55	20	15	10
All answering	**54**	**61**	**22**	**17**	**-**
Individuals	26	69	23	8	-
Organisations	28	54	21	25	-
- Local Authority	14	43	21	36	-
- Waste Management	4	100	0	0	-
- Reuse and Resale	7	43	29	29	-
- Public Body	3	67	33	0	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	0	-	-	-	-

Q4. Do you believe household collection of textiles should be a service supplied by local authorities?

Respondent type	n=	% Strongly agree	% Agree	% Neither Agree or Disagree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% No Answer
All respondents	60	18	15	8	20	28	10
All answering	**54**	**20**	**17**	**9**	**22**	**31**	**-**
Individuals	26	35	27	8	15	15	-
Organisations	28	7	7	11	29	46	-
- Local Authority	14	0	14	0	36	50	-
- Waste Management	4	0	0	25	50	25	-
- Reuse and Resale	7	0	0	29	14	57	-
- Public Body	2	50	0	0	0	50	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	1	100	0	0	0	0	-

Q5. If collections of textiles from households are not a service supplied by local authorities, do you think there should be a requirement for all local authorities to offer textile recycling through Household Waste Recycling Centres or other bring facilities?

Respondent type	n=	% Yes	% No	% Don't know	% No answer
All respondents	60	73	8	7	12
All answering	**53**	**83**	**9**	**8**	**-**
Individuals	26	88	8	4	-
Organisations	27	78	11	11	-
- Local Authority	14	86	14	0	-
- Waste Management	4	50	0	50	-
- Reuse and Resale	6	83	0	17	-
- Public Body	2	50	50	0	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	1	100	0	0	-

Q6. What is the estimated number of textile items you recycle/dispose of each year?

Respondent type	n=	% 1-5	% 6-15	% 16-30	% 31-50	% > 50	% I do not recycle my textiles	% Don't know	% No Answer
All respondents	60	10	17	18	3	12	3	12	25
All answering	**45**	**13**	**22**	**24**	**4**	**16**	**4**	**16**	**-**
Individuals	26	15	31	27	8	8	8	4	-
Organisations	19	11	11	21	0	26	0	32	-
- Local Authority	10	10	10	20	0	30	0	30	-
- Waste Management	3	0	0	0	0	33	0	67	-
- Reuse and Resale	4	25	0	50	0	25	0	0	-
- Public Body	2	0	50	0	0	0	0	50	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Q7. What services are currently available in your local authority area to recycle or dispose of textiles?

Respondent type	n=	% Local Textile Bank in supermarket / car park	% Charity Shops – In Store	% Charity Shops – Household Collection	% Household Waste Recycling Centre
All respondents	**60**	**75**	**78**	**43**	**63**
Individuals	26	85	92	31	65
Organisations	34	68	68	53	62
- Local Authority	14	93	93	64	86
- Waste Management	8	38	38	38	38
- Reuse and Resale	7	57	57	43	43
- Public Body	3	67	67	67	67
- Environmental Nonprofit	2	50	50	50	50

Q8. What services do you currently use in your local authority area to recycle or dispose of textiles?

Respondent type	n=	% Local Textile Bank in supermarket / car park	% Charity Shops – In Store	% Charity Shops – Household Collection	% Household Waste Recycling Centre	% Other
All respondents	**60**	**37**	**52**	**10**	**25**	**25**
Individuals	26	50	85	15	35	23
Organisations	34	26	26	6	18	26
- Local Authority	14	43	36	14	36	36
- Waste Management	8	0	0	0	0	25
- Reuse and Resale	7	29	43	0	0	14
- Public Body	3	33	33	0	33	33
- Environmental Nonprofit	2	0	0	0	0	0

Q9. Do you foresee any barriers or unintended consequences to local authority collection of textiles at the kerbside becoming a statutory service?

Respondent type	n=	% Yes	% No	% Don't know	% No answer
All respondents	60	80	5	2	13
All answering	**52**	**92**	**6**	**2**	**-**
Individuals	26	85	12	4	-
Organisations	26	100	0	0	-
- Local Authority	13	100	0	0	-
- Waste Management	5	100	0	0	-
- Reuse and Resale	5	100	0	0	-
- Public Body	2	100	0	0	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	1	100	0	0	-

Q10. If your local authority offered household collection of textiles, how likely are you to utilise this service?

Respondent type	n=	% Very likely	% Somewhat likely	% Somewhat unlikely	% Very unlikely	% Not sure	% No Answer
All respondents	60	27	12	3	17	7	35
All answering	**39**	**41**	**18**	**5**	**26**	**10**	**-**
Individuals	26	50	23	4	19	4	-
Organisations	13	23	8	8	38	23	-
- Local Authority	6	17	17	0	33	33	-
- Waste Management	1	0	0	0	0	100	-
- Reuse and Resale	4	0	0	25	75	0	-
- Public Body	2	100	0	0	0	0	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	0	-	-	-	-	-	-

Part Two: Rural Food Waste Exemption

Q1. Are you located in an area with a rural food waste exemption?

Respondent type	n=	% Yes	% No	% Don't know	% No answer
All respondents	60	32	25	7	37
All answering	**38**	**50**	**39**	**11**	**-**
Individuals	19	37	53	11	-
Organisations	19	63	26	11	-
- Local Authority	13	77	23	0	-
- Waste Management	2	0	0	100	-
- Reuse and Resale	1	100	0	0	-
- Public Body	2	50	50	0	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	1	0	100	0	-

Q2. What is your preferred approach to the rural food waste exemption in the future?

Respondent type	n=	% Keep it as it is	% Remove it	% Other	% No answer
All respondents	60	20	22	22	37
All answering	**38**	**32**	**34**	**34**	**-**
Individuals	17	29	47	24	-
Organisations	21	33	24	43	-
- Local Authority	12	42	17	42	-
- Waste Management	4	0	50	50	-
- Reuse and Resale	2	50	0	50	-
- Public Body	2	50	0	50	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	1	0	100	0	-

Q3. If your local authority were to offer a kerbside food waste collection service, would you be likely to opt-in?

Respondent type	n=	% Very likely	% Some what likely	% Somewhat unlikely	% Very unlikely	% Not sure	% No Answer
All respondents	60	28	2	0	3	10	57
All answering	**26**	**65**	**4**	**0**	**8**	**23**	**-**
Individuals	14	71	7	0	14	7	-
Organisations	12	58	0	0	0	42	-
- Local Authority	7	43	0	0	0	57	-
- Waste Management	1	0	0	0	0	100	-
- Reuse and Resale	1	100	0	0	0	0	-
- Public Body	2	100	0	0	0	0	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	1	100	0	0	0	0	-

Q4. If you live or operate a business in an area in which the rural food waste exemption is used, what do you currently do with your food waste?

Respondent type	**n=**	**% At-home composting**	**% Take it to the local recycling centre**	**% Other**	**% No answer**
All respondents	60	5	0	30	65
All answering	**21**	**14**	**0**	**86**	**-**
Individuals	8	25	0	75	-
Organisations	13	8	0	92	-
- Local Authority	10	10	0	90	-
- Waste Management	1	0	0	100	-
- Reuse and Resale	1	0	0	100	-
- Public Body	1	0	0	100	-
- Environmental Nonprofit	0	-	-	-	-

Appendix B: Consultation Questions

Part One: Household Textile Collection

Q1a. Do you consider your current options for textile recycling to be efficient (Yes/No/Don't Know)?

Q1b. Do you consider your current options for textile recycling to be accessible (Yes/No/Don't Know)?

Q1c. If you do not consider your current options for textile recycling to be efficient and/or accessible, what improvements would you recommend? Please provide your answer here.

Q2. Do you believe household collection of textiles would provide benefits to householders (Yes/No/Don't Know)?

Q3. What potential benefits do you consider household collection of textiles would provide to householders? Please provide your answer here.

Q4. Do you believe household collection of textiles should be a service supplied by local authorities (Strongly agree/Agree/Neither Agree or Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree)? Extra note: A mandatory service would be a statutory requirement for all local authorities in Scotland to collect textiles separately as part of their waste collection services at household kerbsides. This may require a separate household recycling bin. Please provide your answer here.

Q5. If collections of textiles from households are not a service supplied by local authorities, do you think there should be a requirement for all local authorities to offer textile recycling through Household Waste Recycling Centres or other bring facilities (Yes/No/Don't Know)? Please provide your answer here.

Q6. What is the estimated number of textile items you recycle/dispose of each year (1-5/ 6-15/16-30/31-50/Over 50/I do not recycle my textiles/Don't know)?

Q7. What services are currently available in your local authority area to recycle or dispose of textiles (Local Textile Bank – Supermarket or Car Park/ Charity Shops - In Store /Charity Shops – Household Collection/ Household Waste Recycling Centre)?

Q8. What services do you currently use in your local authority area to recycle or dispose of textiles (Local Textile Bank – Supermarket or Car Park/ Charity Shops - In Store /Charity Shops – Household Collection/ Household Waste Recycling Centre/ Other)? If other, please provide your answer here.

Q9. Do you foresee any barriers or unintended consequences to local authority collection of textiles at the kerbside becoming a statutory service (Yes/No/Don't Know)? Please provide your answer here.

Q10. If your local authority offered household collection of textiles, how likely are you to utilise this service (Very likely/ Somewhat likely/ Somewhat unlikely/ Very unlikely/ Not sure)?

Q11. Do you have any additional views, regarding household collection of textiles or what you would expect a useful service to look like? Please provide your answer here.

Part Two: Rural Food Waste Exemption

Q1. Are you located in an area with a rural food waste exemption (Yes/No/Don't Know)?

Q2. What is your preferred approach to the rural food waste exemption in the future (Keep it as it is/ Remove it/ Other)? If other, lease provide your answer here.

Q3. If your local authority were to offer a kerbside food waste collection service, would you be likely to opt-in (Very likely/ Somewhat likely/ Somewhat unlikely/ Very unlikely/ Not sure)?

Q4. If you live or operate a business in an area in which the rural food waste exemption is used, what do you currently do with your food waste (At home composting/ Take it to local recycling centre/ Other)? If other, please provide your answer here.

Q5. Do you have any other views regarding the rural food waste exemption? Please provide your answer here.

Part Three: Assessing the Impact of the Proposal

Q1. Equality: Are there any additional likely impacts the proposals contained in this consultation may have on particular groups of people, with reference to protected characteristics? Please provide your answer here.

Q2. Business and Regulation: Do you think that the proposals contained in this consultation are likely to increase or reduce the costs and burdens placed on any business or sector? Please provide your answer here.

Q3. Children's Rights and Wellbeing Impact Assessment: Do you think that the proposals contained in this consultation are likely to have an impact on children's rights and wellbeing? Please provide your answer here.

Q4. Islands Communities Impact Assessment: Do you think that the proposals contained in this consultation are likely to influence an island community significantly differently from its effect on other communities in Scotland? Please provide your answer here.

Q5. Fairer Scotland Duty: Do you think that the proposals contained in this consultation are likely to have an impact in relation to the fairer Scotland duty? Please provide your answer here.

Q6. Environment: Do you think that the proposals contained in this consultation are likely to have an impact on the environment? Please provide your answer here.

Part Four: Final Comments

Q1. Do you have any other comments that you would like to make, relevant to the subjects of this consultation, that you have not covered in your answers to other questions? Please provide your answer here.

This publication is available at **www.gov.scot**

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at

The Scottish Government
St Andrew's House
Edinburgh
EH1 3DG

ISBN: 978-1-80643-483-1 (web only)

Published by The Scottish Government, November 2025

Produced for The Scottish Government by APS Group Scotland, 21 Tennant Street, Edinburgh EH6 5NA
PPDAS1680906 (11/25)

w w w . g o v . s c o t