

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):

D024789	Miss Firu Marinela	£220 Fine £130 costs £22 Victim surcharge
D024796	Mr Jordon Abbotts	£145 Fine £130 costs £20 Victim surcharge
D024801	Miss Anna Melvin	£220 Fine £125 costs £22 Victim surcharge
D024803	Mr Adam Hollinshead	£220 Fine £130 costs £22 Victim surcharge
D024807	Mrs Solaya Rowley	£220 Fine £130 costs £22 Victim surcharge
D024819	Miss Sara Rossborough	£75 Fine £130 costs £20 Victim surcharge
D024824	Miss Clare White	£220 Fine £130 costs £22 Victim surcharge
D024827	Miss Joanne Hannon	£75 Fine £125 costs £20 Victim surcharge

D024831	Mr Kevin Jones	£220 Fine £130 costs £20vs £150 Court Charge
D024834	Miss Lorraine Barlow	£217 Fine £130 costs £22vs
D024853	Miss Victoria Ecclestone	£60 Fine £130 costs £22 Victim surcharge
D024857	Mr Adam Knight	£220 Fine £125 costs £22 Victim surcharge
D024868	Mr Rob Parsons	£220 Fine £125 costs £22 Victim surcharge
D024871	Mr Andrew Edwards	£220 Fine £125 costs £22 Victim surcharge
D024878	Mr Lee Bradbury	£40 Fine £130 costs £22 Victim surcharge
D024892	Mr Alei Tzgel	£220 Fine £130 costs £22 V S
D024895	Mr Michael Thorley	£50 Fine £95 costs £20 VS
D024912	Miss Carol Sidley	£220 Fine £125 costs £22 Victim surcharge
D024918	Miss Emma Brown	£220 Fine £125 costs £22 Victim surcharge
D024921	Miss Shona Woodcock Mclean	£40 Fine £100 costs £20 Victim surcharge
D024923	Mr Carl Austin	£60 Fine £130 costs £22 Victim surcharge
D024926	Mr Jamie Ash	£220 Fine £130 costs £20Victim surcharge
D024927	Mr Ovidiu Cipran	£220 Fine £145 costs £22 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.