



A report by Susan Hall AM

Cleaning up London.

Improving London's environment is a key priority for the Mayor of London. London has the highest level of fly-tipping in England and it is rising. Clearly, this is a problem that needs to be tackled.



GLA Conservatives.

Contents.

Cleaning up London.....	0
Executive Summary.....	0
Introduction.....	1
What is fly-tipping?.....	2
What are the relevant penalties?.....	3
Scale of fly-tipping.....	3
Costs	4
Types of fly-tipped waste in London	5
Behaviour in London.....	5
A better way forward.....	8
Communication.....	8
Capital Clean Up.....	9
CCTV support.....	10
Create a legal services hub pilot at the GLA.....	11
Conclusion and recommendations.....	12

Cleaning up London.

Executive Summary.

Improving London's environment is a key priority for the Mayor of London. London has the highest level of fly-tipping in England and it is rising. Clearly, this is a problem that needs to be tackled.

Local Authorities are responsible for dealing with investigating, clearing and taking appropriate enforcement action in relation to smaller scale fly-tips on public land (including public roads and highways within their responsibility). However, the Mayor's priority is to improve the

quality of the environment, and fly-tipping reduces the state of the environment in the capital.

The Mayor has a strategic role in recycling; in his Environment Strategy, he has set a target of 50 per cent for local authority collected waste by 2025¹ and 65 per cent for overall municipal waste by 2030². The Strategy also strongly promotes moving to a circular economy. Reducing fly-tipping by increasing responsible disposal through effective reuse and recycling would aid in delivering on the Mayor's targets and promotion of the circular economy³.

This report sets out the problem of fly-tipping in London including the scale, costs, types of waste and the behaviours that lead to the illegal dumping of waste. It contains proposals on how the Mayor can play a role in assisting local authorities with tackling fly-tipping so that both levels of government in London can deliver on their priorities.

This report puts forward four recommendations on how the Mayor can aid local authorities in addressing the problems related to fly-tipping. This would make a positive impact on the lives of ordinary Londoners and improve the quality of their environment.

Listed below is a brief outline of the report's four key recommendations, all of which are directed to the Mayor:

¹ https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/london_environment_strategy_0.pdf Page 310
² https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/london_environment_strategy_0.pdf Page 317

³ A circular economy is a regenerative system in which resource input and waste, emission, and energy leakage are minimised by slowing, closing, and narrowing energy and material loops; this can be achieved through long-lasting design, maintenance, repair, reuse, remanufacturing, refurbishing, recycling, and upcycling.

1. **Raising awareness of fly-tipping and its social, environmental and economic consequences.**

The London Directors of Environment Network, in conjunction with Keep Britain Tidy, carried out research on the behaviours behind fly-tipping⁴. Awareness was a key factor as many Londoners simply did not know what constituted fly-tipping and the social, environmental and economic consequences of it. This report argues that the Mayor should use Transport for London's advertising space to deliver an anti-fly-tipping campaign to clean up the capital.

2. **Resurrect the Capital Clean Up Programme.** The former Mayor of London, Rt Hon Boris Johnson MP, delivered the Capital Clean Up programme⁵ dedicated to cleaning up neighbourhoods and parks. The programme awarded grants to community groups to undertake clean up events removing litter and fly-tipping. The report argues that the current Mayor should resurrect the Capital Clean Up Programme.

3. **Fund extra CCTV.** Catching large scale fly-tippers is usually very difficult

without recorded footage of them illegally dumping waste. The Mayor should offer to fund extra CCTV provision to local authorities who put forward a bid outlining specific cases where it has been difficult to catch fly-tippers in the act due to lack of CCTV footage.

4. **Create a legal services hub at the GLA.** After obtaining evidence of fly-tipping, local authorities must take the process through the courts. The report argues that City Hall could provide a central legal services hub to provide and fund the necessary services required to take cases through the court system after local authorities have caught fly-tippers. The removal of the legal costs associated with prosecuting fly-tippers from local authorities would allow them to invest more money into fly-tipping prevention and enforcement. City Hall should also keep a London-wide database, as fly-tippers could replicate their bad behaviour in other boroughs.

Introduction.

London has the highest level of fly-tipping in the country. Streets are often littered with dumped waste such as mattresses, sofas,

⁴<https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Policy%20themes/Environment/Understanding%20and%20Tackling%20Fly-Tipping%20in%20London%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf>

⁵ <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/environment/waste-and-recycling/capital-clean>

furniture and white goods. Open spaces are used as dumping grounds not just for household goods but large scale industrial fly-tipping. The fly-tipping on our streets, open spaces and other areas reduces the quality of London's environment.

The consequences of fly-tipping go much further than just spoiling the aesthetics of an area. Fly-tipping has social implications as it often leads to the deterioration of communities. In 2015, Defra published a survey that found more crime in streets with rubbish, graffiti and fly-tipping, and less in cleaner areas⁶. When an area becomes a focal point for fly-tipping it encourages others to use that location as a regular place to dump rubbish. In contrast, people are more reluctant to fly-tip or litter in cleaner areas. It is well known that if places are dirty and look 'unloved', this can adversely impact upon health and wellbeing.⁷

Local authorities in London are responsible for dealing with investigating, clearing and taking appropriate enforcement action in relation to fly-tips on public land (including public roads and highways within their responsibility). However, the Mayor's priority is to improve the quality of the environment, and fly-tipping reduces the quality of the environment in the capital.

The Mayor is therefore correct to make improving London's environment a key priority, but

we believe a stronger partnership between the Mayor and local authorities could be beneficial in tackling fly-tipping in London. This report investigates the background to fly-tipping and puts forward proposals on how the Mayor can play a partnership role in aiding local authorities to reduce fly-tipping in order to deliver a better environment for all Londoners.

What is fly-tipping?

Fly-tipping is a criminal offence pursuant to section 33 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990:

a person shall not... deposit controlled waste, or knowingly cause or knowingly permit controlled waste to be deposited in or on any land unless a waste management licence authorising the deposit is in force and the deposit is in accordance with the licence.⁸

There is also an associated offence relating to the unlawful deposit of waste from a motor vehicle whereby the person who controls or is in a position to control the vehicle shall be treated as knowingly causing the waste to be deposited whether or not he or she gave any instructions for this to be done.⁹

⁶ <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2014/nov/13/dirty-streets-crime-link>
⁷ <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2014/nov/13/dirty-streets-crime-link>

⁸ Section 33(5), Environmental Protection Act 1990 (as amended)
⁹ ENDS Report, Operator fined over illegal 'fly-infested' waste site, 10 March 2016 [accessed 5 May 2016] [subscription needed]

What are the relevant penalties?

The penalties for fly-tipping set out in the Environmental Protection Act 1990 were increased through the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005.¹⁰ It is now a criminal offence punishable by a fine of up to £50,000 or 12 months imprisonment if convicted in a Magistrates' Court. The offence can attract an unlimited fine and up to 5 years imprisonment if convicted in a Crown Court.

In addition to fines, those found guilty of fly-tipping may also have to pay legal costs and compensation, which can greatly increase the financial implications of illegal dumping. For example, in 2010 a firm was fined £95,000 for the illegal dumping of waste; in 2013 two waste criminals were fined more than £80,000 for fly-tipping asbestos waste; and in 2016 an individual was fined £47,000 for allowing waste to be illegally deposited at two different sites, causing a fly infestation as well as risk of pollution and fire.¹¹

From July 2014, new sentencing guidelines produced by the Sentencing Council for England and Wales have also increased potential fines for serious environmental offences, including fly-tipping.¹²

Who is responsible for dealing with fly-tipping?

Local authorities are responsible for dealing with investigating, clearing and taking appropriate enforcement action in relation to smaller scale fly-tips on public land (including public roads and highways within their responsibility).

The Environment Agency is responsible for dealing with larger scale fly-tips on public land involving more than a lorry load of waste, hazardous waste and fly-tipping by organised gangs. In addition, the Environment Agency works with local authorities in removing fly-tipped waste.

Scale of fly-tipping.

Year	Region	Total Incidents
2016-17	*Total England	1002154
2016-17	East Midlands	63056
2016-17	East	75447
2016-17	London	366087
2016-17	North East	48966
2016-17	North West	128193
2016-17	South East	79911
2016-17	South West	44745
2016-17	West Midlands	67845
2016-17	Yorkshire and The Humber	69758 ¹³

London is the worst region in England for fly-tipping. Fly-tipping in the capital has risen over 14% from 2015/16 to 2016/17¹⁴. The latest data available is 2016/2017 and during that year there were a total of 1,002,154 incidents in England.

¹⁰ <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2005/16/notes>

¹¹ ENDS Report, Operator fined over illegal 'fly-infested' waste site, 10 March 2016 [accessed 5 May 2016] [subscription needed]

¹² Sentencing Council, New sentencing guideline for environmental crimes brings higher sentences for serious offenders, 26 February 2014 [accessed 15 September 2015]

¹³ Fly tipping datasets in Excel format 2016 to 2017, Defra
¹⁴ <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Policy%20themes/Environment/Understanding%20and%20Tackling%20Fly-Tipping%20in%20London%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf> Page 8

There were 366,087 fly-tips reported incidents in London.¹⁵

The London borough with most reported incidents in 2016/2017 was Enfield with 75,614. Haringey came second with 33,333 incidents and Croydon third with 24,797¹⁶. The table below shows the sheer scale of the problem in London¹⁷. You need to take into consideration the different size of the boroughs, as Enfield, Haringey and Croydon have a large population and geography. Boroughs often argue that local authorities calculate the number of fly-tipping incidents differently to look better than they are. However, it does not change the fact that, using the Defra figures, Enfield had the most reported incidents of fly-tipping in London.

Bexley was rated London's cleanest borough with just 1,680 reports of fly-tipping. Lewisham came a close second where 1,931 incidents were reported.

Year	Borough	Total incidents
16/17	Barking and Dagenham	2423
16/17	Barnet	7029
16/17	Bexley	1480
16/17	Brent	17,340
16/17	Bromley	3246
16/17	Camden	6778
16/17	City of London	1731
16/17	Croydon	24,797
16/17	Ealing	14,270
16/17	Enfield	75,614
16/17	Greenwich	7960
16/17	Hackney	3267
16/17	Hammersmith & Fulham	14,870
16/17	Haringey	33,333
16/17	Harrow	6835

¹⁵ Fly tipping datasets in Excel format 2016 to 2017, Defra
¹⁶ Stats provided by Defra - Fly tipping incidents reported by local authorities in England.
¹⁷ Stats provided by Defra - Fly tipping incidents reported by local authorities in England

16/17	Havering	4061
16/17	Hillingdon	7766
16/17	Hounslow	22,973
16/17	Islington	3011
16/17	Kensington & Chelsea	9029
16/17	Kingston upon Thames	1528
16/17	Lambeth	1931
16/17	Lewisham	1931
16/17	Merton	3113
16/17	Newham	19,917
16/17	Redbridge	12,461
16/17	Richmond upon Thames	5253
16/17	Southwark	17,131
16/17	Sutton	2296
16/17	Tower Hamlets	6287
16/17	Waltham Forest	6772
16/17	Wandsworth	4335
16/17	Westminster	10,075

18

The data used above shows the number of reported fly-tipping incidents. However, there are many fly-tips that go unreported for years, so the data is an indication rather than an exact measurement of the extent of fly-tipping in London.

Costs.

Clearing up fly-tipping costs more than £57 million a year for local councils in England. In London, local authorities estimate that they spent £18,395,660 on clearing up fly-tipping, an average of £557,444 per each of the 33 London authorities.¹⁹ The money used to clear up fly-tipping could be spent on other priorities such as children's services and adult social care, where demand for support is growing.

¹⁸ Stats provided by Defra - Fly tipping incidents reported by local authorities in England.
¹⁹ <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Policy%20themes/Environment/Understanding%20and%20Tackling%20Fly-Tipping%20in%20London%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf> Page 4

Types of fly-tipped waste in London.

In London, in 2016/17 fly-tipped waste overwhelmingly came from households; almost half (47%) of all incidents were 'other household waste' (bulky waste items, such as mattresses, furniture, whitegoods, children's toys, etc.), while just under one quarter (24%) were 'black bags' of household waste.²⁰

Table 3: Fly-tipping incidents recorded in the 2016/17 WasteDataFlow

Waste type	Count of incidents	% of total incident
Other Household Waste Incidents	170,915	47%
Black Bags - Household Incidents	86,500	24%
Primary Waste Type Measures Other (unidentified) Incidents	33,395	9%
Construction / Demolition / Excavation Incidents	17,332	5%
White Goods Incidents	14,449	4%
Black Bags - Commercial Incidents	12,376	3%
Other Commercial Waste Incidents	10,463	3%
Green Incidents	10,332	3%
Other Electrical Incidents	4,197	1%
Vehicle Parts Incidents	2,236	1%
Animal Carcass Incidents	1,361	<1%
Tyres Incidents	1,179	<1%
Chemical Drums, Oil, Fuel Incidents	951	<1%
Asbestos Incidents	230	<1%
Clinical Incidents	171	<1%

21

Behaviour in London.

The London Environment Directors' Network (LEDNet), in partnership with Keep Britain Tidy, conducted research as part of a project to better understand what makes people decide to fly-tip in London²². The findings from the research included Londoners' behaviours behind fly-tipping.

Residents' behaviour.

- There is confusion about what fly-tipping is and the many forms of it. This means that

communications aimed at addressing fly-tipping may not be reaching audiences who do not recognise the behaviour as something that they, or someone else they know, might do. As an example, people living in shed dwellings cannot be included within council services such as waste collections. This leads to increased levels of fly-tipping, which blights local areas.²³

- Certain types of fly-tipping are seen as more socially acceptable.
- Fly-tipping is often motivated (or excused) by a perception of 'helping someone out'. Respondents who had fly-tipped were more likely to agree with the statement, 'If someone can find a use for the items, then it's fine to leave them;' for example, people sometimes leave bags of clothes outside a charity shop when the shop is closed, not knowing that in doing so they are fly-tipping.
- There is a lack of understanding about the impacts of fly-tipping and waste service systems.
- A common perception is that the 'council is already out there collecting rubbish, so they may as well collect mine while they're at it'. There is an expectation that fly-tips

²⁰<https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Policy%20Themes/Environment/Understanding%20and%20Tackling%20Fly-Tipping%20in%20London%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf> Page 4
²¹<https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Policy%20Themes/Environment/Understanding%20and%20Tackling%20Fly-Tipping%20in%20London%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf> Page 13

²²<https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Policy%20Themes/Environment/Understanding%20and%20Tackling%20Fly-Tipping%20in%20London%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf>
²³https://www.glaconservatives.co.uk/uploads/1/1/7/8/117899427/beds_in_sheds_report_.pdf Page 4

will be collected quickly and without repercussions. People believed there was low level of enforcement.

- Some of the methods used by councils to clean streets and collect waste unintentionally drive fly-tipping. Three examples were identified: 'side waste' rules, which drive some people to leave excess rubbish by public litter bins where they know it will be collected; rules that increase the 'hassle' factor of using council bulky waste and 'tip' services (for example, councils being 'fussy' about what will and won't be collected/accepted as well as the price); and practices such as 'time banding' that involve bags of rubbish being left on the street for collection.
- Households are not managing their waste effectively and frequently run out of room in their bins before collection day; therefore, dumping rubbish or leaving side waste is seen as an easy option.
- People do not think about where fly-tipping ends up once it has gone "out of sight, out of mind". They are also unaware that if they pay someone a low price to remove large household items it may end up dumped elsewhere. People often

just put rubbish out the front of their homes in the hope that someone will remove it not thinking about its final destination.

- Disposing of waste responsibly is seen as a 'hassle' (and there is much scope for improving this).²⁴

Business behaviour.

- The interviews with local businesses found that, just as with the responses from residents, that many did not know the variations of fly-tipping. Despite this, when prompted, participants talked passionately about the negative impacts of fly-tipping in their local area (even if they contributed to the issue themselves).
- There was confusion around waste collection services in businesses' own area, which appears to influence fly-tipping. This confusion was caused by recent services changes, different collection schedules by council and private waste collectors, issues with non-council bags creating confusion around who collects their waste, and charges.
- As found in the research with residents, certain council practices and rules appear to be unintentionally contributing to the issue. For example, in one case

²⁴<https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Policy%20Themes/Environment/Understanding%20and%20Tackling%20Fly-Tipping%20in%20London%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf> Page 6

the council provided a free clearing service for market traders, so local businesses simply put their business waste out at the same time so that it would be collected for free with the market waste.

- The perceived effectiveness and threat of enforcement varied from business to business and relied heavily on whether they had heard personally of another business receiving a warning or fine.²⁵

Susan Hall AM published a report called *Secret Sleepers – London's problem with beds in sheds*²⁶ and the research matches some of the responses that the London Environment Directors Network received. 'Beds in sheds' are unauthorised dwellings, typically located in back gardens and garages of other residential properties. Often, however, such outbuildings and other structures are rented out as living accommodation without planning permission being obtained. When a structure is built and rented out without planning permission, it is effectively operating illicitly and unofficially. The dwellings cannot be included within council services such as waste collections. This leads to increased levels of fly-tipping, which blights local areas. Indeed, frequent fly-tipping in an area can be an indication of local beds in

sheds. Fly-tipping on public land in London increased by 30 per cent between 2010/11 and 2015/16²⁷, which should be reason alone to tackle beds in sheds. The residents who live in these dwellings usually do not have any space to store their waste and often leave it for others to take because it is the only way to dispose of their rubbish. Plus, the council picks up everyone else's waste, so it is not incomprehensible that it will collect theirs as well.

The price of bulky waste collection that was mentioned as part of the responses to the Understanding Fly-tipping report varies between boroughs. Harrow charges £35 for up to 4 items to be collected²⁸. Lambeth charges £21.50 each time you use the service for up to four separate items or four bags²⁹. Enfield charges £36.00 for one item.³⁰ The view is that, by charging for bulky waste collection, local authorities are pricing Londoners out of doing the right thing and it is inconvenient. Challenging times have meant that for many local authorities they must charge for this service, but it is a disincentive for Londoners to organise for bulky waste to be collected properly.

The results from the research carried out for the London Environment Directors' Network (LEDNet) and the Secret Sleepers reports show there is a certain

²⁵ <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Policy%20themes/Environment/Understanding%20and%20Tackling%20Fly-Tipping%20in%20London%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf> Page 7

²⁶ https://www.glaconservatives.co.uk/uploads/1/1/7/8/117899427/beds_in_sheds_report_.pdf

²⁷ https://www.glaconservatives.co.uk/uploads/1/1/7/8/117899427/beds_in_sheds_report_.pdf Page 4

²⁸ <https://www.harrowcommercialservices.co.uk/services/trade-waste/bulky-waste-collections>

²⁹ <https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/rubbish-and-recycling/rubbish-collections/arrange-a-bulky-waste-collection>

³⁰ <https://new.enfield.gov.uk/services/rubbish-and-recycling/special-collections/bulky-rubbish/>

naivety when it comes to fly-tipping demonstrated by both residents and businesses. Londoners do not necessarily feel that leaving side waste out on the street, due to either their wheeled bins or sacks being full, is a type of fly-tipping. There is a broad level of expectation that any dumped items will be collected by the council at some point so therefore it will be disposed of correctly. Living accommodation in London that does not provide any or inadequate waste storage leads to dumping because residents do not have anywhere to put their rubbish or anyone to officially collect it. These behaviour patterns prove that more needs to be done to highlight what fly-tipping is, so that more people become aware that they may be doing it even if unintentionally, along with the consequences of fly-tipping.

A better way forward.

The sheer scale, cost and confusion regarding fly-tipping proves that more needs to be done to reduce the dumping of waste in our city. The Mayor can play a leading role in aiding local authorities in reducing fly-tipping incidents and at the same time promote recycling as well as the circular economy which are key priorities in London's Environment Strategy.

The Mayor's role could include using Transport for London's advertising space to help promote cleaning up London, providing a dedicated fund for

social action projects that clear fly-tipping hotspots, funding CCTV projects to catch fly-tippers in areas that have become frequent dumping grounds, and creating a central legal hub to take fly tip cases through the courts after local authorities have obtained evidence of an offence taking place.

Communication.

The results of the research carried out by the London Environment Directors' Network (LEDNet) showed that many people simply lack awareness about fly-tipping and its impact. The outcome of the research evidenced that communication needs to be improved further.

The Mayor has communication tools that can help raise more awareness about keeping London clean. Transport for London's tube, rail and bus network provides space for advertising opportunities. The Mayor is a well-known figure in London and is more recognisable than most local authority members. TfL's advertising space should be used to run a periodic anti-fly-tip campaign promoted by the Mayor himself across the network. The Mayor's status can assist with emphasising that all Londoners have a social responsibility to our shared environment. The communication campaign would be centred on improving London's environment generally by keeping our streets, parks and open spaces free from dumped waste.

The communication campaign, whilst taking a general line, could include encouraging greater recycling and the circular economy by illustrating how waste can be reused. The Mayor has a strategic role in recycling and has set a target of 50 per cent for local authority collected waste by 2025³¹ and 65 per cent for overall municipal waste in his Environment Strategy³². If more people recycled items rather than dumped them, it could help with cleaning up London and at the same time help with delivering London's recycling target.

TfL is currently promoting a £500,000 prize for adverts on its network reflecting female diversity. This would be removed in favour of part funding the anti-fly-tipping communication programme. It is also not unusual to see the promotion of mayoral programmes on London's transport network, so there is an opportunity to allocate funding from existing budgets.

Capital Clean Up.

The former Mayor, Boris Johnson, delivered a programme called Capital Clean Up. Capital Clean-up was a Mayoral partnership campaign to help Londoners get together to clean up London. The programme was aimed at community groups and local authorities to help clear areas of rubbish. The project was part of his wider Team London volunteering programme and

supported by McDonald's. The GLA offered small grants of £500-£1,500, as well as clean-up kits to help run local clean up events. The grants covered costs of materials and equipment. The aim was to fund projects that benefit both the environment and local community.

Capital Clean Up ran from May to September 2015. 230 events took place which resulted in:

- over 4,600 volunteers joined events across London;
- 3,867 bags of rubbish were collected;
- 830,000m² of land/area was improved;
- 17,000 hours of volunteer time was donated.³³

Case Study – Hendon Green Clean Up.

A Capital Clean Up grant helped fund Hendon Green Clean Up. The North-West London Clean-up group ran a number of different events to remove the large amount of waste that had accumulated³⁴. Televisions, sleeping bags and an old mattress are just some of the items which were removed, as well as a large amount of empty drinks cans. The group were assisted by the nearby University of Middlesex, who provided further equipment for the events. The success of the original events on Hendon Grove led to further litter picks being carried out in the surrounding area, which were well supported

³¹ https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/london_environment_strategy_0.pdf Page 310

³² https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/london_environment_strategy_0.pdf Page 317

³³ <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/environment/waste-and-recycling/capital-clean>

³⁴ https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/case_study_hendon_grove_clean_up.pdf

by a range of community members. The group now run regular events in the area.³⁵

The current Mayor already provides the Community Green Space Grants, but this is aimed at delivering greening projects and improving access to nature for children and groups. The previous Capital Clean Up criteria included streetscapes, parks, open spaces and rivers. A new Capital Clean Up programme should highlight within its criteria potential monies for projects that include cleaning up the streetscape, housing estates, alleyways, parks, vacant land and open spaces. The programme could emphasise the recycling of any materials found during the clean-up activities. The Hendon Green Clean Up case study proved that funding could be awarded by the Mayor to clean up areas blighted by litter and fly-tipping. The Mayor could transfer £100,000 from the Team London small grants fund to re-start Capital Clean Up. Capital Clean Up would include the volunteering aspects that were expected of Team London Small Grants projects. The Mayor could also stipulate the community cohesion/social integration criteria that was part of the Team London Small Grants programme for Capital Clean Up projects.

A dedicated fund to aid in the clearing of fly-tipping bringing Londoners together will help local authorities with clearance costs and deliver a better environment for our city.

³⁵
https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/case_study_hendon_grove_clean_up.pdf

CCTV support.

The research by the London Directors of Environment Network showed that respondents believed there was little chance of being caught fly-tipping³⁶. Residents and businesses outside of the research have complained that increases in bulky waste collections have made it more economically attractive to fly-tip. When an area is seen experiencing fly-tipping a few times it attracts others to dump waste as well turning the area into a fly tipping hotspot.

The respondents were correct in their comments that catching fly-tippers especially on a large scale, can be difficult. The Mayor can help with providing opportunities for local authorities to have equipment that can help catch fly-tippers. The Mayor could provide opportunities for councils to use a mobile dome camera in fly-tip hotspot areas where it has been difficult to catch the culprits. Local authorities would apply for the use of these cameras, so it would be the Mayor providing additional support to councils to improve the environment.

Example of where CCTV has proved successful:

London Borough of Waltham Forest caught fly-tippers through CCTV. The fly-tipper was caught out after dumping waste directly in front of CCTV cameras. When council officers discovered the fly-tipped waste they scoured the

³⁶<https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Policy%20themes/Environment/Understanding%20and%20Tackling%20Fly-Tipping%20in%20London%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf> Page 5

footage on a nearby CCTV camera, which caught the fly-tipper in the act. The fly-tipper received a criminal conviction, was fined £200, and was ordered to pay costs of £926.20, which included £500 towards the costs of clearing the waste – a total financial penalty of £1,126.20.³⁷

The Mayor could ask the Deputy Mayor for Environment to reprioritise her budget to allocate £100,000 to fund the purchase of 8 dome cameras or, more specifically, money could be removed from the Greener City Fund. The rationale being that if it stops parks, open spaces and neighbourhoods being regularly fly-tipped, it will lead to an improvement in London's environment.

Create a legal services hub pilot at the GLA.

After collecting evidence against the perpetrators of fly-tipping, local authorities must take cases through the courts to achieve prosecutions where penalty charge notices are not applicable. Prosecutions are often costly, time-consuming and difficult for local authorities to achieve. The Mayor could create a legal services hub with GLA Group staff to provide support when the fly-tip cases go to court. The costs for the hub would be paid for through successful prosecutions. The awarding of costs would be put towards the funding of the legal services hub. After a year,

the hub would be reviewed to see if the money received through winning fly-tip cases had paid for the legal services provided.

The aim of the hub would be to reduce legal costs for local authorities and potentially allow them to allocate more money to fly-tipping prevention and enforcement, as not all councils are at the same level when it comes to the number of prosecutions achieved against fly-tippers. However, the hub would only be created if local authorities were in agreement.

Example of costs obtained through FOI

The costs incurred by the London Borough of Croydon to prosecute fly-tippers in the listed years.

2014/15	£ 200
2015/16	£1,685
2017/18	£4,265

The total amount of funds collected through fines due to successful prosecutions in the listed years.

2014/15	£ 6,830
2015/16	£11,141
2017/18	£14,430

³⁸

The costs incurred by the Royal Borough of Greenwich to prosecute fly-tippers in the listed years.

2014/15	£0
2015/16	£0

³⁷ <https://www.standard.co.uk/news/crime/flytipper-caught-out-after-dumping-waste-directly-in-front-of-cctv-camera-a3249476.html>

³⁸ London Borough of Croydon costs obtain through FOI

2017/18	£0 Pending cases still to be concluded
---------	--

The total amount of funds collected through fines due to successful prosecutions in the listed years.

2014/15	£0
2015/16	£0
2017/18	£0 Pending cases still to be concluded

The Royal Borough of Greenwich's explanation for above figures is:

*"Fly-tipping is an increasing problem for local authorities and private land owners across London and the UK, There is therefore a need to maximise our efforts to deter fly-tipping and to penalise those who engage in it. Prosecution is one route the Council can pursue but this is often difficult and costly to achieve. As a result the number of convictions for fly-tipping is low. The Royal Borough of Greenwich adopted the £400 FPN in Sept 2016, The ability to issue FPN for fly tipping offences, does assist in dealing with fly tipping offences more swiftly and with potentially less resource implications for the prosecuting authority. This approach has enabled Greenwich Council to deal with such offences quickly. It also reduces administrative demands on officers when compared to preparing papers for prosecution."*³⁹

Conclusion and recommendations.

London has the highest rate of fly-tipping in England and the figures are rising. The level of illegally dumped waste is having a social, economic and environmental impact on Londoners.

The report highlights the sheer scale and cost of the problem in London and the behaviours behind it. The report shows that there is still a lot of misunderstanding around fly-tipping, proving that existing communication is not entirely working. There is also a presumption by Londoners that enforcement action will not be taken. The report puts forward proposals on how the Mayor can play a role in assisting local authorities with tackling fly-tipping through communication, funding for clean-up projects, additional cameras to improve enforcement and reducing the cost of prosecuting fly-tippers.

The four recommendations below indicate what the Mayor should consider going forward in order to deliver policies in partnership with local authorities that will make a difference to the quality of the environment in London.

- 1. Raising awareness of fly-tipping.** The London Directors of Environment Network in conjunction with Keep Britain Tidy carried out research on the behaviours behind fly-

³⁹ The Royal Borough of Greenwich's prosecution figures and the explanation that accompanied them were obtained via FOI

tipping and the conclusion was that lack of awareness was a key factor. The report argues that the Mayor should use Transport for London's advertising space to deliver an anti-fly-tipping campaign to clean up the capital.

2. **Resurrect the Capital Clean Up Programme.** The former Mayor of London, Rt Hon Boris Johnson MP delivered the Capital Clean Up programme dedicated to cleaning up neighbourhoods and parks. The programme awarded grants to community groups to undertake clean up events removing litter and fly-tipping. The report argues that the current Mayor should resurrect the Capital Clean Up Programme.
3. **Fund extra CCTV for local authorities.** Catching large scale fly-tippers is usually very difficult without recorded footage of them illegally dumping waste. The Mayor should offer to fund extra CCTV provision to local authorities who put forward a bid outlining specific cases where it has been difficult to catch fly-tippers in the act due to lack of CCTV footage.
4. **Establish a legal services hub at the GLA.** Local authorities after obtaining evidence of fly-tipping

must take the process through the courts where penalty charge notices are not applicable. The report argues that City Hall could provide a central legal services hub to provide and fund the necessary services required to take cases through the court system. The removal from local authorities of the legal costs associated with prosecuting fly-tippers would allow them to invest more money into fly-tipping prevention and enforcement. City Hall should also keep a London-wide data base because it's almost certain that many fly-tippers will not confine their bad behaviour to just one borough.