

# **P**rotecting the **C**ity **E**nvironment

**London's response to fly tipping, litter, graffiti, fly posting and abandoned vehicles**

Report of the Environment Committee  
May 2004





# rotecting the ity nvironment

**London's response to fly tipping, litter, graffiti, fly posting and abandoned vehicles**

Report of the Environment Committee

May 2004

# copyright

**Greater London Authority**  
**May 2004**

**Published by**

Greater London Authority  
City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
London SE1 2AA

**[www.london.gov.uk](http://www.london.gov.uk)**

enquiries **020 7983 4000**

minicom **020 7983 4458**

ISBN **1 85261 639 3**

**Front and back cover photos**

ENCAMS, LFEPA and GLA

This document is printed on recycled paper

# **Protecting the City Environment**

**Report of the Environment Committee**

**May 2004**

## Chair's foreword



Issues like graffiti, litter and fly-tipping significantly affect our sense of well-being. Poll after poll shows that clean, safe streets, parks and public spaces are a priority for Londoners. Our report looks at how London can best address these problems and how weaknesses in our current approaches can be overcome.

Eradicating environmental crime is time consuming and expensive. London boroughs spend millions every year cleaning graffiti and picking up dumped rubbish - it is estimated that cleaning graffiti alone costs more than £100m every year and many

London boroughs spend over £1million a month in clearing up grime. And one dumped car can cost the tax-payer over £1000 to remove!

What was most apparent from our work was that partnership working is crucial for a swift and streamlined response to this problem. There are many examples of good practice but too often systems to share this across the board are not in place. Joint working and co-ordination between council departments, agencies, community groups and residents could speed up response times and provide a more effective service.

Campaigns to boost awareness are crucial. Raising awareness of the issue, not only with the public, but also with all those involved in tackling it at all stages, such as magistrates, is key. And single public contact points for reporting this kind of crime would help to simplify and speed up action to combat it.

We also need to ensure that existing powers are being using to their fullest extent. More robust knowledge and practice of these powers could make a big difference. Additional and clearer legislation would also be useful.

Our report is timely. Its recommendations are designed to work alongside the 'Safer Neighbourhoods' programme to boost community policing, the new community wardens, recent legislation to combat anti-social behaviour and the Mayor's 'Capital Standards' enforcement officer's academy to clean up London's street environment. We commend all of these initiatives.

This report is the result of months of research, useful visits to Croydon, Lewisham, Kings Cross, Sutton and Westminster and several stakeholder events. We have spoken to boroughs, other agencies, young people, community groups and individual residents. We are very grateful for their thoughtful and enlightening contributions.

I should also like to thank my fellow committee members Roger Evans, Diana Johnson, Brian Coleman, Darren Johnson and Graham Tope for their hard work.

Thanks must also go to Anna Malos, Natalie Adamson, Sue Riley, Jane Mulholland and our consultants, MEL research.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Samantha Heath".

**Samantha Heath, 4 May 2004**

## Environment Committee Membership & Terms of Reference

At the meeting of the Assembly on 7 May 2003, the membership and terms of reference was agreed as the following:

Samantha Heath (Chair)	Labour
Roger Evans (Deputy Chair)	Conservative
Brian Coleman	Conservative
Darren Johnson	Green
Diana Johnson	Labour
Graham Tope	Liberal Democrat

The terms of reference of the committee are as follows:

1. To examine and report from time to time on -
  - the strategies, policies and actions of the Mayor and the Functional Bodies
  - matters of importance to Greater London
2. To examine and report to the Assembly from time to time on the Mayor's Air Quality, Biodiversity, Energy, Noise and Waste Strategies, in particular their implementation and revision.
3. To consider environmental matters on request from another standing committee and report its opinion to that standing committee.
4. To take into account in its deliberations the cross cutting themes of: the health of persons in Greater London; and the promotion of opportunity.
5. To respond on behalf of the Assembly to consultations and similar processes when within its terms of reference.

### Assembly Secretariat Contacts

Anna Malos, Assistant Scrutiny Manager  
020 7983 4421  
[anna.malos@london.gov.uk](mailto:anna.malos@london.gov.uk)

Sue Riley, Committee Co-ordinator  
020 7983 4425  
[sue.riley@london.gov.uk](mailto:sue.riley@london.gov.uk)

Kelly Flynn, Senior Media Officer  
020 7983 4067  
[kelly.flynn@london.gov.uk](mailto:kelly.flynn@london.gov.uk)

# **Contents**

## **Chair's Foreword**

## **Executive Summary**

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. A co-ordinated response**
- 3. Fly tipping**
- 4. Litter**
- 5. Graffiti**
- 6. Fly posting**
- 7. Abandoned Cars**
- 8. Overview**

Annex A – List of Recommendations

Annex B – Evidence cited

Annex C – Evidence submitted

Annex D – Orders and translations

Annex E – Scrutiny principles



## **Abstract**

The Protecting the City Environment report assesses London's response to fly tipping, litter, graffiti, fly posting and abandoned vehicles.

In order to reduce the impact of these issues, there needs to be a co-ordinated response to address the motivation and causes of the issues as well as tackle the symptoms. Desired behaviour must be made easy and attractive. Undesired behaviour must be made less acceptable and more difficult, including through effective enforcement.

While examples of good practice exist, these need to be shared more effectively and current activities and legislation still ought to be improved. Boroughs need to engage with their communities and work across departments and agencies in order to increase people's belief that their actions matter and will improve where they live. Boroughs and other relevant agencies must create systems which allow straightforward reporting of problems and rapid response.

Swift and co-ordinated action is vital to tackle the increase of fly tipping and the involvement of organised crime.

## Executive Summary

As demonstrated repeatedly in public opinion polls, the maintenance and appearance of our streets, parks and other public spaces are of major concern to Londoners. The Protecting the City Environment scrutiny therefore considered the impact of fly tipping; litter; graffiti; fly posting; and abandoned vehicles. Our report discusses how London is addressing these issues and any weaknesses in the approaches used.

The motivations behind the behaviour creating each of these issues are very different; therefore resolutions also need to be varied to tackle the problem effectively by acting on the causes as well as the symptoms. A combination of services offered, education and overall approach needs to encourage people to feel it is worth caring for their local area.

To this end, action should be taken to make desired behaviour easy and attractive and undesired behaviour less acceptable, more difficult and more liable to punishment. There also need to be good systems in place to allow straightforward reporting of problems and rapid clear-up afterwards.

We welcome the many examples of good practice and innovation that is used but believe that some local authorities still need to improve how they address these problems. We would encourage joint working between Council departments, with other agencies, community groups and residents. Co-ordination of community policing units and street warden initiatives will be especially important.

Fly tipping is of particular concern to us because of the evidence we heard about the increasing problem of large scale dumping of commercial waste. We were shocked to hear of the profits that can be made from this and nature of the individuals involved. We recommend a number of actions to reduce this problem, particularly through increasing powers of enforcement and initiatives to prevent the illegal disposal of construction waste. We would like to see the earliest possible introduction of the proposed National Fly tipping Abatement Force through a pilot in the London and Thames Gateway regions.

We would like to encourage better use of measures to designing out unacceptable behaviour. The choice of which measures are appropriate depend on the exact location and the problem in that area, but include: increasing pedestrian use and natural surveillance, special paint surfaces, lattice style shutters for shops, slatted hoardings, improved lighting and CCTV.

Educational campaigns and awareness raising are an important part of action to improve our public spaces and the way people behave in them. Effective campaigns need to consider their multiple audiences, their different attitudes and the mechanisms and messages to reach them.

Boroughs, Transport for London and companies managing stations and other transport interchanges should reconsider how to provide litter disposal in a safe manner. Examples include the use of transparent bags instead of bins for high security areas and bins capable of withstanding fire in arson prone areas.

Boroughs must use all the voluntary and statutory measures at their disposal to reduce fly posting and improve clear up, including the possibility of introducing legal sites and working with relevant businesses. We also recommend further changes to legislation to improve enforcement.

The problem of abandoned vehicles should be greatly reduced with the introduction of new initiatives. However this situation needs to be closely monitored by local authorities through the Association of London Government so that the effectiveness of these measures can be tested.

# 1 Introduction

## Background

- 1.1 The maintenance and appearance of our streets, parks and other public spaces are frequently a cause of concern to Londoners when they consider their quality of life in the capital. As an example of these concerns by Londoners, public opinion polls and surveys show that cleanliness of streets is one of the most important issues for residents. In this report, we use the term public space in its widest sense, to refer to the areas of London which the public use, and are visible to them, regardless of who owns or manages the land.
- 1.2 This level of concern was the motivation for the Protecting the Environment scrutiny which covers a wide range of issues that affect the world outside our front door. The Committee received nearly 150 written submissions of information from individuals, community groups, local authorities and private companies. We visited Croydon, King's Cross, Lewisham, Sutton and Westminster to find out more about how these issues affected Londoners and how they were being tackled. The workshop session held in December 2003 on Designing out Crime also formed an important part of the evidence for the scrutiny.
- 1.3 Information previously gathered by the Committee on envirocrime and creating a safer public realm fed into our investigation. Also the scrutiny allowed the Assembly to follow up our previous work on Graffiti in London produced in May 2002 and certain aspects of Green Spaces in London November 2001.
- 1.4 Our scrutiny has already resulted in reports on related issues from evidence during our investigation. The following reports, were published in February 2004 and are available at <http://www.london.gov.uk/assembly/reports/environment.jsp>:
  - Raising the Standard? Review of the Capital Standards Campaign to improve street cleanliness
  - EU Directives affecting waste electrical and electronic equipment
  - Young London Speaks: young people's views on improving the street environment.

## Scope of the scrutiny

- 1.5 This report considers the impact of the following issues on the city environment: graffiti and fly posting; fly tipping and dumping; abandoned vehicles; and litter. Our report considers how London is addressing these issues and any weaknesses in approach and actions taken. We aim to describe the degree to which each issue is a problem, along with its causes and consequences, and make recommendations where appropriate.
- 1.6 Throughout the report, we aim to identify good practice both in having co-ordinated systems to address problems and in addressing each specific issue<sup>1</sup>. We consider existing initiatives and measures to address the problems as well as new proposals. The introduction of the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2004 and related measures has been key, as have recent changes to local authority powers.
- 1.7 Most of this behaviour is about low level criminality, albeit often with a significant impact for the rest of the community, however some fly tipping or illegal dumping is

---

<sup>1</sup> Case studies are drawn from work by MEL research for the Committee. See Annex B for information.

the result of highly lucrative organised crime. The evidence we heard suggests that this is an increasing problem of great concern due to the level of violence to which those involved are prepared to resort. Fly tipping is therefore an important emphasis of this report.

### **Tackling the issues affecting publicly used space**

- 1.8 Publicly used space is under a wide variety of ownership with equally varied responsibility for upkeep. Despite this, people like a consistent and reasonable standard of appearance and maintenance regardless. From the point of view of many Londoners, all the matters that our investigation considered are part of the same, wider, issue – i.e. the nature of their streets and public spaces and how this affects their feelings of pride and safety in the areas where they live, work and spend their leisure time.
- 1.9 However, as well as having an overall approach which recognizes this view, local authorities and other agencies also have to consider the particular characteristics of each issue. Motivations behind each are very different and therefore resolutions also need to be varied to tackle the problem effectively and act on the causes. It should be recognized that whilst most people view all the issues here alike, others have a different response on each issue. For example some people find posters a useful way of finding out information about music and events, and may view certain kinds of graffiti as art and therefore would not consider either as an indicator of a ‘bad’ area<sup>2</sup>.
- 1.10 The issues need to be addressed coherently and on different fronts to try and tackle the causes as well as the symptoms. This needs a joint approach by local authorities, government, community organisations and other relevant bodies e.g. social landlords. A combination of services offered, education and overall approach should encourage people to obey the law and have community pride so that people feel it is worth caring for their local area.
- 1.11 To this end, action should be taken to:
- make desired behaviour easy: provide alternative ways of meeting the need/desire for the motivation (e.g. clear, convenient waste disposal arrangements, legal poster sites),
  - make behaviour that creates problems less acceptable: increase pride in area and in doing ‘the right thing’, seek to change behaviour through education campaigns and work with the community
  - make behaviour that creates problems more difficult: through design measures and community attitudes
  - make behaviour that creates problems more liable to appropriate punishment and effective enforcement: fines etc well-known and consistently applied; punishment of those that offend should aim to contribute towards the cost of dealing with crime and to act as a preventative measure
  - allow straightforward reporting of problems and rapid clear-up
- 1.12 Due to the specific nature of fly tipping, litter, abandoned vehicles, graffiti and fly posting the first four of these points are dealt with in the individual chapter on each issue. Examples of good practice and our views on straightforward reporting and action systems are dealt with in the next chapter on co-ordinating responses.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Young London Speaks*, London Assembly Environment Committee, February 2004

## 2 A co-ordinated response

- 2.1 It is clear from the individuals and community groups who wrote to us that views differ in how much litter, graffiti, illegal posters and dumping are all a similar part of the same bigger issue about the quality of where they live. For many, these issues equally affect their sense of security in and enjoyment of public spaces. However, as mentioned above this is not true for everyone, especially young people who do not always have a negative view of fly posting and certain kinds of more colourful graffiti.<sup>3</sup>
- 2.2 Even with this variety of opinion there is agreement that where there are problems, they should be addressed coherently to try and tackle the causes as well as the symptoms.
- 2.3 The Committee welcomes attempts by local authorities, community organisations and other relevant groups, especially housing associations, to change people's attitudes and motivations. There are many excellent projects to increase people's feelings of pride and sense of ownership and control over where they live. This is key to addressing all of the issues considered in our investigation.
- 2.4 Boroughs also have school-based schemes to educate children about the problems that can be caused by litter, dumping and graffiti. For most local authorities these schemes are linked to the London-wide London Schools Environment Award. Work in schools by the Metropolitan Police and the London Fire Brigade also seeks to make young people realise the repercussions of their behaviour and to try and involve them in more constructive activities. Southwark has created three posts to work specifically on raising awareness and education as part of the borough's overall approach to improving the street environment.<sup>4</sup>
- 2.5 As mentioned above we think it is important that residents can see that a local authority is addressing problems in a street in a co-ordinated manner. A number of local authorities have introduced teams to tackle all issues in a street, rather than having a different officer or department to deal with the matter depending on the nature of the problem. The latter has tended to produce a fragmented response for the public. We saw an example of good practice in the use of such 'Street Teams' during our visit to Sutton<sup>5</sup> and similar measures are in place in 12 town centres in Barnet<sup>6</sup>. Street Action Teams are used in Southwark in conjunction with voluntary 'Street Leaders' who provide information and evidence to improve the response for cleaning up after incidents and to improve enforcement<sup>7</sup>.
- 2.6 A poor environment contributes to people feeling it is irrelevant how they act. Not only will they be more likely to contribute to problems or try and prevent others from doing so, but they will also be less likely to report problems. In this way an initial incident can result in a downward spiral.
- 2.7 Addressing this problem is the idea behind intensive cleansing initiatives, where a concerted effort is made to bring an area up to a standard of which the community can be proud. An example of this is Barnet's 'block cleanse' scheme which is aimed to be provided three times per year for each street. Street Enforcement Officers carry out inspections two weeks ahead of the cleansing team's arrival to allow

---

<sup>3</sup> p 7, *Young London Speaks*, op cit

<sup>4</sup> Andrew Chandler, London Borough of Southwark. Oral evidence, 6 November 2003.

<sup>5</sup> Council officers. Oral evidence, Environment Committee visit, London Borough of Sutton, October 2003.

<sup>6</sup> Dominic Campbell, London Borough of Barnet written evidence, October 2003.

<sup>7</sup> Phil Davies, London Borough of Southwark, written evidence, October 2003.

remedial works to be completed. Residents are advised of the date by letter drop and the schedule is advertised on the web. The scheme currently operates on weekdays, but this may be expanded to weekends if that allows an area to be cleaned more easily.<sup>8</sup>

- 2.8 In other local authorities, such as Sutton, their use of street teams has a similar impact. All problems which detract from the quality of the street environment are addressed by the team. They are either cleansed or reported for action by the team on a street-by-street basis and the teams have a schedule of streets to work through on a rota. Southwark has 'street action teams' which work with voluntary 'street leaders' who provide information on problems and often provide evidence to improve enforcement.
- 2.9 Clean up days are also used in many areas and these may be initiated by the community, local council or by housing associations and other concerned bodies. Again, one of the aims of these is to create a step change in people's pride in an area and set a high standard that cleansing contracts should meet. As well as members of the local community, these ideally involve people from the important organisations in the area. By taking joint action there can be a great sense of achievement, a major improvement in the quality of an area alongside awareness raising and improved contact between relevant people.<sup>9</sup>
- 2.10 Our visit to the Bemerton Estate<sup>10</sup> showed starkly the problems that arise when responsibilities are highly divided. In this case, responsibilities are split between the Council, the Tenant Management Organisation, Hyde Northside and Council contractors. This means that residents find it difficult to get problems resolved as they do not know whom to contact. The Council is trying to address the problems on the estate through the North Kings Cross Neighbourhood management project. One of their first actions was to organise joint clean up events as the start of improving coordination between organisations.
- 2.11 Designing out crime measures should be encouraged in a number of ways to ensure that we learn from good practice and create communities that are pleasant to live and work in. Few examples of design measures and guidelines have been evaluated fully, despite efforts by the police, some local authorities, the Home Office and the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE). There ought to be further efforts to improve the information available to developers, architects, designers and the public, and awareness of sources of existing information.
- 2.12 Attendees at the Designing Out Crime workshop stressed that care must be taken over which design features are used. There was concern to avoid prison-like communities with high fences, isolated within gates and with over-reliance on hard landscaping. Of greater importance is the need to create a dynamic community and increase natural surveillance by increasing the number of people who use and can look out on public spaces. The maintenance and cleansing of areas was also generally considered to be as, if not more, important, than the design. Furthermore, it was widely agreed that design measures would not work unless they were part of a wider approach to increase community involvement in the management of their area and their sense of local pride.

---

<sup>8</sup> Dominic Campbell, Barnet, op cit.

<sup>9</sup> Daniel Harrison, on behalf of Transport of Environment Committee, Association of London Government, written evidence, March 2004

<sup>10</sup> Oral evidence. Environment Committee visit to King's Cross area, October 2003.

- 2.13 However, where a crime hotspot is identified, there often are measures that can reduce the problem by changing physical aspects of area. These include improving lighting, introducing CCTV, moving the location of street furniture, and changing access to an area. The type of fences and shutters, choice of surfaces for street furniture and hoardings, and the use of murals, can also be important.
- 2.14 The Metropolitan Police Service has design advisers as part of their crime prevention work. Hammersmith and Fulham and Tower Hamlets were both cited as examples of areas where there is particularly effective joint working between these officers, the local authority and developers.<sup>11</sup>
- 2.15 We would welcome more use of the planning system and planning guidance to improve new developments and renovations. An example of good practice in this is Tower Hamlets who have issued a guidance note on Designing out Crime. Forthcoming supplementary planning guidance to the London Plan on Urban Design and on Sustainable Design and Construction should set standards as well as provide information on good practice and sources of support.

*Recommendation 1*

**The Committee believes that proposed supplementary planning guidance to the London Plan on design issues should include information on designing out crime, and that boroughs should consider issuing planning guidance notes on the subject. We also believe that further initiatives are needed to evaluate and promote good practice for design measures to reduce crime.**

- 2.16 The Committee heard about improved systems for tracking problems and identifying hotspots by analysing reported incidents. Barnet uses the FirstStat system. This can provide mapping of incidents and graphic illustration of the number of incidents reported at a site which allows improved targeting of response and resources<sup>12</sup>. Newham has been using its monitoring system to compare how different policies and activities have affected problems in particular areas of the borough. Southwark has introduced an improved reporting system for council officers, which makes it easier to communicate across departments. Westminster has introduced a new system which allows better co-ordination with its cleansing services contractors and can enables officers to manage the contract more efficiently.

*Recommendation 2*

**Boroughs need simple, co-ordinated reporting systems for incidents of dumping, graffiti and other problems, for use by residents, officers and contracted staff. The monitoring of reports from these systems should inform the allocation of resources and track the response to reported problems.**

- 2.17 Street warden schemes can be a useful means of reducing problems in our streets and public spaces, whether they are employed through housing associations or the local authority. However, although generally considered effective, our *Young London Speaks* report showed that this effectiveness depended on how individual wardens acted.<sup>13</sup> In some cases the wardens did not interact well with the community, particularly with young people, and so had had less of an impact.

---

<sup>11</sup> Designing out Crime workshop, 4 December 2003

<sup>12</sup> Dominic Campbell, op cit

<sup>13</sup> pp 13-14 *Young London Speaks*, op cit

Another issue is that currently wardens are only present in some of the areas that would benefit from them.

- 2.18 The increase in community policing through the Safer Neighbourhoods programme (which creates dedicated community police units and the introduction of more Community Support Officers) is intended to reduce crime of all kinds due to the greater level of uniformed presence on the street. The Safer Neighbourhoods programme is part of the wider Step Change initiative.
- 2.19 Co-ordination between the Metropolitan Police and local warden schemes will be essential for effective use of resources and to ensure that all communities have the benefit of increased formal supervision in their areas where necessary. The extension to Community Support Officers of the power to issue fixed penalty notices for such offences as littering, graffiti and fly posting should make their work more effective.
- 2.20 We were interested to see how the co-ordination between these different officers and the street cleansing teams operated in Westminster during our site visit<sup>14</sup> and would encourage other areas to set up formal mechanisms to co-ordinate, as well as encouraging informal contact between staff if they have not already done so.

*Recommendation 3*

**The Committee welcomes the aspirations of the Safer Neighbourhoods programme of the Metropolitan Police service to create community policing units. This must be co-ordinated with existing street warden initiatives to ensure a coherent approach. Measurable indicators should be established and evaluated to demonstrate the effectiveness of this programme in tackling envirocrime. As recommended in *Young London Speaks* these programmes should specifically address the concerns of young people and ensure their constructive involvement.**

- 2.21 It will be interesting to see if increased numbers of street wardens and community based police can improve the gathering of evidence against those who damage our public spaces. We can see that there may be two benefits; firstly that there will be more professionals on our streets who may witness events, and secondly that members of the public may feel that they are more able to give evidence without fear of reprisals.
- 2.22 We would like to stress the importance of sharing good practice, and we welcome initiatives to encourage this. Examples of initiatives include the Together Academy and Hotline, co-ordinated by the Home Office, and the Capital Standards Campaign which encompasses issue-based working groups e.g. on graffiti and enforcement training for council officers.
- 2.23 The Together Academy and Hotline aim to enable practitioners and community members to become confident in using the powers available to them and to be aware of which bodies have complementary powers. It also gives them access to innovative and creative solutions and enables them to network and share knowledge and successes.<sup>15</sup> London also has a number of groups covering particular geographic areas or issues which are also useful in encouraging co-ordinated working and the sharing of good practice. These include the North London Strategic partnership and South West Action Against Graffiti (SWAAG).

---

<sup>14</sup> Council officers. Oral evidence, Environment Committee visit to City of Westminster, November 2003.

<sup>15</sup> For details see <http://www.together.gov.uk/index.html> or contact the Home Office.



#### *Recommendation 4*

**Despite many good initiatives and examples of good practice, some local authorities still need to improve joint working between Council departments, other agencies, community groups and residents. Mechanisms for improvement include existing joint working groups to address specific issues such as South West Action Against Graffiti, the North London Strategic Partnership and Capital Standard groups.**

- 2.24 The Government's vision for improving the public realm (Living Places: Cleaner, Safer, Greener) in 2003 proposed reforms to the legislative framework to clarify and improve the statutory powers, rights and responsibilities. A number of these measures have been brought forward in legislation and others are in the pipeline. However, it is important that resources are available to the necessary bodies in order for this vision to be delivered, particularly where new duties have been introduced. It is also important that initiatives and funding regimes are sufficiently flexible to allow delivery mechanisms to be locally appropriate.

### European Case Studies

Many cities around the world are trying to tackle street cleanliness. Each city is unique, with different populations, structure, and attitudes to waste; and London is particularly large and diverse. Two case studies from Europe are detailed here and although neither can provide a like-for-like comparison, their methods have proved successful.

#### **Madrid**

Madrid's main cleansing contractor commissioned Environmental Campaigns (ENCAMS) in 1994 to undertake a detailed technical study in order to identify the causes of, and solutions to the unsatisfactory standards present in some parts of the city.

The report covered issues relating to service operations, the selection and use of cleansing equipment, the design and management of the local environment, including traffic management, and highway and landscape design, and the behaviour and attitudes of people and businesses. The recommendations were fully implemented by the client and Madrid City Council.

In 1998, ENCAMS was requested to evaluate standards in the city centre, and to extend the process to include a peripheral housing area. The 1998 report recommendations are now being implemented, including the introduction of new designs of street furniture, maintenance methods and equipment. The evaluation was repeated in 2003.

#### **2003 Findings**

The standard of street cleansing in the City has risen by a remarkable 11 Standard Quality Intervals (SQI) on a 16 point scale, which runs from -8 to +8 SQI. Madrid's achievement in 2003 is the highest standard that ENCAMS encountered in a densely developed urban environment.

Overall, in 97% of the areas surveyed street cleansing was of a 'Good' or 'Satisfactory' standard, and on a remarkable 56% of sites there was either no litter present or only a few small items. Significant improvements have been achieved not only in cleansing, but also in most other elements that contribute to local environmental quality, including: litter bins; detritus (dust and grit); fly posting; legally and illegally parked vehicles; and especially, the physical condition of paved areas.

Overall, the performance recorded by this survey is remarkable considering Madrid's population density, complex land uses, and continuing difficulties of physical obstruction to the delivery of local environmental maintenance services. Traffic management and enforcement are particularly high on the agenda for further improvement works. The majority of cleansing is manual, rather than mechanical, which is the opposite of the situation in the UK.

The initial rise was a result of better, more targeted resource management and cross-departmental working. The second rise was a result of engaging with third parties, an injection of cash and the use of new equipment. The third rise, to the current impressive standard, has largely been from high investment.

Since the project started in the early 90s to 1998 the equivalent of approximately £44 million had been spent on improving the quality of the issues highlighted from surveys. Since then even more money has been invested in improvements. Areas of improvement include:

- increased staff retention
- reduced sickness amongst staff and
- reduction from 7% to 2% of litter being dog fouling

Initiatives carried out included:

- An industrial designer has been employed to look specifically at street furniture
- Equipment specification
- Urban design / planning
- Community engagement
- Street refurbishment programme

### **Barcelona**

The city is focusing its attention on particular aspects of an evaluation report, commissioned from ENCAMS, to prioritise action. The key to success is the partnership working of a wide group of people in the city.

- Tracking the downside of tourism through cost / benefit analysis.
- Street based refuse collection and sorting.
- Fly posting – identification of sources and causes e.g. community notices, flat advertising, commercial entertainment
- All stakeholders sign a civic agreement and have individual action plans (night clubs, cinemas, outlets, etc) for the 180 stakeholders and other government agencies. The annual meeting involves over 300 people and provides an enabling role for the local authority.
- The majority of cleansing is carried out at night, when areas can be cleaned more effectively.

## UK Case Studies

These case studies look at tackling fast food litter, littering on railway land, use of wardens and abandoned vehicles. Some of these case studies show that things don't always work out as planned, but some important lessons can be learnt.

### **Stoke on Trent – Eat Neat**

Stoke on Trent Council designed and implemented an anti-fast food litter campaign known as Eat Neat. They identified areas within the city centre with particular problems through an ENCAMS Local Environmental Quality Survey (LEQS). In these areas bin provision was improved and a campaign devised. The Eat Neat branding was developed by a professional advertising agency following unsuccessful approaches to the local university. The campaign was run on the local commercial radio station and involved daily prize draws of named and addressed litter items placed by the public in specially marked litter bins around the city centre. Litter in the area has shown a marked improvement since the campaign.

### **Attempting joint work with fast food multi-nationals**

Birmingham City Council identified three areas in which to target campaigns against fast food litter. These were the city centre, an affluent suburban shopping area (Sutton Coldfield) and an urban village (Moseley). The initial stages of the work focused on characterising the litter found in these locations while later stages hinged on co-operation from McDonald's which was not forthcoming in the timescale. Community wardens were used as the delivery mechanism in Moseley. The project has found that the fast food business is more complex than might have been thought and that there are problems in dealing with multi-nationals.

### **Approaches to difficulties with working on railway land**

Whilst the examples below all date from the period when Railtrack rather than Network Rail was responsible for railways, they highlight relevant issues and ideas.

Birmingham City Council planned a joint project with Railtrack aimed at identifying and removing fly tipping, dealing with trackside litter and preventing and removing graffiti. An initial problem was that only qualified people could access Railtrack land. This was overcome by employing Birse, a company that employs Railtrack accredited staff. Identifying potential perpetrators was made easier by purchasing global positioning equipment. A project was devised to assess whether removing line of sight discourages graffiti, but little progress was made because of lack of co-operation from Railtrack.

Lewisham worked with Railtrack, and now Network Rail, to carry out environmental enhancements to several areas of railway land in the Borough. Six areas were identified but efforts have focused on two of these: railway land that runs through the Winslade Estate, and the area from St John's station to Lewisham Station. In these areas, Railtrack cleared fly tipped waste and erected higher fences. Legal action is being taken against some companies. The local Tenants Association have been involved in the projects. Railtrack has also supplied posters that have been put up in fly tipping hot spots and leaflets that have been distributed to residents. The local Tenants and Residents Associations have been involved, and in one area, neighbourhood wardens. Lewisham Council publicises successful prosecutions to act as a deterrent to would-be tippers.

land:

1. large scale commercial fly tipping on an area immediately adjacent to railway tracks
2. domestic fly tipping on a railway embankment
3. pigeons roosting under railway bridges
4. less than ideal station environments

A working group was formed consisting of the Council, Railtrack, the Police, and a private pest control company. This group successfully tackled the four problems through clean-ups, community involvement, leafleting and trying an innovative approach to discouraging pigeons from roosting. The group worked by placing peer pressure on the other members to drive things forward.

South Holland District Council worked with Railtrack to improve the visual appearance of a short line of track in the centre of Spalding. The main problem was littering from the station platform and an overhead pedestrian bridge. From time to time abandoned cars were also an issue on an adjacent area of land. A local contact was made in Railtrack and a meeting was held on the trackside together with a local Councillor. As a result of this meeting, litter levels and associated complaints decreased. Discussions were also held about adjacent areas of Railtrack land, and these are continuing.

### **Partnership and Wardens**

Thames 21 – The Development of a Canal Wardening Scheme<sup>16</sup>

The focus of the project was on London's canals and to develop best practice guidelines for a warden scheme for canals, rivers, inland lakes and estuaries to which the public have access. Data has been gathered by developing a version of the ENCAMS LEQ survey. The scheme recruited volunteers from a wide variety of backgrounds and established 40 full-time 'Canal Keepers'. Volunteers came from a wide range of London communities not just from people who always volunteer. Guidance for the volunteers was written, and they were provided with a rolling programme of health and safety training and a mini graffiti removal kit. As a result the amount of graffiti and litter has been reduced.

Other initiatives as part of the project included an 'adopt a canal' project in Southall with clean up events. The project now wants to challenge anti-social behaviour in a non-confrontational way. This includes problems like littering, dog fouling and minor vandalism.

---

<sup>16</sup> ENCAMS LEQ Pathfinder Programme 2003

### 3 Fly tipping

- 3.1 Fly tipping or illegal dumping can be divided into three types: domestic dumping, small scale commercial dumping and large scale commercial dumping (adapted from work by Lift 1984). 47% of Londoners polled felt that dumped household waste was a problem or major problem. 26% thought dealing with abandoned/dumped household waste was one of their three priorities for improving London's environment.
- 3.2 Even small amounts of waste can blight the lives of residents and workers if the same area is subject to repeated dumping. This can create a vicious circle because waste often attracts waste. For this reason, dumping around bins and recycling areas can also be a problem.
- 3.3 In order to reduce the nuisance of fly tipping, boroughs must not only concentrate on clearing up afterwards, but we would encourage the investment of resources, to make it easier to dispose of waste correctly, make it harder to dump waste in hotspots, and in greater prosecution of offenders. These actions should result in a lower level of fly tipping and so lower costs in the long run. It is encouraging that many local authorities are showing good practice in identifying problem areas and addressing why the problems occur in that area.
- 3.4 Domestic dumping can be of normal waste discarded at the wrong time or place, or of bulky items of rubbish which are not picked up as part of the normal collection. Some householders may feel forced into this by lack of storage space, or may be ignorant of collection arrangements, or simply want to avoid personal inconvenience. Small scale commercial dumping is normally caused by businesses wishing to avoid paying for waste collection and disposal. Larger scale commercial dumping is intended purely to make money in a way that cannot be explained by ignorance of collection types or restrictions, and covers all illegal dumping by companies or individuals who have been paid to dispose of this waste.
- 3.5 Large scale dumping ranges from the 'man with a van' operator through to highly organised gangs who arrange the dumping of tonnes of waste in one hit. It is of great concern to the Committee due to the evidence we heard about its nature and increasing scale. As one local authority officer put it: "Drug barons are moving out of drugs and into fly tipping. There is more money in it, and less risk"<sup>17</sup>.
- 3.6 According to Chris Birks, Director of Thames Region for the Environment Agency:

There is increasing evidence of organised criminal fly tippers illegally disposing of large loads in ... London... They are extremely efficient at disposing of the material, and often return once the waste has been removed to dump further loads.
- 3.7 Clearly which type of fly tipping is the greatest problem in any area will depend on the nature of that area. A large number of high street shops and a high density of commercial activities will result in problems with trade waste. Likewise, high density residential areas, particularly where there are a large number of multiple-occupancy dwellings and conversions, will tend to have problems with domestic dumping. Problems with large scale commercial fly tipping tend to occur in areas where there are significant construction and redevelopment projects or proximity to major arterial routes.

---

<sup>17</sup> Gail Lovell, Highway Enforcement, London Borough of Waltham Forest. Oral evidence, 20 November 2003.

- 3.8 A key difference is that small scale dumping of domestic or commercial waste is mainly by people who live and or work in the area, whereas large scale dumping is not. Local authorities therefore can reduce small scale dumping by changing behaviour through working with their residential and business communities, whereas tackling large scale dumping can only be through enforcement and design measures. The best set of approaches in each area will therefore vary due to the differences in which type of dumping is most prevalent.
- 3.9 The cost of dealing with fly tipping varies greatly between local authorities according to whether they are subject to large scale tipping. However in an Environmental Campaigns (ENCAMS) survey, 90% of local authorities felt it was a 'significant' or 'major' problem. The average number of complaints handled by London boroughs was 2961 in 2001/02, six times the national figure, at an average of 804 locations.<sup>18</sup>
- 3.10 The Thames region of the Environment Agency has recorded an increase of 70% to 1,100 serious incidents. Across England and Wales, the Agency estimated that fly tipping costs land owners and the taxpayer £100 million per year<sup>19</sup>. A significant proportion of these costs, and thousands of incidents each year, occur in London.
- 3.11 The London Borough of Lewisham reported that their costs to clear up 13, 600 fly tipping incidents in 2002 were more than £500 000 and that these costs were 50% higher than the year before which were in turn a 50% increase from 2000.<sup>20</sup> Boroughs reported to the Environment Agency costs of between £40, 000 and £1 million per year for clearance of dumping that required action other than covered by their core cleansing contract.<sup>21</sup>
- 3.12 The mapping of incidents of dumping shows that many areas have hotspots where there is repeated dumping. Physical prevention measures can reduce or eliminate these hotspots. Possibilities include redesign of areas including the use of gates, bollards or width restrictions. The installation of CCTV can act as a deterrent as well as providing evidence for enforcement. Whilst requiring investment up front, preventative measures can save money by eliminating the need for costly clearing up.

#### *Preventing large scale illegal disposal of commercial waste*

- 3.13 The cost for legal disposal of commercial waste is already substantial and these costs are rising. This is due to a shift towards charging for disposal so that all environmental costs are covered and not merely the cost of burying or incinerating the waste. This includes the need to take more stringent measures to improve safe disposal of hazardous waste. In addition, London is running out of suitable sites for landfill. This will mean that the distance that waste must be transported will increase with a resultant increase in cost and inconvenience. Such increases will clearly result in a higher likelihood of illegal disposal and greater profitability for those involved in such activities.
- 3.14 It is estimated that people involved in illegal waste disposal can profit by up to £1 million per year<sup>22</sup>. Not only is this level of profit from criminal activity abhorrent, but

---

<sup>18</sup> ENCAMS 2003 fly tipping survey.

<sup>19</sup> Chris Birks, Director of Thames Region, Environment Agency. Written evidence, October 2003.

<sup>20</sup> Defra, Fly tipping strategy. February 2004

<sup>21</sup> Chris Birks op cit.

<sup>22</sup> Defra, Consultation on statutory directions to the Environment Agency and waste collection authorities on the unlawful disposal of waste. February 2004

the Committee were also shocked by evidence of the response of these people when tackled. As explained by Daniel Harrison of the ALG:

There was one person whose vehicle they [the police involved in an enforcement exercise] did manage to seize, and took it to the local authority pound. The guy turned up. When they refused to give it back to him, he set fire to the pound manager. They are incredibly violent people.

- 3.15 Suggestions for a National Fly tipping Abatement Force need to be progressed rapidly because of the seriousness of fly tipping and its increase. The Committee would welcome a regional pilot in London if this would allow an earlier start to the initiative. This must have police involvement because of the danger of confronting some of these individuals.

*Recommendation 5*

**The Committee would welcome a regional pilot in the London and Thames Gateway area for the proposed National Fly Tipping Abatement Force because of the prevalence of fly tipping if this would speed up the introduction of the Force.**

- 3.16 Many major fly tipping incidents in London involve construction waste.<sup>23</sup> We therefore support proposals by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) for site waste plans for construction sites with funding to allow monitoring of whether the plan is followed. Greenwich is using this approach through making such a plan part of planning permission consent with funding from Section 106 money for an officer to audit their waste disposal.<sup>24</sup>

*Recommendation 6*

**Developers must ensure that they and their contractors do not use illegal waste disposal operators. To allow for this to be monitored all construction site plans should have clear plans for their waste, and resources should be identified by the planning authority to check that these plans are followed. This will be of particular importance in the Thames Gateway because of the proposed level of development.**

- 3.17 The increase in incidents of dumping of hazardous waste such as asbestos is also of great concern and action is needed to allow better monitoring of companies employed to carry out site clearance.
- 3.18 We were interested in the idea that companies should be required to show their waste transfer note and registration before they would be allowed to advertise their services, as part of action to prevent people from using companies that are operating illegally given the substantial number of companies and self-employed operators that advertise.

*Recommendation 7*

**The Committee recommend Defra and DTI investigate the practicality of companies being required to show waste disposal documents before advertising their services.**

---

<sup>23</sup> Special Enforcement Team, London. Cited Environment Agency op cit.

<sup>24</sup> Daniel Harrison, Association of London Government, oral evidence November 20 2003.

### *Small scale domestic and commercial dumping*

- 3.19 Small scale domestic and commercial dumping can often be partly explained due to ignorance about waste collection times and responsibilities and also lack of storage space. Problems are exacerbated when people live or run a business at an address only for a short time and when people with English as a second language find it hard to understand written information provided.
- 3.20 Local authorities and housing associations, in conjunction with tenants and residents associations and local business groups, need to ensure that collection arrangements and obligations are readily understood so there is no excuse for the misuse of services. Although we recognise that leaflets are often available in a number of languages, availability is normally by request and so language still represents a barrier for local authorities to get their message across.
- 3.21 We welcome the often innovative work on this to improve awareness, including the use of multi-lingual leaflets and home visits in areas with low levels of English or literacy.<sup>25</sup> We recognize that personal contact can often be particularly useful in reducing dumping, because council information may not be read. Visits provide an opportunity to explain the services offered by the council and the responsibilities of residents and businesses. They also increase the sense of surveillance and, particularly for businesses, can also allow officers to explain legal obligations and penalties.
- 3.22 Newham has used a phased awareness and enforcement campaign targeted at businesses working across the trade waste and cleansing departments. This consists of initial visits to request details of waste arrangements, advice about responsibilities, a second phase of checking and then prosecution where necessary.<sup>26</sup> In Southwark, the authority has used street wardens in Peckham to visit every business in the town centre to explain responsibilities regarding waste collection and disposal.
- 3.23 Local authorities should ensure that waste collection systems are appropriate for the conditions of an area, although we recognise that this can be difficult. It may be possible to arrange collection times to fit traffic and working conditions. We believe that collection frequencies may need to be increased in areas of high density. Particular problems arise with lack of storage particularly in properties above shops, houses in multiple occupancy, and on estates. This is worsened because the amount of waste produced by households and businesses has increased markedly over the last generation, and recycling can increase the requirements for storage because of the need for separation.
- 3.24 Examples of good practice in improving collections was presented by the City of Westminster who have particularly extreme problems of high density and therefore provide more than one collection per week. Providing this level of service is common in Scottish towns, perhaps because of their high density of households in areas with tenement flats. This may become a necessity for more areas of London if housing density is increased.
- 3.25 Bulky items are a major part of domestic dumping particularly in areas of low car ownership which makes access to civic amenity sites difficult. Boroughs vary in their provision of and charging for collection of bulky items of domestic waste such as furniture and electrical goods. They should improve awareness of their bulky item

---

<sup>25</sup> London Borough of Newham presentation at ALG fly tipping seminar October 2003

<sup>26</sup> London Borough of Newham, op cit.



collection services and how these can tie into recycling projects for these goods so that costs can be reduced.

- 3.26 We are interested in the results of trials by local authorities of waste collection facilities in dumping hotspots. Whilst it is recognized that this may encourage the use of these areas, such facilities may prove cheaper and less problematic for near-by residents.
- 3.27 We would like to encourage initiatives to improve the design of residential dwellings and commercial properties to ensure adequate storage is provided for the collection frequency of that area, and look forward to the Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Guidance to the London Plan covering this topic.
- 3.28 An additional concern is that where there are poor storage facilities for rubbish, particularly just before collection, there can be litter scattered across the street due to split rubbish bags if they are not put out in containers. Wheelie bins are not appropriate for all areas or types of housing, but the local authority should look at what other solutions can be provided. One resident mentioned the use of rubbish cages, but that the Council had failed to maintain these so that they no longer were effective.<sup>27</sup> However rubbish on streets after collection can also be due to poor collection standards.
- 3.29 An issue raised during our inquiry, that we did not have time to investigate further, was whether businesses paying separately for their rates and for their waste collection and disposal was appropriate. This does allow businesses to choose their collector, rather than having to have the system provided by the Council. We would be interested to know whether this separation of payment is preferable for businesses, particularly considering evidence from Westminster on the difficulties of co-ordinating collection times of different contractors.

#### *Improving enforcement*

- 3.30 Enforcement ought to act as a deterrent by punishing offenders, but should also recoup costs incurred in clearing up a fly tipping incident. Many contributors to our scrutiny stressed the need for increased penalties especially for repeat offenders. There are also a number of areas where existing law is considered difficult to enforce. We welcome recent and forthcoming changes to relevant legislation addressing these issues, as discussed below, but consider that in some areas further changes are still necessary. We believe that more work is needed on finding ways to make the originators of waste and those fly tipping accountable for the costs of clearance.
- 3.31 Defra have proposed changes to existing legislation and ways of working that are currently under consultation. These include: introduction of new fixed penalty notices, increased maximum penalties for fly tipping, revision of the duties of local authorities in respect to waste management and the revision of relationship between the Environment Agency and local authorities, including extension of certain powers to local authorities e.g. investigation of incidents.

---

<sup>27</sup> Hanger Hill Garden Estate Residents Ltd. Written evidence, September 2003..

*Recommendation 8*

**The Committee support in principle the amendment of relevant legislation to increase in maximum fines for fly tipping and the introduction of greater flexibility to allow for higher penalties in response to repeat offences and dumping of hazardous waste.**

- 3.32 With recent developments in technology, CCTV has become more sensitive, easily portable and can provide high quality pictures capable of identifying people and licence plates. Hand held video recorders are also being used by many councils to gather evidence.<sup>28</sup> The Committee had the opportunity to visit a mobile covert recording unit in Lewisham and see the quality and flexibility of the technology. Haringey have 60 mobile cameras.<sup>29</sup> Hounslow use mobile cameras with some success but do find that although the cameras are a deterrence when they are in place, dumping recurs when they are moved.<sup>30</sup>
- 3.33 Magistrates Courts are not felt to treat the matter seriously enough in many instances. Fine levels in 2001/02 were approximately £2, 000, compared with a maximum potential fine of £25, 000. Clearly a £2,000 fine would have little impact on the profitability of an illegal waste disposal operation.
- 3.34 We therefore welcome the reissuing of the training package by the Magistrates' Association on the seriousness of environmental crime in November 2003. However we believe that further measures should be taken by the Association and by the Government to ensure more stringent fines and sentencing. Initiatives such as visits by magistrates to residential areas to understand the impact of the crime and meetings with officers trying to deal with fly tipping could help raise the awareness of magistrates.
- 3.35 The introduction of fixed penalty notices (FPNs) for certain offences relating to illegal waste disposal is welcomed. It is recognised that there is the danger that local authorities and the Environment Agency may abandon more costly and time consuming prosecution routes. The use of FPNs should therefore be monitored to ensure that it does not reduce prosecutions through the courts. We would also welcome clarification that receipts from the FPNs will be kept by the local authority and the Agency which is now the practice for litter and dog fouling fines.

*Recommendation 9*

**The Government should monitor the use of alternative mechanisms of enforcement of waste transfer notes and waste management registration to ensure that the introduction of fixed penalty notices does not lead to a decline in alternative methods of prosecution which, although more costly, result in stronger penalties.**

- 3.36 The government have so far rejected using fixed penalty notices for fly tipping because it believes that this would undermine the use of other, stronger deterrents. However the Committee believes that there is a case for using fixed penalty notices for small scale dumping, although we recognise that this would have to be carefully defined. This could allow easy enforcement of small fly tipping offences and concentration on more serious or repeat offences.

---

<sup>28</sup> Phil Davies, op cit.

<sup>29</sup> Daniel Harrison, op cit.

<sup>30</sup> Suresh Kamath, Head of Street Management and Public Protection, London Borough of Hounslow. Written evidence October 2003

- 3.37 Some local authorities, such as Lambeth, are already using FPNs for very small scale dumping that are more usually used for litter<sup>31</sup> and this is found useful. Also useful are street litter control notices which can be used for dumping as well as littering if there is a repeated problem. Amendment to allow their use against all types of businesses would make these notices more flexible.

*Recommendation 10*

**The Government should reconsider their decision on fixed penalty notices for small incidents of dumping and these should be introduced with local authorities being able to keep receipts from enforcement where they are the issuing body.**

- 3.38 The extension of investigative powers to the local authority to deal with waste management issues should improve effective enforcement. A major weakness in current legislation is the difficulty in proving that the originators of the waste are aware that their waste would be dumped illegally, and so may not be held accountable.
- 3.39 The removal of the defence for employees of a business held to be operating illegally that 'he acted under instruction from his employer ...' will significantly improve enforcement and accountability and is welcomed. However, accountability for waste through chains of contractors, particularly those involved in construction, still needs to be improved.
- 3.40 Local authorities now have the power to seize vehicles suspected of being involved in fly tipping. However, local authorities still cannot stop on the highway and so this will continue to rely on joint operations with the police. Although some local authorities have requested powers to stop vehicles, we believe that it is better to target more police resources on these joint operations because of the possible dangers.

*Recommendation 11*

**The Metropolitan Police Service must identify specific resources to target the enforcement of fly tipping because of the increase in the links between this illegal enterprise and organised crime.**

- 3.41 Those fly tipping as a business often use illegal vehicles so even when registration numbers are recorded, it can be hard to trace the owner or operator. It is hoped that at least the aspect of unregistered vehicles will improve under the newly introduced continuous registration introduced in January 2004. However other measures are needed to improve the accuracy of vehicle registration.

*Recovering costs of clear up*

- 3.42 Where dumping takes place on public land it is straightforward, if costly, for the local authority and/or the Environment Agency to clean it up. The local authority and Environment Agency do have powers to remove fly tipped waste<sup>32</sup>. However, costs can only be recovered from the occupiers of land if they have knowingly caused or permitted the dumping. This is considered unenforceable because it is too difficult to prove this. There are also no costs recoverable from unoccupied land because the land owner is not liable.

---

<sup>31</sup> Peter Sheppard, Head of Street Care, London Borough of Lambeth. Written evidence, October 2003.

<sup>32</sup> Section 59 of Environmental Protection Act 1990.

- 3.43 The ALG has suggested that the wording needs to be amended to 'knowing permitter', used in another section of the Act, which is thought to be preferable because this is considered to include landowners who failed to deal with deposits once they are made aware.
- 3.44 Whilst charging the land occupier could be seen as punishing the victim, enforcement is normally constrained to where the occupier has made little or no effort to prevent dumping on their land or they are believed to be complicit in the dumping. If owners of unoccupied land put little effort into preventing dumping there is no legal recourse at present. It was suggested to us that costs of clearing up fly tipping should be recoverable through general insurance held by private owners as part of public liability cover<sup>33</sup> which may make the distribution of costs from dumping more equitable.
- 3.45 An added difficulty with dealing with fly tipping on private land is recovering the full cost of expenses concerned, because any estimate at the time of the court case will only be indicative and it is time consuming to prepare an estimate of the amount and nature of waste.
- 3.46 There should also be measures to deal with the recovery of costs where there are multiple occupiers. At present if an occupier cannot be traced the amount that can be recovered is proportionately reduced. We would suggest that Defra consider amending legislation so that all those occupiers who can be located should be responsible for the full costs because this would create an incentive to co-operate in acting to reduce further fly tipping.

*Recommendation 12*

**The Government should amend relevant legislation so that it is easier to recover the full costs of clearing up fly tipping from private land occupiers and/or owners where they are a 'knowing permitter' and do not take action to prevent and clear up after fly tipping.**

*Division of responsibilities*

- 3.47 An important issue is that responsibility is split, with local authorities and the Environment Agency having a role in both clear-up and enforcement. Whilst this division does result in difficulties, these bodies are accustomed to the need for joint working and there are formal agreements such as the memorandum of understanding between the Environment Agency and Local Government Association *Working Better Together (England) 2003*.
- 3.48 The Environment Agency tends to deal with large-scale fly tipping, hazardous waste and waste that could pollute or block rivers and streams through existing protocols as part of the Memorandum of Understanding. The fly tipping protocol for this division of responsibility is currently being revised and is due to be agreed by mid 2004 between the Environment Agency and the Local Government Association.
- 3.49 The division of responsibility is dynamic, partly because powers that were previously held solely by the Environment Agency have been devolved to local authorities. An example of this is the extension of existing Agency powers to enforce the Duty of Care under section 34 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to local authorities in 2003.

---

<sup>33</sup> Bob Griffith, London Borough of Enfield. Written evidence, November 2003.

- 3.50 Increased partnership working between local authorities and the Environment Agency is essential<sup>34</sup> and to this end we welcome recent initiatives through the ALG and proposals by Defra, currently under consultation.
- 3.51 Many local authorities do work well with their Environment Agency colleagues and an important step forward in such joint working arose through the Association of London Government (ALG) seminar on fly tipping in October 2003. According to the ALG Transport and Environment Committee the seminar 'provided clarification on some key issues and generated good debate' and further work with the Environment Agency to follow up on these issues is under way. The seminar also allowed relevant officers across the local authorities and the Agency to develop contacts and awareness of who was working on which issues.
- 3.52 One of the results of the division of responsibility is a lack of comprehensive data particularly at the regional and national levels. This makes it difficult to assess both the true scale of the problem and the efficacy of any policy intervention. Current proposals for the introduction of a new database to be known as 'FlyCapture' in mid 2004 will address this failing. This will allow online entry from local authorities and the Environment Agency in a consistent form. This should provide an easy system to fulfil the requirement for local authorities to provide information under the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003 for all dumping incidents.
- 3.53 We welcome this joint database and hope that it will also encourage co-ordination between local authorities. We particularly hope that it will encourage joint prosecutions of individuals so that the scale and number of offences is recognized, thus increasing the likelihood of a higher level of punishment for persistent offenders.
- 3.54 The split in responsibility of who deals with different types of fly tipping should not result in members of the public needing to report incidents to different bodies. We would support a system where people report any incident to the local authority which then refers to the Environment Agency if necessary. We realise that it might require some support for the local authority to take this on, but the introduction of the integrated web-based recording system should make such reporting straightforward.

*Recommendation 13*

**Despite the division in responsibility for fly tipping between local authorities and the Environment Agency, there should only be a single reporting point through the local authority for fly tipping.**

---

<sup>34</sup> Penny Spirling, Recycling Manager, London Borough of Sutton, written evidence, October 2003.

## London Case Study 1: Enforcement in Lewisham

### Lewisham

The project was started in response to public concerns. The borough used surveillance to combat fly tipping and the ever increasing costs of clear up. The project works on the assumption that if people can be prosecuted, the cost of clean-up can be recouped.

Hotspots were targeted with a surveillance van and pin hole cameras. The project involved considerable partnership working with other organisations which also improves the efficient use of resources. The Environment Agency helped to track down companies who were fly tipping, Millwall FC surveillance equipment was used to gather evidence and the police impounded vehicles that were causing tipping. Enforcement on housing estates involves tenants, community organisations and the housing offices. All involved are trained and know what evidence is needed for a prosecution.

### What didn't work

- Naming and shaming. Information was initially placed on boards outside the town hall listing names and companies who had been prosecuted. The borough decided this was the wrong approach and was too negative.
- Use of press is limited. Prosecutions were released to the press on a regular basis, but because of the number of prosecutions the press lost interest. The borough now concentrates on big companies or newsworthy prosecutions.

### What worked

- Working holistically and in partnership with other organisations. In addition to the partners mentioned the local authority's Street Leaders are also actively involved.
- The borough monitored statistics carefully and has concentrated on the areas that were heavily tipped. Since the use of surveillance there has been a drop in incidents in these areas. Information is vital to target resources effectively

### Tips for replication

- Need clear objectives for what you want to achieve.
- Split staff into specific areas to allow targeting of resources. Officers would then have their own areas where they can liaise with tenants, local groups and develop good relationships locally. Unfortunately lack of staff resources has prevented this approach from continuing at present.
- Use intelligence and evidence gathering e.g. waste analysis to find out what is in the fly tipping. Use statistics and plot trends to evaluate what is effective.
- Work with contractors, share resources
- Work across departments particularly with colleagues dealing with trade waste.

## 4 Litter

- 4.1 Litter in London is a serious problem. 44% of Londoners polled in the 2003 London Survey felt dealing with litter was a priority for improving the quality of London's environment. An estimated 177,000 tonnes of litter are dropped in London every year and this costs the tax payer over £100 million to clear up. Not only is litter unsightly, it can pose a threat to human and animal health and can reduce economic potential especially if it deters visitors to an area. This is likely to be particularly important for areas that rely on tourism.
- 4.2 To address this problem, many local authorities are increasing the amount they spend on cleansing contracts and trying to tighten contract management to improve standards. The latest London survey does suggest that the situation is improving: the number of people who feel that litter is a problem or major problem has declined, from 71% in 2001 and 2002 to 59% in 2003. The percentage who stated it was a major problem has declined, from approximately 40%, to 24% in 2003.
- 4.3 Litter tends to be a problem in areas used heavily by pedestrians, transport interchanges, bus stops, shopping areas, parks and open spaces particularly in better weather, and areas near fast food places. There is a particular problem of litter that is made up of materials that do not biodegrade quickly because this will tend to accumulate. Cigarette ends can be a problem outside offices and other non-smoking areas, and are a highly persistent form of litter. Chewing gum is becoming a more widespread problem and it is difficult to remove, and can cause staining as can greasy foods and drinks.
- 4.4 Whilst some people would never drop litter, many others do regardless of whether they feel this to be wrong. Indeed research by ENCAMS in October 2001 showed that nearly all adults drop some form of litter. The most frequently littered items were those that were seen as small and less harmful, such as small sweet papers, apple cores, cigarette butts and chewing gum.
- 4.5 The public admit that the most likely situation in which they would drop litter is when they are driving because they feel less accountable in a car and that they can't be identified. People thought it was more acceptable to drop litter if an area was already run-down or dirty and if there were insufficient bins. However they would think twice if they were in their own neighbourhood, if the area was tidy and presentable or if they were with children. Young people in particular feel peer pressure to drop litter rather than carry it until they can dispose of it properly.
- 4.6 The Committee therefore considered good practice for effective campaigns and how to avoid increasing the kudos of rebellion. ENCAMS are the UK experts on this matter and run campaigns to educate people not to litter. They try to base campaigns on messages that the people they want to influence believe are effective. Councils may want to stress the waste of resources because the millions spent on cleansing could be put to better use. Hounslow has used this approach.<sup>35</sup> ENCAMS runs the People and Places programme which local authorities are encouraged to join so that they can make use of nationwide initiatives and resources.
- 4.7 26 boroughs have chosen to join the Mayor's Capital Standards Campaign which aims to set London-wide standards. The Campaign addresses a number of the issues considered by our investigation, but has a particular emphasis on litter in its

---

<sup>35</sup> Suresh Kamath, op cit.

campaigns and educational work through the London School Environment Award. The Mayor has recently promoted a London-wide television and cinema 'Litter fairy' campaign. The Committee will be interested to see the evaluation of this work and its impact.

*Recommendation 14*

**Where a local authority or other body wishes to develop an anti-litter campaign, multiple strands may be necessary to address all audiences effectively and create constructive peer pressure. Campaigns must involve their target audience in their design to ensure the selection of appropriate methods and messages.**

- 4.8 People now commonly eat and drink in the street, which increases the likelihood of people not disposing of litter properly. Litter from fast food is most likely to be discarded rapidly, legally or otherwise, because it is often greasy and unpleasant to carry. An additional problem is the increased packaging on the food we buy, particularly on sweets, which also increases the amount of litter to be discarded.
- 4.9 London has particular problems because of security concerns, which means that litter bins have been removed from many busy areas. In other areas bins are a focus for vandalism and arson. These factors create areas without useable bins and so it becomes more difficult for someone on the street to dispose of litter easily in an appropriate way. We believe that more efforts must be made to provide litter bins or other ways in which people can dispose of their litter when in public.

*Recommendation 15*

**Boroughs, Transport for London and companies managing stations and other transport interchanges should reconsider how to provide for litter disposal in a safe manner. Examples include the use of transparent bags instead of bins for high security areas and bins capable of withstanding fire in arson-prone areas.**

*Improving Enforcement*

- 4.10 A number of organisations, including local authorities, have a duty to keep public spaces clean and tidy under section 89 of the Environment Protection Act 1990. This gives the authority the power to issue Fixed Penalty Notices and since the Local Government Act 2003 authorities are allowed to keep revenue from these fines.
- 4.11 The Committee welcomes the fact that fines from Fixed Penalty Notices for dog fouling and littering can now be retained and used by the local authority on cleaning and related issues. We hope that will increase the resources available to local authorities for tackling these issues and so increase their ability to enforce zero-tolerance to behaviour which is costing Londoners millions of pounds a month.
- 4.12 There are two areas of weakness with fixed penalty notices that need to be addressed – at present only the police can require an offender to provide their name and address, although it should be noted that the majority of fixed penalty notices are paid even without this additional power. Additionally local authorities should be able to delegate powers to issue fixed penalty notices to contractors so as to make full use of staff under contracted-out services.
- 4.13 Southwark and Lewisham have both significantly increased their level of enforcement in the last few years. Lewisham have used a team of 4 enforcement officers stationed at the entrances to the boroughs from the bordering authorities



issuing fixed penalty notices in intensive sessions to raise peoples awareness that they can and will be penalised for littering. Southwark have likewise used on-street enforcement campaigns, combining a poster campaign warning about penalties, street wardens issuing penalty notices to people littering the streets and, as a publicity exercise, rewards of £50 randomly issued for use of bins in the street.<sup>36</sup>

- 4.14 Apart from local authorities, other organisations with a duty to keep land clear are: schools, colleges and universities, 'statutory undertakers'<sup>37</sup> and the managers of crown lands. These organisations can be served with a Litter Abatement Notice by the local authority. Once served with a Notice, the owner or occupier must clean up the area within a given period of time. If an area falls below the standard and the organisation will not put matters right, a member of the public can take legal action to get a Litter Abatement Order.
- 4.15 Street litter control notices<sup>38</sup> and cleansing notices<sup>39</sup> can be used against premises that repeatedly do not meet appropriate standards of cleanliness. These are being used by many local authorities against premises which are a continuing source of litter. They are normally used against fast food premises, but are also being considered in some areas against other businesses including those that produce smoking related litter.
- 4.16 A Cleansing Notice can specify the standards and frequency at which relevant land is to be cleaned for any land adjacent to a street. When issued with such a notice, the operator of the business has to provide litter disposal facilities and ensure that the area outside their premises is kept clean. This reduces the cost to the local authority and creates an incentive for the operator to reduce litter arising from their business and educate their customers not to litter. They allow the local authority to carry out the work and recover its costs if the notice is not being complied with after 42 days.
- 4.17 The local authority can declare a Litter Control Area where there is bad littering of certain kinds of private land to which the public has access, such as supermarket car parks. The owner or occupier of the land is then under a duty to clear the land and keep it free of litter.
- 4.18 We welcome the use of notices against businesses and other private land owners where the lack of care for their premises and manner of operating their business is causing problems. However this should not be to the exclusion of voluntary agreements with businesses which can often be more constructive. Also useful are schemes to encourage good practice by businesses – e.g. Cleaner City Awards Scheme by the Corporation of London.

*Recommendation 16*

**The Committee believes that local authorities and businesses, especially those operating fast food premises, need to work together more effectively to reduce litter. We would support the use of joint agreements whereby such businesses have responsibility for the cleaning public spaces adjacent to their premises and are involved in educational work to reduce littering.**

<sup>36</sup> MEL research report to Environment Committee, November 2003.

<sup>37</sup> Statutory undertakers are any private or public body carrying out functions of a public character under statutory power, include the public utility companies (water, electricity, gas, phones, public transport).

<sup>38</sup> Section.94, Environmental Protection Act 1990, contains the power to serve a Street Litter Control Notice on certain types of premises.

<sup>39</sup> Issued under Section19 of the London Local Authorities Act 2000.

## London Case Study 2: Education in Hounslow

Hounslow introduced a litter free schools campaign two years ago to secondary schools in the borough. The campaign was supported by the local McDonald's store and worked very closely with the Education Business Partnership.

The schools are given a starter kit of litter pickers, gloves and information. Council staff visit the school and a meeting is set up with the school council, caretaker and staff, including a pre-inspection of the school ground to point out problems. The grounds are then inspected and graded A-D using the guidelines from the Environmental Protection Act. The areas graded are the school entrance, playground area and canteen. A second surprise inspection is carried out and the school awarded gold, silver or bronze.

Working with the Council has resulted in some schools designating green zones and the councils work out the best places to site litter bins. The Council provide induction days on request. A small trial has been run with 6 junior schools that have proved successful. Ten community environment officers will now also promote the programme in the junior schools.

The key to success was partnership working. The Education Business Partnership helped identify the best people in the school to talk to, which may not always be the headteacher. In addition to McDonalds supporting the litter free schools, the company also ran a design and technology challenge for secondary schools. This year's challenge was to design a litter bin to accommodate three types of fast food litter; the year before was a litter bin for a drive through. IBM supports the events and supplies computers to winning schools.

IBM also run workshops for schools where children see how printer cartridges are recycled. This year ENCAMS and Hounslow ran similar workshops at the same event.

The programme will complement the LSEA as those who sign up for the awards can also sign up for litter free awards or vice versa. A further LEQ survey after the campaign showed a reduction in litter dropped. The placing of bins was a contributory factor. Awareness about litter has also been raised.

### Tips for Replication

- Work with people who understand schools
- Works across departments (e.g. recycling officer and LA21 officer) to avoid duplication of effort and provide complementary education programmes
- Without the support of partners the council would not have been able to have prizes for the schemes.
- The scheme could function better with a full time co-ordinator; it is currently part of a number of people's jobs.

## London Case Study 3: Campaigns in Croydon

The London Borough of Croydon have run three campaigns by adapting national ENCAMS campaigns to the local situation within seven months. As a member of the Capital Standards Campaign Croydon has access to the ENCAMS *People and Places* network including information on national campaigns and materials produced by ENCAMS. ENCAMS material already contains the research to allow targeted marketing, and limited resources to be used most effectively. Working with ENCAMS also aids gaining support from members and chief officers, as ENCAMS research can be used to demonstrate the importance of the issue.

### **Campaign 1 - Rats that are a consequence of littered areas.**

The borough used the original artwork but added the Council logo. This was used in the borough magazine with a circulation of 140,000 and the Council paid for a slot in a free cinema magazine. Posters were placed in public display areas such as libraries and doctors surgeries.

### **Campaign 2 - Striking images targeted to the youth market.**

The campaign originally featured an image of a dead cat and dog with instructions to log onto ENCAMS website for more graphic pictures demonstrating how litter caused these problems. Croydon decided to adapt this and make the link in the imagery between litter and death of animals much clearer. The posters were displayed in 60 locations with DECEAUX providing the space for free and the Council paying for printing.

### **Campaign 3 - National car litter campaign.**

The Council felt that the images were not appropriate for a campaign in the borough but the campaign did prompt policy change. The Council decided to issue fixed penalty notices to people who litter from cars. This policy change was helped by evidence of ENCAMS research, which showed that people see this as a big problem. Press releases were issued to warn people that littering from cars would be enforced. To date a number of notices have been issued although it is still early days. The enforcement team have been deployed in areas of commuter traffic to carry out this new initiative.

#### Tips for replication

- Look at up and coming ENCAMS campaign and plan round these. This enables the year to be planned in advance and aids in seeking approval. Membership of Capital Standards Campaign helped to kick start the work and most importantly, has given access to ENCAMS campaigns.
- Work with the Education Business Partnership to target efforts and make the right contacts and with school councils.
- Make promotion of projects part of environmental warden's duties.

## London Case Study 4: Tackling Drug Litter in Camden

There was a need to tackle the growing amount of this type of litter and public complaints of anti-social deposits. To ensure the work was targeted a crime and disorder survey was carried out to locate the hotspots. Camden worked in partnership with other organisations, especially with the police, and the established project to stop drug use in the streets in the area. At the start of the initiative, street cleaning staff did not want to pick up needles and so it was clear that if the problem was to be tackled effectively a new method of working was needed.

The Drug Action Response Team (DART) was established, made up of trained staff with purpose designed vehicles and equipment. The team collect drug litter and are trained to deal with intimidating behaviour. The training includes what effects drugs have, health and safety, and customer care and has helped to change operatives' attitude toward drug users. The vehicle is acoustically lined to reduce the noise from the pressure washer and has a microbiological lining to aid cleaning.

The use of a dedicated team has allowed local knowledge to be gained so hotspots are tackled and work can be planned. Working hours from 6am –2pm ensure areas are cleaned before people go to work etc. Data is collected and plots made of where needles are found. All data is shared with the police and plotted using GIS. Palm tops will soon be used to record all information. DART are now witnessing a reduction in needles. The service is now part of mainstream spending and not reliant on extra funding.

As the scheme has been running people now call in and report litter and there is a dedicated hotline. Street Wardens also support the team, as they are located in hotspots.

In addition to the DART team the council has actively targeted other forms of litter.

### Tips for replication

- Work in partnership – this project worked with street wardens, businesses, health agencies, outreach teams, police.
- Train staff not only about litter clearance but how to deal with difficult situations
- Use data to help plan and evaluate schemes

## 5 Graffiti

- 5.1 77% of Londoners listed graffiti as of concern to their quality of life in a 2001 survey.<sup>40</sup> That many people find graffiti threatening, and a sign that an area is run-down and uncared for, was demonstrated by responses to our investigation and to the Graffiti in London report. Indeed public concern about this issue is such that local authorities and transport companies spend more than £100 million per year on cleaning and repairs after graffiti and etching.<sup>41</sup>
- 5.2 Graffiti is concentrated around transport hubs and infrastructure, town centres, some housing estates and parks. Graffiti varies in type and includes: large brightly coloured displays, political comment, racist/sexist slogans, tagging and etching. A worrying issue is that in some cases graffiti is used to advertise illegal drug activities, or mark a property as vulnerable to burglary.<sup>42</sup>
- 5.3 The motivation for graffiti does vary with type and includes desire for expression, and trying to get a message across, albeit illegally. In the case of racist and sexist slogans it also aims to intimidate. Tagging and etching is strongly motivated by boredom, territoriality and desire to show bravado.
- 5.4 Tagging and etching are worsened by a lack of recreational activities and services for young people. There is some evidence that tagging is on the increase.<sup>43</sup> The likelihood of all types of graffiti is worsened by the relatively small threat of being caught, lack of formal or informal supervision and alienation from the community.
- 5.5 The decline in youth provision and the lack of appropriate supervised and unsupervised play areas for young people creates a situation where many young people have little better to do than hang out in the streets and parks. Evidence shows that this is a situation that creates a high level of graffiti and vandalism and must be avoided<sup>44</sup>.
- 5.6 The Committee has heard mixed views about the usefulness of legal graffiti walls. Some people believe that they are effective at preventing writing on other properties. Others believe they merely serve as a magnet for graffiti writers, which then increases writing in the surrounding area. Those who would like to see the introduction of a wider use of graffiti walls suggest that the important factors are how a project to create such a wall involves people from the local community and that it is part of on-going work in the area and not a one off project.<sup>45</sup>
- 5.7 For instance, Guinness Housing Trust have created an Art Flat on the Naish Estate near King's Cross where project supervisors encourage young people to produce art work that was then reproduced and used to decorate the hoardings surrounding the estate. These hoarding have remained free of graffiti whilst the young people have received training and support in art. This is just one example of projects across London to harness creative talent. Particularly with tagging and etching, the issue is

---

<sup>40</sup> Association of London Government 2001.

<sup>41</sup> *Graffiti in London* 2003, London Assembly Graffiti Investigative Committee.

<sup>42</sup> Simon Baxter, London Borough of Southwark. Oral evidence 20 November 2003

<sup>43</sup> Pieter Johnson, Operations Director - Adshel. Written evidence, October 2003. Jason Hughes, Group Compliance Manager, Telewest broadband. Written evidence, October 2003.

<sup>44</sup> Campbell S and Harrington V. Youth Crime: Findings from the 1998/99 Youth Lifestyles Survey, Home Office research findings 209. 2000

<sup>45</sup> p39, *Graffiti in London*, op cit

how to create more constructive ways of marking territory and confronting gang culture.

- 5.8 Education campaigns have to be very carefully designed so as to create peer pressure against graffiti. For such campaigns to be effective they must tackle the kudos associated with graffiti and it should be remembered that young people tend to have different attitudes to graffiti they see as art as opposed to tagging and etching.<sup>46</sup> Whilst it is difficult to create objective criteria for differentiating between types of graffiti we have to recognise that some people do consider it very differently.

*Recommendation 17*

**As recommended in Young London Speaks, local authorities and central government must ensure that initiatives to tackle street crime and anti-social behaviour support youth provision of specific diversionary activities, and of supervised and unsupervised areas.**

- 5.9 The Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003 makes it illegal to sell spray paint to under 16s. The Committee welcomes this measure which was recommended by the London Assembly Graffiti in London report in 2002.<sup>47</sup> However we recognise it will not be effective unless properly enforced. We believe that efforts by local authorities, before the enactment of this legislation, to form voluntary agreements with shop owners on paint sales will improve compliance with this measure.

*Recommendation 18*

**The Committee believe that the measure to make illegal the selling of spray paint to minors will not be effective unless local authorities act to raise awareness and act jointly with the Metropolitan Police Service to enforce it.**

- 5.10 The design of public spaces can make an important contribution to reducing graffiti. Features such as, easy clean paint surfaces, lattice rather than solid shop shutters all aim to reduce the number of surfaces vulnerable to graffiti. 'Spiky paint' can reduce tagging with marker pens, but makes the surface more difficult to clean when graffitied. Other design measures can increase natural supervision by encouraging people to use public spaces, along with improved lighting and CCTV<sup>48</sup> can also reduce occurrences. CCTV can also provide evidence for prosecution of offences. The introduction of CCTV into all London buses is welcomed.
- 5.11 Additional work is needed to encourage good design and evaluate which measures are most effective as discussed in 2.11-2.13. We would also encourage the investment of further resources into preventative measures where possible.

*Enforcement*

- 5.12 Penalties imposed should reflect the cost of removal, prosecution and impact on the local environment. Graffiti is an offence under the Criminal Damage Act 1971. This sets maximum penalties for juvenile and adult offenders depending on the value of the damage.
- 5.13 With the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003 local authorities can issue clean-up notices to owners of street furniture such as phone boxes. If the property is not cleaned in 28 days local authorities can now remove the graffiti. Additionally, the ability to

---

<sup>46</sup> Participants from focus group work. Oral evidence, 4 Feb 2004.

<sup>47</sup> pp 29-30. *Graffiti in London* op cit

<sup>48</sup> Ms Tia Cox - Corporation of London

recover costs for this work will be piloted in twelve areas. We believe that powers to recover costs should be extended at the earliest possible time. This should encourage the use of preventative design measures as outlined in paragraph 5.9 above and the removal of redundant street furniture.

- 5.14 Local authorities do now have the power to issue fixed penalty notices of £50 for minor offences of graffiti with the ability to retain the fine. We believe that this will encourage zero-tolerance against small scale tagging and etching by introducing an appropriate, easy to implement punishment.
- 5.15 We would like to see an expansion of the use of reparation placements where those found guilty of graffiti are asked to carry out work to clean up areas. This also encourages cross department working and requires the involvement of youth services and probation services. However it can be difficult and costly to arrange supervision and the time taken for supervision can lengthen cleansing operations. Lambeth is looking to supervise placements through their street wardens to try and reduce these problems. They were also one of the boroughs that suggested that central government support should be available for the cost of such supervision.<sup>49</sup>
- 5.16 A recent enforcement initiative is the offering of incentives to 'shop' taggers. This was launched nationally for the transport system on BBC Crimewatch. Southwark had a 'Shop them and Stop them Campaign' against the three worst taggers in their area which resulted in them discovering the name and address of one offender and information on another.<sup>50</sup> Barnet have had similar success in their area.<sup>51</sup>
- 5.17 Local authorities and housing associations can also seek Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBO) or in less serious instances, an Acceptable Behaviour Contract. A weakness of these orders seems to be that there is insufficient funding for support work of the offender, which lessens the likelihood of reforming behaviour. If convicted of a juvenile criminal offence support is given from the youth offenders team, however this is not necessarily the case when given an ASBO because it is a civil order.<sup>52</sup>
- 5.18 Whilst some people writing graffiti will do so only in their very local area there are other more persistent offenders who work across a wide area, often following transport corridors<sup>53</sup>. For this reason working in partnership is especially important to reduce graffiti as exemplified by SWAAG (South West Action Against Graffiti).
- 5.19 Some local authorities already record tags to aid in identifying those doing the graffiti. This can also allow a better record of the number of incidents for which an individual is responsible and so better enforcement. It is hoped to create a cross-borough database system for recording this information to improve the exchange of information. This is being developed as a pilot in Tower Hamlets, Croydon and Southwark with funding through the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund.

#### *Clearing up*

- 5.20 Racist and sexist slogans are rightly given the highest priority by local authorities and are targeted for removal within 24 to 48 hours of a report or earlier where possible. Other types of graffiti are removed within three to five days, depending on the local

---

<sup>49</sup> Peter Sheppard, op cit.

<sup>50</sup> Phil Davies, op cit.

<sup>51</sup> Cllr Brian Coleman, Environment Committee meeting, 4 February 2004.

<sup>52</sup> Paul Tye, youth worker. Cited Channel 4 News, 22 April 2004

<sup>53</sup> Council officers. Environment Committee visit to London Borough of Croydon, September 2003.

authority. Where the graffiti is on private property it depends on the local authority whether a graffiti removal service is offered free to the land owner or occupier.

- 5.21 We have been impressed by the commitment that many community, tenants and residents organisations demonstrate in their area in carrying out graffiti removal in agreement with their local authority. Indeed some local authorities issue cleaning kits to encourage such initiatives. Others such as Hounslow<sup>54</sup> work jointly with their residents on graffiti action days, in this case through their Community Environment Team. Ealing Fields Residents Association were typical of others in welcoming this approach but in also wishing for more action:

The Council should work more closely with Residents Associations like us on 'clear up' days. These have been successful in the past, but are used too infrequently.<sup>55</sup>

- 5.22 Local authorities need powers to recover costs associated with cleaning up graffiti from private property, as with fly tipping and fly posting. As mentioned in paragraph 5.12, this is being introduced in relation to statutory undertakers in some areas as a pilot. If extended to all property this would at least provide the local authority with legal protection should graffiti removal cause minor damage such as damage to paint or pointing. If costs were recoverable from negligent owners this would encourage owners to take measures to protect property.

---

<sup>54</sup> Suresh Kamath, op cit. Joint working is delivered through the Community Environment Team

<sup>55</sup> Roger Jarman, Ealing Fields Residents Association. Written evidence October 2003.



## Case Study 5: Tackling Graffiti in Kingston-upon-Thames & Croydon

### Kingston-upon-Thames

This project was started because of public concern shown in MORI polls. The Council found that where there is graffiti on private property people take it personally and it is a highly emotive issue. The key factor of success was the partnership working with the police, youth offenders department and the housing department. Young offenders were used to clear up graffiti although not necessarily graffiti offenders. The police provided information on suspicions of who could be responsible for the graffiti. This enables resources to be targeted rather than taking a stab in the dark at who is responsible. The police also worked with schools to match doodles on schoolbooks to graffiti tags. There have been approximately five arrests to date.

In addition the council provide paint for businesses to cover the graffiti. There is a full-time graffiti officer with the support of Neighbourhood Environmental Rangers. When offenders are caught the local press are involved. A spin off from this is that people in the borough are seeing action, resulting in residents reporting incidents and becoming more involved within the community.

#### Tips for replication

- Working in partnership
- Good communication between partners and residents
- To ensure support of councilors keep them informed throughout an initiative rather than just presenting results at the end

### Croydon

Croydon has a team of 20 staff equipped with the latest technology (and lots of tins of paint!) to remove graffiti wherever it is found. The Council promises to tackle any reports of graffiti within 14 days, with racist or offensive messages being removed within 24 hours. This is a free service to all private householders and small businesses, with a nominal charge being made to larger commercial concerns. Weekly sessions are held with the probation service and the youth offending team, which takes people issued with community service or reparation orders and puts them to work with brushes and paint to remove graffiti from the Borough's walls. There are also many local volunteers who help remove stains left by taggers.

There is also a further project under way, in partnership with Tower Hamlets and Lewisham, to develop a database of graffiti tags that will eventually be accessible by every London local authority, the police and transport operators. This will enable comprehensive cases to be compiled against identified graffiti writers, helping to ensure that any punishment they receive is in line with the damage they are known to have caused.

## 6 Fly posting

- 6.1 Fly posting is the display of advertising without the prior consent of the owner of the land on which it is displayed. Such advertising covers posters glued to walls and hoardings; posters on placards that are then attached to street furniture; and stickers. The beneficiaries are principally venues, events, working from home schemes, music and associated magazines and products
- 6.2 The Committee believes that the solution depends partly on the organisation doing the advertising. There is a clear difference in the scale of offending, with garage sales and similar seldom being the cause of major problems. Small, local venues need to have legal ways they can advertise that are not prohibitively expensive. It is recognised that some advertising is found useful, especially by young people<sup>56</sup>. We are therefore interested in investigating the possibility of commercial poster sites for events. These could be available to registered users for a set amount per year. However there seems little excuse for multinational companies such as EMI and Sony to have marketing strategies which result in the use of illegal means of advertising.

### *Recommendation 19*

**As recommended in *Young London Speaks*, local authorities with the support of the Association of London Government and central government should consider the feasibility of establishing legal poster sites for local venues and events.**

- 6.3 Some local authorities include the removal of posters on placards as part of their core street cleansing contract, which means such placards are rapidly removed. This has resulted in lower incidence rates<sup>57</sup>. Other posters are removed by dedicated cleaning teams at additional expense to the tax payer.
- 6.4 Local authorities have the power to order the beneficiaries of a poster to remove or obliterate it within 48 hours of receipt of notice, or costs will be charged for removal,<sup>58</sup> and many of the local authorities contributing to our investigation use the London Local Authorities Act to good effect<sup>59</sup>. Under this measure, the 'beneficiaries of advertising' for events include both the venue owners and those owning the event management companies. Some contributors to our inquiry would like to include the ability to cover the cost of remedial measures so that the offender is contributing to prevention.<sup>60</sup>
- 6.5 Southwark received £80 000 from companies who failed to remove their unlawful posters after issue of these notices. Lambeth currently charges £120 per poster if this notice period is exceeded. Lambeth have anecdotal evidence that beneficiaries have told guerrilla marketing companies not to target Lambeth because of their enforcement on fly posters<sup>61</sup>. Camden has successfully prosecuted 20 companies, including EMI and Sony, in an effort to rid the streets of untidy fly posters.<sup>62</sup>
- 6.6 In an interesting approach, Westminster serve notice on the business and on its directors such that they can serve an injunction if the fly posting continues. This

---

<sup>56</sup> See views expressed in *Young London Speaks* 2004.

<sup>57</sup> Peter Sheppard, op cit.

<sup>58</sup> Section 225 of the TCP Act 1990 and section 12 of London Local Authority Act 1995.

<sup>59</sup> Corporation of London, Enfield, Sutton etc

<sup>60</sup> Bob Griffith, op cit.

<sup>61</sup> Peter Sheppard, op cit.

<sup>62</sup> MEL research, op cit

seems to have been effective because they have not yet had to carry out this proposed next step because of improved behaviour by the companies concerned. They also have planned a further step of seeking to have the individual barred from Directorships should the injunction not be effective.

- 6.7 Companies putting up hoardings around buildings undergoing a revamp now have to use specially slatted hoardings, making it virtually impossible for those putting up fly posters to ply their trade and so many don't even bother to try.
- 6.8 Further work is necessary to ensure that marketing contracts state that no illegal measures must be used and that there is clear monitoring and accountability so that this undertaking is fulfilled. It should be no defence if the company has subcontracted to a different organisation which has used illegal means for their promotion.
- 6.9 Our evidence suggests that further alteration of existing legislation would improve enforcement and reduce the advantage to beneficiaries of this form of illegal advertisement.<sup>63</sup>

*Recommendation 20*

**The Committee would support amendment of fly posting legislation to: shorten the notice period from 48 hours to 24 hours; remove the assumption that 48 hours is required for the receipt of the notice; and amend the wording in relevant legislation to read 'removed' rather than 'obliterated' so that companies cannot simply overlay one poster with a new one.**

- 6.10 Other ideas for tackling the issues include seeking discussions with those managing and owning organisations benefiting from these forms of illegal advertising. For example since council officers from Enfield invited proprietors of entertainment venues in for discussions, the repeated offending of their venues has reduced.

*Recommendation 21*

**Boroughs must use all the voluntary and statutory measures at their disposal to reduce fly posting and improve clear up. An example of each is holding meetings with venue managers on their use of fly posting and serving enforcement notices on directors as well as companies.**

- 6.11 As for graffiti, following the Anti-Social Behaviour Act, the local authority can serve notices on statutory companies to force them to remove fly posting. Again, if this is not carried out within the statutory period only those local authorities in pilot areas are currently allowed to charge the company to cover costs. We believe that the ability to charge for removal costs should be extended at the earliest possible opportunity. This new power also does not address the problem of removal of posters from private land, but should encourage the use of preventative design and the removal of redundant street furniture.
- 6.12 As stated in the section on graffiti, we would welcome powers for local authorities to issue notices against private owners to indemnify the local authority for minor damage during poster removal and where appropriate recovery of costs incurred for removal.

---

<sup>63</sup> Written evidence calling for this includes: Daniel Harrison on behalf of ALG TEC op cit, Peter Sheppard, on behalf of LB Lambeth op cit.

- 6.13 We believe that the duty to remove fly posters will create an incentive to use design to make fly posting more difficult. These include the overall design of an area to increase natural supervision, but also measures that make it hard to attach a poster or sticker to a surface, as considered above in paragraphs 2.11-2.13 and 5.9. According to the Camden Square Neighbourhood Association, covering cable boxes with a roughened surface has eliminated most fly posting in their areas.<sup>64</sup>
- 6.14 The surfaces of hoardings are a common site for mass fly posting which can be made more difficult by the addition of diagonal slats. Local authorities, such as Kensington and Chelsea, are now making poster resistant surfaces for hoardings a requirement for planning consent.<sup>65</sup> Camden use this approach, and according to MEL research: Companies putting up hoardings around buildings undergoing a revamp now have to use specially slatted hoardings, making it virtually impossible for those putting up fly posters to ply their trade and so many don't even bother to try.
- 6.15 Local authorities are not the Highway Authority for all roads within their area, which affects their ability to control fly posting. Certain main roads are managed by the Highways Agency and others by Transport for London (TfL). Although TfL arrange regular removal, apply design measures and consider enforcement<sup>66</sup>, we did receive complaints about low levels of enforcement and clear up on roads under its management and on its street furniture.<sup>67</sup> We understand that the Highways Agency has entered joint agreements with local authorities to allow them to enforce and suggest that TfL either considers a similar arrangement or increases its rate of enforcement.
- 6.16 Railway bridges, whether carrying the road across the railway or vice versa, are the property of Network Rail and these are commonly fly posted. Clearing up these areas therefore requires joint work with Network Rail. The Committee welcomes the arrangements whereby local authorities are funded to carry out removal of fly posting and graffiti, such as in Lambeth. However, it appears that the Train Operating Companies who manage stations have been less amenable to such arrangements<sup>68</sup>. It is hoped that the new powers to serve notice on such organisations will provide an incentive for the start of more productive relationships.
- 6.17 An added complication is the prevalence of large advertising boards that appear official but have not been granted planning permission. The mounting of such boards can be extremely lucrative and it can take a very long process to get them removed even where their illegality is recognized. Some fly posting agencies have also used board frames from recognized advertising hoarding companies to make advertising appear legitimate even where the land owner has not given permission for their erection.<sup>69</sup>
- 6.18 We would be interested in further study of such illegal hoardings to be able to quantify the scale of this problem. As one contributor to our investigation rightly considered, profiting from illegally erected advertising hoardings could be far more lucrative than fly posting and should not escape prosecution.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> Mrs M.S. Lake, Camden Square Neighbourhood Association. Written evidence October 2003.

<sup>65</sup> Cllr Merrick Cockell, Leader of the Council. Written evidence, October 2003.

<sup>66</sup> David Baker, Street Management, Transport for London. Written evidence, October 2003.

<sup>67</sup> Philip Godfrey. Written evidence, November 2003.

<sup>68</sup> John Lacey, Graffiti and Flyposting officer, London Borough of Lambeth. Tel. con. April 2004.

<sup>69</sup> John Lacey, op cit.

<sup>70</sup> Gordon Hill Residents' Association. Written evidence, October 2003.

## **7 Abandoned vehicles**

- 7.1 250 000 vehicles were reported as abandoned in London in 2001/02. Whilst some of these were merely untaxed, the remainder were indeed abandoned and had to be removed at a cost of to local authorities of £7.5 million. The number of vehicles abandoned in the capital was estimated to account for 37% of all abandoned vehicles in England.<sup>71</sup> Not only does this create dangerous eyesores on our streets, but arson of abandoned vehicles is estimated to cost £50 million per annum, according to Home Office figures, and abandoned vehicles tend to be a dumping hotspot, attracting a variety of rubbish.
- 7.2 According to the 2003 London survey, 17% of Londoners thought dealing with abandoned vehicles was one of their top three priorities for improving London's environment and 44% though it was a problem or major problem.
- 7.3 The likelihood of a vehicle being abandoned depends on the balance between its value as parts and scrap metal and the cost of disposal, which is currently increasing due to the need to handle the different components to meet a higher standard of disposal. The EU End of Life Vehicle Directive will continue to influence these costs as it is phased in. However final implementation should reduce abandonment in 2007 when the producer, not the final owner, will be responsible for the cost of disposal.
- 7.4 As mentioned in the section on fly tipping, Britain's vehicle registration system has changed. The new system of continuous registration means that the existing owner is now obliged to register any change in ownership and to pay duty on the vehicle. The DVLA will also be able to check vehicle registration and excise on their computer system which improves enforcement of correct registration. This new measure should result in greater accountability and more accurate records.
- 7.5 As this system is entirely new, it will not be clear for a while how effective it is, how well the DVLA enforce their new powers, and what impact continuous registration will have. It has the advantage that local authorities will be able to access the vehicle registration record and discover if a vehicle has up-to-date tax and registration. There is some concern that it may result in an initial high level of abandonment as people dump illegal vehicles before they have to pay the vehicle excise duty.
- 7.6 A further alteration in legislation has reduced the notice period for removal of nuisance or abandoned vehicles from seven days to 24 hours<sup>72</sup>. The local authority will have guidelines to check if the vehicle is abandoned, which considers such issues as road worthiness. If the vehicle has incorrect documentation it will be impounded, and if abandoned it can be crushed.
- 7.7 There are two major initiatives within London for dealing with abandoned vehicles. Operation Scrap-it will be operational in all boroughs by October 2004. Operation Cubitt has been operating as a pilot in Newham, Croydon and Wandsworth.
- 7.8 Operation Scrap-it allows owners to hand in their vehicle free of charge to a local collection point run by the local authority. This does mean that the local authority are assuming responsibility for the costs of vehicle disposal, rather than the owner, but it is believed it will save costs because it will reduce the numbers of abandoned

---

<sup>71</sup> Defra 2000/01 Municipal Waste Management Survey

<sup>72</sup> Requiring changes to the Refuse and Disposal Amenities Act 1978

vehicles, in which case the local authority ends up paying for collection and disposal, and the Fire Brigade has to deal with any resultant vehicle fires. Scrap-it also sets a standard for removal of abandoned and untaxed vehicles within three working days of report and assessment.

- 7.9 Operation Cubitt allows action by the local authority against untaxed vehicles through the devolution of certain DVLA powers. The local authority is therefore able to clamp and remove untaxed vehicles. This initiative was delivered through joint work by the local authorities and the police. This increased levels of legal taxation of vehicles and allowed the removal and destruction of unregistered vehicles including those abandoned.<sup>73</sup>

*Recommendation 22*

**With the introduction of Operation Scrap-it across London and the implementation of continuous vehicle registration the problem of abandoned vehicles should be greatly reduced. However this situation should be closely monitored by local authorities through the Association of London Government so that the effectiveness of these measures can be tested.**

- 7.10 When we asked young people about their views on abandoned vehicles, they mostly considered the issue in connection with joy riding. Their ideas for reducing this problem therefore revolved around initiatives to reduce joy riding. These largely consisted of design measures such as squeeze gates and speed restrictions to prevent speeding through an area<sup>74</sup>. Of course the need for such measures will depend on the proportion of vehicles abandoned after joy riding in the area, which varies widely.
- 7.11 It is not only cars that can cause a problem. Abandoning stolen mopeds and motorbikes and related arson is an important issue in some areas e.g. King's Cross. The Committee saw interesting work by Sparkplug to engage young people's interest in vehicles more constructively through legal driving projects and vehicle maintenance sessions.
- 7.12 Abandoned vehicles are particularly prone to arson, although dumped rubbish and litter bins are also a focus. These make up the majority of the 32, 000 non-accidental fires in London each year. We therefore welcome the official approval of a widened role for the Fire Brigade.<sup>75</sup>
- 7.13 We recognise that London's Fire Brigade has already been involved in excellent projects to prevent arson through their Arson Reduction Team and Education and Engagement Team, amongst other staff. The aim is to support the local authority and other bodies in dealing with abandoned vehicles, litter bins and dumping where arson has occurred or is a risk.
- 7.14 The Arson Reduction Team liaises with Metropolitan Police and local authority staff, including the environmental health department. Officers are also active in the Abandoned Vehicle Steering group of the Capital Standards Campaign to improve success in removing abandoned vehicles before they are set alight. Brigade staff are also being trained in note taking at the time of a suspected crime in a manner that

---

<sup>73</sup> Newham evidence – see case study.

<sup>74</sup> *Young London Speaks* op cit.

<sup>75</sup> Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004

allows these notes to be used as evidence.<sup>76</sup> The Fire Brigade is piloting systems to map hotspots to provide boroughs with useful information and allow targeted enforcement.

- 7.15 Projects of interest include the Junior Citizenship Scheme, Fire Setter Intervention Scheme, and the Local Intervention Fire Education (LIFE) project. These involve education work with young people, known and likely arsonists.
- 7.16 The Fire Setter Intervention Scheme has a specialist team of advisors who are trained to deal with children and young people who have shown an unhealthy fascination with fire. These advisors take referrals of young people from a wide range of sources and work with the young person and their parents and guardians to discuss their behaviour and potential consequences. 400 individuals have passed through this scheme and there is yet to be a repeat referral. Guidance for parents and guardians has also been produced to support those concerned about their children.<sup>77</sup>
- 7.17 The LIFE project developed in response to difficulties with local young people, in certain areas in Tower Hamlets, when the Brigade was responding to fires. Funding for the project came from the Single Regeneration Budget, Government Office for London and the local Youth Offending Team to provide week long courses on social and citizenship skills. Issues covered included firesetting, attacks on firefighters, graffiti, anti-social behaviour and gang culture on estates. The Brigade has found that this has reduced problems on the estates and has resulted in recruitment to brigade positions from the area.<sup>78</sup> The LIFE project is to be introduced in Islington.
- 7.18 The Committee welcomes London Fire Brigade's work on this important subject and hope to see resources available to expand their activities to match their widened remit.

### Case Study 6: Abandoned Vehicles in Newham

Newham is cracking down on untaxed cars and car dumping with a zero tolerance stance. In 2000 the council approached the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA), asking to be given the same powers of removal as the DVLA in a borough pilot. This started in April 2001 and its success led to greater powers being granted to other UK local authorities a year later. As a result, the DVLA agreed the council could remove untaxed cars immediately.

At least 24 hours' notice is still required to remove abandoned cars, unless they represent a health and safety risk to the public in which case the borough can immediately remove them.

Newham now claims the quickest abandoned and untaxed car removal rate in the country. This is partly due to a close partnership forged with the local fire brigade at a time when Newham was one of the local authorities with the most vehicle fires each month. Now the fire brigade notifies the borough of any vehicle fires it attends so the shell can be removed immediately to avoid repeat fires. The average monthly number of vehicle fires in the borough has been reduced by 28 % since 2001. Newham also aims to remove all abandoned cars within 24 hours, increasing the figure from 50 %. A 500 capacity car pound has been set up to help achieve this.

---

<sup>76</sup> Jill Lightbown, Head of Democratic Services, LFEPA. Written evidence, September 2003

<sup>77</sup> Jill Lightbown, op cit.

<sup>78</sup> Max Hood, Operational planning, LFEPA. Oral evidence, 16 October 2003.

## **Annex A – List of Recommendations**

### **Recommendation 1**

The Committee believes that proposed supplementary planning guidance to the London Plan on design issues should include information on designing out crime, and that boroughs should consider issuing planning guidance notes on the subject. We also believe that further initiatives are needed to evaluate and promote good practice for design measures to reduce crime.

### **Recommendation 2**

Boroughs need simple, co-ordinated reporting systems for incidents of dumping, graffiti and other problems, for use by residents, officers and contracted staff. The monitoring of reports from these systems should inform the allocation of resources and track the response to reported problems.

### **Recommendation 3**

The Committee welcomes the aspirations of the Safer Neighbourhoods programme of the Metropolitan Police service to create community policing units. This must be co-ordinated with existing street warden initiatives to ensure a coherent approach. Measurable indicators should be established and evaluated to demonstrate the effectiveness of this programme in tackling envirocrime. As recommended in *Young London Speaks* these programmes should specifically address the concerns of young people and ensure their constructive involvement.

### **Recommendation 4**

Despite many good initiatives and examples of good practice, some local authorities still need to improve joint working between Council departments, other agencies, community groups and residents. Mechanisms for improvement include existing joint working groups to address specific issues such as South West Action Against Graffiti, the North London Strategic Partnership and Capital Standard groups.

### **Recommendation 5**

The Committee would welcome a regional pilot in the London and Thames Gateway area for the proposed National Fly Tipping Abatement Force because of the prevalence of fly tipping if this would speed up the introduction of the Force.

### **Recommendation 6**

Developers must ensure that they and their contractors do not use illegal waste disposal operators. To allow for this to be monitored all construction site plans should have clear plans for their waste, and resources should be identified by the planning authority to check that these plans are followed. This will be of particular importance in the Thames Gateway because of the proposed level of development.

### **Recommendation 7**

The Committee recommend Defra and DTI investigate the practicality of companies being required to show waste disposal documents before advertising their services.

### **Recommendation 8**

The Committee support in principle the increase in maximum fines for fly tipping and the introduction of greater flexibility to allow for higher penalties in response to repeat offences and dumping of hazardous waste.

### **Recommendation 9**

The Government should monitor the use of alternative mechanisms of enforcement of waste transfer notes and waste management registration to ensure that the introduction of fixed penalty notices does not lead to a decline in alternative methods of prosecution which, although more costly, result in stronger penalties.



#### Recommendation 10

The Government should reconsider their decision on fixed penalty notices for small incidents of dumping and these should be introduced with local authorities being able to keep receipts from enforcement where they are the issuing body.

#### Recommendation 11

The Metropolitan Police Service must identify specific resources to target the enforcement of fly tipping because of the increase in the links between this illegal enterprise and organised crime.

#### Recommendation 12

The Government should amend relevant legislation so that it is easier to recover the full costs of clearing up fly tipping from private land occupiers and/or owners where they are a 'knowing permitter' and do not take action to prevent and clear up after fly tipping.

#### Recommendation 13

Despite the division in responsibility for fly tipping between local authorities and the Environment Agency, there should only be a single reporting point through the local authority for fly tipping.

#### Recommendation 14

Where a local authority or other body wishes to develop an anti-litter campaign, multiple strands may be necessary to address all audiences effectively and create constructive peer pressure. Campaigns must involve their target audience in their design to ensure the selection of appropriate methods and messages.

#### Recommendation 15

Boroughs, Transport for London and companies managing stations and other transport interchanges should reconsider how to provide for litter disposal in a safe manner. Examples include the use of transparent bags instead of bins for high security areas and bins capable of withstanding fire in arson-prone areas.

#### Recommendation 16

The Committee believes that local authorities and businesses, especially those operating fast food premises, need to work together more effectively to reduce litter. We would support the use of joint agreements whereby such businesses have responsibility for the cleaning public spaces adjacent to their premises and are involved in educational work to reduce littering.

#### Recommendation 17

As recommended in *Young London Speaks*, local authorities and central government must ensure that initiatives to tackle street crime and anti-social behaviour support youth provision of specific diversionary activities, and of supervised and unsupervised areas.

#### Recommendation 18

The Committee believe that the measure to make illegal the selling of spray paint to minors will not be effective unless local authorities act to raise awareness and act jointly with the Metropolitan Police Service to enforce it.

#### Recommendation 19

As recommended in *Young London Speaks*, local authorities with the support of the Association of London Government and central government should consider the feasibility of establishing legal poster sites for local venues and events.

#### Recommendation 20

The Committee would support amendment of fly posting legislation to: shorten the notice period from 48 hours to 24 hours; remove the assumption that 48 hours is required for the receipt of the notice; and amend the wording in relevant legislation to read 'removed' rather than 'obliterated' so that companies cannot simply overlay one poster with a new one.

#### Recommendation 21

Boroughs must use all the voluntary and statutory measures at their disposal to reduce fly posting and improve clear up. An example of each is holding meetings with venue managers on their use of fly posting and serving enforcement notices on directors as well as companies.

#### Recommendation 22

With the introduction of Operation Scrap-it across London and the implementation of continuous vehicle registration the problem of abandoned vehicles should be greatly reduced. However this situation should be closely monitored by local authorities through the Association of London Government so that the effectiveness of these measures can be tested.

## **Annex B – Evidence cited**

To obtain any evidence listed, please e-mail [anna.malos@london.gov.uk](mailto:anna.malos@london.gov.uk)

### **Written evidence cited:**

Bill Bailey, Hanger Hill Garden Estate Residents Ltd.  
David Baker, Street Management, Transport for London.  
Chris Birks, Director, Thames Region, Environment Agency.  
Dominic Campbell, London Borough of Barnet  
Cllr Merrick Cockell, Leader of the Council, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.  
Tia Cox on behalf of Chris Duffield, Town Clerk, Corporation of London  
Phil Davies, Head of Waste Management, London Borough of Southwark  
Philip Godfrey.  
Gordon Hill Residents' Association.  
Bob Griffith, Environmental Enforcement, London Borough of Enfield.  
Daniel Harrison, on behalf of Transport and Environment Committee, Association of London Government.  
Jason Hughes, Group Compliance Manager, Telewest broadband.  
Roger Jarman, Ealing Fields Residents Association.  
Pieter Johnson, Operations Director - Adshel.  
Suresh Kamath, Head of Street Management and Public Protection, London Borough of Hounslow  
Mrs M.S. Lake, Camden Square Neighbourhood Association.  
Jill Lightbown, Head of Democratic Services, LFEPA.  
Peter Sheppard, Head of Street Care, London Borough of Lambeth.  
Penny Spirling, Recycling manager London Borough of Sutton.  
Joe Tavernier, Head of Street Environment Management, LB Tower Hamlets  
Association of London Government 2001. Survey of Londoner's attitudes.  
Campbell S and Harrington V. *Youth Crime: Findings from the 1998/99 Youth Lifestyles Survey*, Home Office research findings 209. 2000  
Defra, *Consultation on statutory directions to the Environment Agency and waste collection authorities on the unlawful disposal of waste*. February 2004  
Defra, *Fly tipping strategy*. February 2004  
Defra, 2000/01 Municipal waste management survey  
Environmental Campaigns 2003 fly tipping survey  
London Borough of Newham presentation at ALG fly tipping seminar October 2003  
London Assembly Graffiti Investigative Committee. *Graffiti in London* 2003  
London Assembly Environment Committee *Young London Speaks* 2004  
MEL research. Capital Standards Campaign, report submitted to London Assembly Environment Committee, November 2003

### **Oral Evidence**

The Committee held evidentiary hearings on 16 October, 6 and 20 November 2003 and 4 February 2004. Transcripts of the hearings can be downloaded from <http://www.london.gov.uk/assembly/envmtgs/index.jsp>

#### **Oral evidence cited:**

Simon Baxter, London Borough of Southwark. Oral evidence 20 November 2003  
Andrew Chandler, London Borough of Southwark. Oral evidence, 6 November 2003.  
Cllr Brian Coleman, Environment Committee meeting, 4 February 2004.  
Daniel Harrison, Environment Policy Officer, ALG  
Max Hood, Operational planning, LFEPA.  
John Lacey, Graffiti and Flyposting officer, London Borough of Lambeth.  
Paul Tye, youth worker. Cited Channel 4 News, 22 April 2004  
Gail Lovell, London Borough of Waltham Forest

## Annex C – Evidence submitted

Organisation	Contact name	Type of Org	Graffiti	Fly posting	Fly tipping, dumping, cars	Litter	Capital Standards	Additional evidence	Area	Submitted
Park Langley Residents' Association	Reg West	TRA	x						Beckenham	email
Links Estate Residents Association (LERA)	A.J. Beskeen	TRA	x						Bromley	
Wimbledon Park Heritage Group	Sim Comfort	TRA	x						Wimbledon Park	email
Leyton Youth Centre	Ray Bellas	Misc	x		x				Leyton	email
MP	Dr Rudi Vis	MP				x			Finchley and Golders Green	letter
Park Court Residents Association	Mrs Joan Brazier	TRA			x	x				email
Leaves Green and Keston Vale Residents' Association	John Norley, Chairman	TRA			x				Bromley	email
London Borough of Havering	John Gross, Streetcare Co-ordinator	Borough		x	x	x			Romford	letter
StewartWalesSomerville Int.	Barclay S Wales, Managing Director	Private Company	x						East Kilbride, Scotland	letter
Effra Close Residents Association	David Richards	TRA				x			Wimbledon	email
	S Hindin	Individual	x			x				letter
IDeA	<a href="mailto:knowledge@idea.gov.uk">knowledge@idea.gov.uk</a>	Misc				x			N/A	letter
Arup Acoustics	Colin Waters, Associate Director	Private Company	x					x	Hampshire	letter
Kensington Court Residents Association	Sir Ronald Arculus, Chairman	TRA				x			Kensington	
MP	Chris Mullin MP	Central				x				letter

		Government								
MP	Barry Gardiner, MP	Central Government	x			x			Brent North	letter
MP	Mrs Jacqui Lait MP	Central Government	x						SW1A 0AA	letter
N/A	Mrs Y Wurtzburg	Individual				x		x	Kensington	
Residents Against Graffiti	Philip Ditton	Private Company	x						Croydon	email
Investigator Training Services Limited	Jane Smith, Director	Private Company	x	x	x	x			Croydon	letter
Arriva London North Limited	Mark Yexley, Managing Director	Private Company	x						London	letter
N/A	John Bartlam	Individual	x		x					
The Knightsbridge Association	Mrs C Seymour-Newton	TRA		x		x		x	Knightsbridge	email
Wimbledon Residents Association	Derrick Chung	TRA	x		x	x			West Hendon	email
St James Church Centre	Prebendary John Root	Misc				x			Wembley	letter
JCDecaux	Karen Crump	Private Company	x						Brentford	letter
Lincoln Court Tenants & Residents Association	Daphne Hart	TRA	x					x	London	
London United Busways Ltd.	Peter Spring	Private Company	x	x	x	x			London	letter
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea	Merrick Cockell	Borough	x	x	x	x			Kensington	
Action Against Graffiti	Tony Blacoe	Private Company	x						Surrey	letter
N/A	Stan Davison	Individual	x	x	x	x			North London	letter
122b Residents Association	Miss J Wilson	TRA	x			x				letter
Hanger Hill Garden Estate	Bill Bailey, Chairman	TRA	x		x	x		x	West Acton	email

Residents Ltd.										
EDF Energy	Sarah Threlfall, Head of Public Service and Sustainable Development	Private Company			x	x			Victoria	letter
Harmondsworth and Sipson Residents Association	Mrs B A B Sobey	TRA	x		x	x			West Drayton	email
LFEPa	Jill Lightbown, Head of Democratic Services	Functional body			x	x			London	letter
Bexley Council	Graham Ward, Head of Review and Improvement	Borough	x	x	x	x			Bexley	letter
N/A	Mrs E Watson	Individual		x	x	x			Leyton	Letter
London Chamber of Commerce and Industry	Piers Merchant	Misc	x			x				Letter
Lee Valley Park	Jan Britton	Misc	x	x	x	x			Lee Valley	letter
Launceston Place Residents Association	C G Dare	TRA	x			x				email
Glasgow City Council	Brian Kelly	City Government	x	x	x	x			Glasgow	letter
London Borough of Harrow	Cllr Paddy Lyne	Borough	x		x				Harrow	letter
MP	Richard Ottaway	Central Government	x		x					email
English Heritage	Martin O'Rourke	Misc	x					x	London	Letter
Randor Walk Residents Association	Peter Bull, Chairman	TRA	x			x			London	email
Pond Square Residents Association	Alison Perkins, Secretary	TRA	x			x				email
Silwood Tenants Residents	Doreen Dower	TRA	x	x	x	x			Rotherhithe	email
Hayes Town Centre Residents Association	Christine McGowan	TRA	x	x	x				Hayes	email
Go Ahead	David Brown	Private	x						London	letter

		Company								
Highways Agency	Paul Harwood	Misc				x			London Road	letter
St Mary Cray Action Group	John Blundell	TRA	x	x	x	x			Crofton	letter
Dacres Tenants Association	David Crittenden	TRA	x						Lewisham	email
Camden Sqaure Neighbourhood Association	M S Lake	TRA	x	x	x	x			Camden	email
Belmont & South Cheam Residents Association	Tony Wallace	TRA	x			x		x	Cheam	email
N/A	Bernard Hawkins	Individual	x			x		x	Enfield	letter
Braham Gardens Committee	Michael E Howard	TRA	x							Letter
Hayes Village Association	Diana Taylor	TRA	x						Bromley	email
Network Rail	Alison Hope, Senior Network Environment Manager	Misc	x	x	x	x			London	letter
Corporation of London	Tia Cox	Borough	x	x	x	x			City of London	email
London Borough of Sutton	Penny Spirling	Borough	x	x	x	x	X		Sutton	letter
London Borough of Southwark	Phil Davies	Borough	x	x				x	Southwark	letter
London Borough of Tower Hamlets	Cllr Janet Ludlow	Borough	x		x				Tower Hamlets	letter
London Borough of Lambeth	Peter Sheppard	Borough	x	x	x	x		x	Lambeth	letter
London Borough of Lambeth	Cllr Clare Whelan	Borough	x	x	x	x		x	Lambeth	letter
Landsdowne College	Anne Kiely	NGO				x				letter
Fellows Consultancy	Katy Sutton	Private Company						x		letter
Environmental Campaign	Ian Linton	NGO	x		x	x				letter

Committee										
Semley House Residents Association	Reg Butchers	TRA				x		x		email
Wimbledon Heritage Group	Sir John Wheeler	TRA	x					x	Wimbledon	letter
Guide Dogs for Blind Association	Chris Dyson	NGO				x		x	London	letter
N/A	Anne Slater	Individual	x						Grove Park	letter
N/A	Louise Oldfield	Individual		x						letter
GWB Residents Association	Holly Smith	TRA	x		x				London	
Pilgrim's to Willoughby Residents Association	Janine Griffis	TRA				x		x		email
The Downs Estate RA	John Calderon	TRA	x	x	x			x	Hackney	email
Inkerman Area Residents Association	David J	TRA	x	x						email
London Borough of Harrow	Andrew Trehern	Borough	x			x		x	Harrow	letter
The National Housing Federation	Desiree Hazeldene-Lloyd	Misc						x	London	letter
N/A	Steffan Jacobson	Individual	x							letter
Lissenden Gardens Tenants Association	Desmond Quilty	TRA	x	x	x	x				email
N/A	Charlotte Francis	Individual				x			London	letter
Council of Mortgage Lenders	Jackie Bennett, Senior Policy Adviser	Misc						x	N/A	email
Clear Channel UK Ltd.	Pieter Johnson	Private Company	x	x	x	x			London	letter
Ealing Council	Ms. Roni White	Borough	x						Ealing	letter
Labour Land Campaign	Paul Brandon	NGO			X				N/A	letter
London Borough of	Peter Sheppard	Borough	x	x	x	x			Lambeth	letter



Lambeth										
Environmental Services Association	Mike Walker	Private Company			x					letter
N/A	Rita Grootendorst	Individual						x		letter
London Borough of Lewisham	Alison Beck	Borough	x		x				Lewisham	letter
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Roger Jarman	TRA	x	x	x	x			Ealing	email
London Borough of Barnet	Dominic Campbell	Borough	x	x	x	x			Barnet	letter
British Telecom	Robin Seaman, Head of Public Policy	Private Company		x				x	London	email
Hollycroft Avenue Residents Association	Lilian Z Brafman	TRA	x							email
Croydon Council	John Bownas	Borough	x	x	x	x		x		letter
TfL, Street Management	David Baker	Functional Body	x	x	x	x				email
Telewest Communications	Jason Hughes	Private Company	x						London	email
Onslow Neighbourhood Association	Roger Baresel	TRA		x	x	x				email
London Underground	John Strutton	Functional body	x						London	letter
MP	Tom Brake, MP	Central Government	x		x			x		letter
LTUC	Vincent Stops	Private Company	x	x	x	x		x	London	email
Fellows Associates	Naomi Stevenson	Private Company						x		email
Tokyo Metropolitan Government	Kaneda Minoru	City Government	x	x	x				Tokyo	letter
Government Office for	Liz Meek	Central	x	x	x				London	letter

London		Government								
Royal Parks	Julia Frayne	NGO							The Royal Parks	letter
Central London Partnership	Patricia Brown	NGO	x		x	x		x	Central London	letter
London Borough of Hounslow	Suresh Kamath	Borough	x	x	x	x			Hounslow	letter
City of Westminster		Borough	x	x	x	x		x	Westminster	
Tower Hamlets	Joe Tavernier	Borough	x	x	x				Tower Hamlets	letter
Environment Agency	Chris Birks	Central Government	x		x	x			London	letter
London Borough of Camden	Tom McMahon	Borough	Submitted to	previous	inquiry request				Camden	letter
Merton Borough Council	Richard Rawes	Borough	x		x	x			Merton	letter
London Borough of Enfield	Bob Griffiths	Borough	x	x	x	x			Enfield	email
NSPCC	Jason Lever	Private Company						x	London	email
Belsize Residents' and Traders Assoc.	Norman Godfrey		x						Belsize Park	email
ENCAMS	Diane Shakespeare	NGO	x					x	London	email
London Borough Waltham Forest	Gail Lovell	Borough		x	x				Waltham Forest	email
London Borough Waltham Forest	Gail Lovell	Borough			x				Waltham Forest	email
London Borough of Lewisham		Borough	x	x	x	x		x	Lewisham	during visit
The Chewing Gum Removal Company	Mike Barrett	Private Company				x			N/A	letter
MPS	Marshall Kent	Functional body	x						London	letter
London Hazards Centre	Mick Holder	NGO			x				London	email

ECT group	Ian Doyle	Private Company				x		x	London	email
trion cleaning products uk	Carl-Johan Sande	Private Company	x					x	N/A	letter
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea	Merrick Cockell	Borough				x	x		Kensington	
London Borough of Richmond upon Thames	Malcolm Sharp	Borough					x		Richmond	letter
London Borough of Havering	Cllr Andrew Mann	Borough					x		Havering	email
London Borough of Bromley	Bob Hetherington	Borough					x		Bromley	email
London Borough of Wandsworth	PG Brennan	Borough					x		Wandsworth	
Association of London Government	Daniel Harrison	Misc	x	x	x	x			London	email
London Borough of Waltham Forest	James O'Rourke	Borough						x	Waltham Forest	letter
XFM	Graham Bryce	Private Company		x					London	email
ENCAMS	Justin Jupps	NGO				x	x		London	email
South Tyneside Council	Mandy Wilson	Borough						x	South Tyneside	email
Swindon Borough Council	Christopher Neville-Jones	Borough						x	Swindon	email

## Annex D – Orders and translations

### How to order

For further information on this report or to order a copy, please contact Anna Malos, Assistant Scrutiny Manager, on 020 7983 4207 or email to [anna.malos@london.gov.uk](mailto:anna.malos@london.gov.uk)

**See it for free on our website** - You can also view and download a copy of this report at: <http://www.london.gov.uk/assembly/reports/plansd.jsp>

### Large print, Braille or translations

If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of this report in large print or Braille, or a copy of the summary and main findings in another language, then please call us on 020 7983 4100 or email to [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk)

আপনি বা আপনার পরিচিত কেউ এ রিপোর্টের সারসর্ম ও প্রস্তাবের কপি বিনামূল্যে বড়ছাপা বা ব্রেইল, অথবা তাদের নিজের ভাষায় চাইলে 020 7983 4100 এ নাম্বারে ফোন করুন বা ই মেইল করুন এ ঠিকানায়: [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk)

જો તમને કે તમે જાણતા હો તેવી કોઈ વ્યક્તિને, આ અહેવાલમાંથી કાર્યકારી સંક્ષેપ અને ભલામણોની નકલ મોટા અક્ષરોમાં છપાયેલી, બ્રેઈલમાં કે તેમની પોતાની ભાષામાં વિના મૂલ્યે જોઈતી હોય, તો કૃપા કરીને ફોન દ્વારા 020 7983 4100 ઉપર અમારો સંપર્ક કરો અથવા આ સરનામે ઈ-મેઈલ કરો [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk)

Se você, ou alguém de seu conhecimento, gostaria de ter uma cópia do sumario executivo e recomendações desse relatório em imprensa grande ou Braille, ou na sua língua, sem custo, favor nos contatar por telefone no número 020 7983 4100 ou email em [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk)

ਜੇ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਜਾਂ ਕੋਈ ਤੁਹਾਡਾ ਜਾਣ-ਪਛਾਣ ਵਾਲਾ ਇਸ ਰਿਪੋਰਟ ਦਾ ਅਗਜ਼ੈਕਟਿਵ ਸੁਮਾਰੀ ਅਤੇ ਸੁਝਾਵਾਂ ਦੀ ਨਕਲ ਵੱਡੇ ਅੱਖਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ, ਬ੍ਰੇਅਲ ਵਿਚ ਜਾਂ ਅਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਵਿਚ ਮੁਫਤ ਪ੍ਰਾਪਤ ਕਰਨਾ ਚਾਹੁੰਦਾ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਕ੍ਰਿਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਸਾਡੇ ਨਾਲ 020 7983 4100 ਤੇ ਟੈਲੀਫੋਨ ਰਾਹੀਂ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk) ਤੇ ਸਾਨੂੰ ਈ-ਮੇਲ ਕਰੋ।

Si usted, o algún conocido, quiere recibir copia del resumen ejecutivo y las recomendaciones relativos a este informe en forma de Braille, en su propia idioma, y gratis, no duden en ponerse en contacto con nosotros marcando 020 7983 4100 o por correo electrónico: [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk)

اگر آپ یا آپ کا کوئی جاننے والا اس انگیزیکٹوسمری اور اس رپورٹ میں سے سفارشات کی ایک کاپی بڑے پرنٹ میں یا بریل پڑیا اپنی زبان میں بلا معاوضہ حاصل کرنا چاہیں تو براہ کرم ہم سے فون 020 7983 4100 پر رابطہ کریں یا [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk) پر ای میل کریں۔

Ta ba ri eniken ti o ba ni ife lati ni eda ewe nla ti igbimo awon asoju tabi papa julo ni ede ti abinibi won, ki o kanswa lori ero ibanisoro. Nomba wa ni 020 7983 4100 tabi ki e kan si wa lori ero [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk). Ako ni gbowa lowo yin fun eto yi.

Haddii adiga, ama qof aad taqaanid, uu doonaayo inuu ku helo koobi ah warbixinta oo kooban iyo talooyinka far waaweyn ama farta qofka indhaha la' loogu talagalay, ama luuqadooda, oo bilaash u ah, fadlan nagala soo xiriir telefoonkan 020 7983 4100 ama email-ka cinwaanku yahay [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk)

## **Annex E – Principles of Scrutiny**

The powers of the London Assembly include power to investigate and report on decisions and actions of the Mayor, or on matters relating to the principal purposes of the Greater London Authority, and on any other matters which the Assembly considers to be of importance to Londoners. In the conduct of scrutiny and investigation the Assembly abides by a number of principles.

Scrutinies:

- aim to recommend action to achieve improvements;
- are conducted with objectivity and independence;
- examine all aspects of the Mayor's strategies;
- consult widely, having regard to issues of timeliness and cost;
- are conducted in a constructive and positive manner; and
- are conducted with an awareness of the need to spend tax payers' money wisely and well.

More information about scrutiny work of the London Assembly, including published reports, details of committee meetings and contact information, can be found on the London Assembly web page at [www.london.gov.uk/assembly](http://www.london.gov.uk/assembly).





**Greater London Authority**

City Hall

The Queen's Walk

London SE1 2AA

**[www.london.gov.uk](http://www.london.gov.uk)**

Enquiries **020 7983 4100**

Minicom **020 7983 4458**