

1. **CLEAN NEIGHBOURHOODS AND ENVIRONMENT ACT 2005
FIXED PENALTY NOTICES**

Submitted by **Head of Environmental Health Services**

Portfolio **Environment and Recycling**

Ward(s) affected **All**

Purpose of the Report

To advise the Committee of the action taken in respect of Littering offences within the borough.

Recommendations

That the report be received.

Reasons

Consistent enforcement is needed to challenge people who choose to ignore the law and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) guidance states clearly that pursuing non-payment of fixed penalty notices is key to a successful penalty system. Authorities need to strive for a high payment rate to reflect this success.

1. **Background**

During recent patrols conducted through the town centre and borough of Newcastle-under-Lyme a number of individuals were witnessed Littering. The offenders were approached and advised with regard to the appropriate legislation and their details were then recorded by an enforcement officer.

It is an offence under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to discard litter, however to avoid a conviction in the courts offenders are given the opportunity to discharge their liability by payment of a fixed penalty. The following offenders have been issued with fixed penalties but failed to pay them, and at Staffordshire Magistrates Court they received the following fines and costs with a victim surcharge (vs):

D023392	Mr Warwick Keen	£200 Fine £130 costs £20 Victim surcharge
D023395	Miss Carla Chatterley	£130 Fine £130 costs £20 Victim surcharge
D023404	Miss Jordanna Lowe	£200 Fine £130 costs £20 Victim surcharge
D023412	Miss Leanne Hulme	£200 Fine £130 costs £20 Victim surcharge
D023415	Miss Natasha Stewart	£200 Fine £130 costs £20 Victim surcharge
D023417	Mr Christopher Hyatt	£200 Fine £130 costs £20 Victim surcharge
D023423	Miss Natasha Heath	£35 Fine £130 costs £20 Victim surcharge
D023424	Mr Simon Livingstone	£200 Fine £130 costs £20 Victim surcharge

D023429	Mr Daniel Mansell	£200 Fine £130 costs £20 Victim surcharge
D023447	Mr Michael Muncey	£200 Fine £130 costs £20 Victim surcharge
D024456	Mr Paul A-Turunen	£200 Fine £130 costs £20 Victim surcharge
D024460	Mr Trevor Fitzherbert Stewart	£200 Fine £130 costs £20 Victim surcharge
D024466	Miss Natasha Baddeley	£200 Fine £130 costs £20 Victim surcharge
D024467	Miss Nadia Miag	£200 Fine £130 costs £20 Victim surcharge
D024468	Mr Gavin Jackson	£200 Fine £130 costs £20 Victim surcharge
D024475	Miss Stephanie Sutton	£200 Fine £130 costs £20 Victim surcharge
D024490	Mr Reece Hunter	£200 Fine £130 costs £20 Victim surcharge
D024498	Miss Stacey Nash	£35 Fine £130 costs £20 Victim surcharge
D024499	Mr Matthew Ashley	£200 Fine £125 costs £20 Victim surcharge

2. **Issues**

Consistent enforcement is needed to challenge people who choose to ignore the law and the DEFRA guidance states clearly that pursuing non-payment of fixed penalty notices is key to a successful penalty system. Authorities need to strive for a high payment rate to reflect this success.

3. **Policy Considerations**

There are none arising from this report.

4. **Outcomes Linked to Corporate Priorities**

4.1 Creating a cleaner, safer and sustainable borough.

- Streets and open spaces are clean and the community have pride in the borough and take responsibility for seeing that it is clean and pleasant by reducing waste.
- The community is not put at risk from pollution or environmental hazards.

5. **Legal and Statutory Implications**

5.1 The Environmental Protection Act 1990 and Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 place duties on the Council and provide powers of enforcement.

6. **Equality Impact Assessment**

6.1 There are no differential equality impacts identified within this report.

7. **Financial and Resource Implications**

The Council would seek to recover costs during any court proceedings.

8. **Major Risks**

8.1 **Non payment**

The non-payment of fines would need to be considered seriously. If a non-payment culture were allowed to develop the Authority would be in disrepute with the residents and members, undermining confidence in a service which aims to improve the quality of the environment.