
Report to: Regeneration and Environmental Services Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Date of Meeting: 20 September 2011

Subject: Incidents of Fly tipping in the Borough

Report of: Director of Built Environment

Wards Affected: All

Is this a Key Decision? No

Is it included in the Forward Plan
No

Exempt/Confidential

No

Purpose/Summary

In response to a request from Crosby Area Committee for the matter to be referred to this committee, this report reviews the level of reported fly tipping incidents across the Borough and considers the impact of the introduction of the van permit scheme by Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority.

Recommendation(s)

To note the report

How does the decision contribute to the Council's Corporate Objectives?

	<u>Corporate Objective</u>	<u>Positive Impact</u>	<u>Neutral Impact</u>	<u>Negative Impact</u>
1	Creating a Learning Community		√	
2	Jobs and Prosperity		√	
3	Environmental Sustainability		√	
4	Health and Well-Being	√		
5	Children and Young People		√	
6	Creating Safe Communities	√		
7	Creating Inclusive Communities		√	
8	Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening Local Democracy		√	

Reasons for the Recommendation:

Report requested by Overview and scrutiny members

What will it cost and how will it be financed?

(A) Revenue Costs

None

(B) Capital Costs

None

Implications:

The following implications of this proposal have been considered and where there are specific implications, these are set out below:

Legal None
Human Resources None
Equality 1. No Equality Implication <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Equality Implications identified and mitigated <input type="checkbox"/>
3. Equality Implication identified and risk remains <input type="checkbox"/>

Impact on Service Delivery:

An increase in levels of fly tipping will impact upon the Councils resources to remove tipped waste and the capacity required to investigate and enforce against offenders.

What consultations have taken place on the proposals and when?

FD 976 – The Corporate Head of Finance and ICT has no comments to make, as there are no direct costs as a result of this report.

LD 334/11 – the Head of Legal Services has been consulted and has no comment to make.

Are there any other options available for consideration?

N/A

Implementation Date for the Decision

Immediately following the Committee meeting.

Contact Officer: Steve Smith Section Manager Environmental Public Health

Tel: 0151 934 4025

Email: steve.smith@sefton.gov.uk

Background Papers:

There are no background papers available for inspection.

1. Background

- 1.1 Fly tipping can present a significant impact upon the environment. This includes statutory nuisance, odour and harm from the potentially hazardous materials dumped, harbourage for and encouragement of rodent activity and the overall impact upon the visual amenity of a neighbourhood. It is clearly shown that environmental conditions affect peoples feeling of well-being and health. The Council has a duty to maintain the cleanliness of public areas and is empowered to investigate and prosecute the illegal deposit of waste under the provisions of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.
- 1.2 In 2009/10 approximately 947,000 fly tipping incidents were reported nationally and over 63 % of these involved household waste. The outcome of fly tipping across the Borough results in significant financial costs both to the Council, who are required to remove fly tipping from the highway, rear entry, council land etc and private land / property owners. The latter often as a result of statutory enforcement action by Officers from the Environmental Public Health section of the Built Environment Department.
- 1.3 In July 2010 the Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority (MWDA) introduced a Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) permit scheme. This scheme restricts the owners of commercial-type vehicle accessing HWRC's unless for the deposit of their own household waste. Commercial businesses and traders have previously attempted to use household waste recycling centres for free rather than pay commercial tipping charges, pushing the bill for commercial waste disposal onto council tax payers and frustrating attempts to meet higher municipal waste recycling targets. Householders who wish to access the centres using a van /flat back pick up / large trailer or similar for their own household waste are now required to get a permit.

2 Potential impact

- 2.1 It has been suggested that introduction of this scheme may have resulted in an increase in the incidents of fly tipping in the Borough particularly from either businesses / traders keen to avoid the expense of legal disposal, or householders not willing to get a permit or those turned away from the recycling centres for not having the appropriate permit. Crosby Area Committee has highlighted two areas;

Hightown and “Sefton Village” were there is a perception that incidents have increased.

2.2 Table 1 below show a breakdown of reported incidents by area for the period July 2009 – June 2010 and July 2010- June 2011. In addition it highlights the year on year difference and the percentage difference comparative to the previous period.

Table 1

Town	01/07/2009 to 30/06/2010	01/07/2010 to 30/06/2011	Total	Year on year difference	% year on year difference
Ainsdale	33	46	79	13	39%
Aintree	15	21	36	6	40%
Birkdale	86	62	148	-24	-28%
Blundellsands	3	2	5	-1	-33%
Bootle	726	917	1643	191	26%
Brighton Le Sands	23	13	36	-10	-43%
Crosby	173	155	328	-18	-10%
Formby	59	48	107	-11	-19%
Hightown	5	4	9	-1	-20%
Ince Blundell	15	24	39	9	60%
Litherland	310	341	651	31	10%
Little Crosby	4	10	14	6	150%
Lydiate	32	21	53	-11	-34%
Maghull	85	68	153	-17	-20%
Melling	83	33	116	-50	-60%
Netherton	188	218	406	30	16%
Seaforth	148	145	293	-3	-2%
Sefton	13	9	22	-4	-31%
Southport	417	421	838	4	1%
Thornton	29	45	74	16	55%
Waterloo	281	250	531	-31	-11%
Grand Total	2728	2853	5581	125	5%

2.3 Overall the total number of incident saw an increase of 5% from 2728 to 2853 during this period. Several areas showed significant percentage increase for example Little Crosby however this can be misleading when the total reported number of incidents are scrutinised. Little Crosby shows an increase from 4 to 14.

2.4 A more representative approach would be to view the total number of reports per area. In this case Bootle stands out as an area that shows an increase of 191 on the previous year from 726 to 917 (40%).

2.5 Between July 2010 & June 2011 the areas with the highest reported incidents were Bootle - 917, Southport – 421, Litherland- 341, Waterloo – 250 and Netherton – 218.

2.6 Particular concerns have been raised regarding the areas of Hightown & “Sefton Village”, Table 2 below shows the number of reported incidents for the periods and their locations. Neighbouring areas are included within the table for comparison.

Table 2

Little Crosby	01/07/2009 to 30/06/2010	01/07/2010 to 30/06/2011	Grand total
Back Lane	3	8	11
DIBB LANE	0	1	1
LITTLE CROSBY ROAD	1	1	2
Grand Total	4	10	14

Ince Blundell	01/07/2009 to 30/06/2010	01/07/2010 to 30/06/2011	Grand total
CARR HOUSE LANE	1	0	1
CROSS BARN LANE	2	2	4
EAST LANE	1	7	8
FORMBY BYPASS	1	0	1
GRANGE ROAD	2	0	2
LADY GREEN LANE	1	0	1
PARK WALL ROAD	7	15	22
Grand Total	15	24	39

Hightown	01/07/2009 to 30/06/2010	01/07/2010 to 30/06/2011	Grand total
BLUNDELL ROAD	1	0	1
GORSEY LANE	1	1	2
MAYFAIR CLOSE	1	0	1
MOSS LANE	0	1	1
SANDY LANE	1	2	3
THORNBECK AVENUE	1	0	1
Grand Total	5	4	9

Sefton	01/07/2009 to 30/06/2010	01/07/2010 to 30/06/2011	Grand total
Brickwall Lane	7	3	10
Buckley Hill Lane	0	1	1
GLEBE END	2	0	2
LONGDALE LANE	4	5	9
Grand Total	13	9	22

Thornton	01/07/2009 to 30/06/2010	01/07/2010 to 30/06/2011	Grand total
Back Lane	6	11	17
Green Lane	1	0	1
HALIFAX CRESCENT	0	1	1
HARTDALE ROAD	0	1	1
HEATHER WAY	0	1	1
HOLGATE	8	20	28
HOLGATE PARK	2	1	3
INCE ROAD	1	1	2
LONG LANE	1	1	2
LYDIATE LANE	1	0	1
LYDIATE PARK	3	0	3
PHILLIPS CLOSE	1	2	3
ROTHWELLS LANE	3	3	6

THORNFIELD ROAD	0	1	1
VIRGINS LANE	2	2	4
Grand Total	29	45	74

2.7 Some of these areas are associated with “narrow country lanes” which may present an increased opportunity for fly tippers especially at night. However Hightown and Sefton show a decrease on reported incidents and the numbers within these areas are comparable to two thirds of the Borough, as shown in table 1. Two locations do stand out; Park Wall Road and Holgate as requiring further investigation.

3 Conclusion

- 3.1 There has been a modest increase in reported fly tipping incidents. However the year on year comparisons show considerable variation across the Borough.
- 3.2 Several Areas show a significant number of fly tipping incidents, a proportion of which continue to show an increase.
- 3.3 Many factors may account for the increase in fly tipping reports. The increase and location of the reports cannot be specifically associated with the introduction of the HWRC permit scheme.
- 3.4 The Head of Corporate Finance comments that there are no financial implications as a direct result of this report.