



Scrutiny Review of Littering

To: Scrutiny Management Team

Date of meeting – 15th November 2016

Notes of Tim Horsley, Community Protection Coordinator
and David Alexander, Senior Environmental Crime Officer

Background

Littering, together with dog fouling, has consistently been one of the leading causes of concern for residents in Pendle.

Responsibility for enforcement around littering lies with the Environmental Crime Team (ECT) and the Community Protection Team (CPT); both are within the Neighbourhood Services Unit.

Although littering takes many forms it is mainly either:

- Caused by an individual dropping or throwing an item of a rubbish bag or less, or
- Associated with a business allowing its customers or others to leave litter in or around the curtilage of the business premises

The former is dealt with mainly by the Environmental Crime Officers (ECOs) on site observing or taking evidence of an offence and issuing a fixed penalty notice (FPNs). During the last financial year the number of ECOs was increased from two to four and they issued 85 FPNs for littering and 48 FPNs for littering from a vehicle; 133 in total. So far this year 67 FPNs have been issued for littering and 24 for littering from a vehicle; 91 in total and well ahead of last year.

The ECT have been involved in a Keep Britain Tidy high profile poster campaign to deter littering from parked vehicles. They have also been targeting town centres vulnerable to littering; in particular Nelson town centre.

Businesses were liable to enforcement action using Street Litter Notices. In 2014 these were replaced by Community Protection Notices (CPN) based on activity being detrimental to the quality of life of people in the locality and offering a wider remit of what could be included in terms of both behaviour and requirements to that behaviour right. CPNs were considered by the Scrutiny Management Team at its meeting in January 2016.

It is in the nature of the more random littering by individuals that one individual will not be caught sufficiently often to be considered for a CPN. They have been more useful where land, a property or a vehicle have been left in an untidy state over a period of time.

Nor has litter associated with one particular business been either so persistent or the business itself so unresponsive as to warrant the initial warning letter required by the legislation.

However, there are situations where a number of businesses together could be held responsible for litter in their locality. One area that has consistently been a concern to both Members and the Whitefield Community Association is Manchester Road in Nelson where litter is left in the street in the evening hours. This is in part due to takeaway users eating in their car and throwing the residue out at a time when neither ECT nor PCSO resources allow for an effective patrol.

The impact of littering enforcement is immediate however time limited with the result that key sites need to be re-visited from time to time.

The impact of visits to businesses is again effective but time limited with the need to re-visit. Whether a business is persistently failing to take regard is being monitored with a view to enforcement action using CPNs should the frequency of those failings allow.

Elliott House,
NELSON,
Report Author: Tim Horsley (Tel :) (01282) 661280
E-Mail: tim.horsley@pendle.gov.uk

Date: 4th November, 2016

Background Papers:

1. PSPO report to the Executive 10 December 2015