

The Guildhall  
Market Place  
Salisbury  
Wilts  
SP1 1JH



**Contact:** J Whitty  
**Direct Line:** 01722 342860  
**Email:** [corporate@salisburycitycouncil.gov.uk](mailto:corporate@salisburycitycouncil.gov.uk)  
**Web:** [www.salisburycitycouncil.gov.uk](http://www.salisburycitycouncil.gov.uk)

# Minutes

**Meeting of** : Environment and Climate Committee  
**Date** : 12 December 2022  
**Meeting held in** : The Guildhall, Salisbury  
**Commencing at** : 6.30pm

---

Present:

Chair: Cllr J Wells Vice Chair: A Riddle

Cllrs: V Charleston, J Bolwell, S Hocking, A Hoque, C Stanway and E Wills.

Officers: Marc Read and Yaroslav Pustarnakov

---

*Please note that Cllr V Charleston has replaced Cllr Bayliss on the Environment and Climate Committee.*

## **41. Apologies:**

41.1. Cllr Hibbert gave her apologies.

## **42. Public Questions/Statement Time:**

There were no questions or statements submitted by the public.

## **43. Councillor Questions/Statement Time:**

Cllr Hocking submitted questions regarding agenda item 12 Cllr Hocking's questions and answers are enclosed at the end of the minutes.

## **44. Minutes of Previous Meeting:**

The minutes of the last meeting of Services Committee held on 24 October 2022 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

**45. Declarations of Interest:**

There were no declarations of interest.

**46. Dispensations:**

No dispensations were requested.

**47. Chairman's Announcements:**

The Chairman made no announcements.

**48. River Park Project update:**

Mr Wallis from the Environment Agency provided an update on the River Park project. Cllrs thanked Mr Wallis, and it was:

**Resolved to:**

48.1. Note the presentation.

**49. Salisbury Green Business Awards/Association:**

Ms McHugh and Ms Karlberg from Salisbury Transition City gave a presentation regarding the Salisbury Green Business Awards/Association. Cllrs thanked Ms Hugh and Ms Karlberg for their presentation, and it was:

**Resolved to:**

49.1. Note the presentation.

**50. Environmental Services Update:**

Marc Read provided an Environmental Services update. Cllrs thanked Mr Read for his presentation, and it was:

**Resolved to:**

50.1. Note the presentation.

### **51. Environmental Policy Action Plan:**

Marc Read provided an Environmental Policy Action Plan update. Cllrs thanked Mr Read for his presentation, and it was:

#### **Resolved to:**

51.1. Note the presentation.

### **52. Revised Litter Enforcement Annual Review:**

Cllrs considered a report regarding the review of Salisbury City Council's Litter Enforcement contract, and it was:

#### **Resolved that:**

52.1. Committee agreed to give East Hants a six months' notice regarding termination of the contract for litter enforcement.

### **53. Allotments Update:**

Marc Read provided an update on the allotments. Cllrs thanked Mr Read for his presentation, and it was:

#### **Resolved to:**

53.1. Note the update.

There were 3 members of the public and no members of the press present.

The meeting closed at 8:55pm

**Agenda Item 3.**  
**Councillor Questions/Statements**

**Question submitted by Cllr Hocking:**

Dear John and Annie

I write to you in your capacities of Chair/Vice of the ECC

Re Litter Enforcement, having read through all the doc's I have some observations as follows:-

1. DOC88739 gives accurate information around FPN's issued for the first six month of FY2022 which is helpful as the figures promoted in DOC87761 at the last Ctte were highly speculative for FY2022/23 and thus are were clearly not representative given the current situation.
2. Looking at the data supplied by EHDC in DOC86603, lockdowns notwithstanding, the trend is downwards, thus given the 252 FPN's issued as stated in DOC88739 for the first six month of this FY it would be reasonable to project the figure for the rest of this FY to more likely around 500 so almost half of the figures presented in DOC87761. It would therefore I believe be better to use these figures in any future forecast.
3. DOC88739 states at line 7.1. "EH often provide a single officer instead of two due to staff shortages (Holiday/Sickness/Recruitment Issues)" thus, again, any figures based on the "potential" cost outlined in DOC87761 are clearly not representative of the true position as the potential assumes 2 officers, 2 days per week, every day of the year, and any future forecast should represent this.
4. Line 4.2 of the report states "This means the number of FPN's issued does not neatly correlate with the income figure" but does not indicate the scale of the non-correlation. As an example, how many FPN's issued are rescinded for whatever reason, or, how many cases are taken forward to prosecution which result in a repayment plan of £2 per week as stated in 4.1(d)? Without this info it is not possible to ascertain the quality of the service provided.
5. Line 7.3 states "...it is hard to catch people in Salisbury". That can mean several things, but from each end of the spectrum, positively, the message has been received by the public who are thus not dropping so much litter, or negatively, EHDC officers are perhaps not looking in the right place.

The report coming to Committee, both DOC 88739 with the recommendations, and being supported by the proposed figures in DOC87761, are not sufficiently detailed, nor provide a realistic future forecast for an accurate assessment of the performance of the service financially, on which to base a retain (in some or any form)/discontinue decision on the service.

Furthermore, at the ECC of 10<sup>th</sup> October it was minuted at 27.2. "The Committee agreed to defer the decision on whether to continue to discontinue Litter Enforcement until all options have been explored and considered." There is nothing in the reports for the upcoming meeting of what other options have been explored or considered.

Based on all the above, please could the following be provided:-

1. A forecast of income vs expenditure calculated from the available evidenced based data
2. Details of what other options have been explored.
3. A statement around whether Officers consider the effect of a complete discontinuation will increase the amount of litter on streets (especially with the current litter bn removal policy) when the public become aware the service has been discontinued.

Kind regards

Sven

### **The Council's Response to Cllr Hocking's Questions:**

Re Litter Enforcement, having read through all the doc's I have some observations as follows:-

1. DOC88739 gives accurate information around FPN's issued for the first six month of FY2022 which is helpful as the figures promoted in DOC87761 at the last Ctte were highly speculative for FY2022/23 and thus are were clearly not representative given the current situation.
2. Looking at the data supplied by EHDC in DOC86603, lockdowns notwithstanding, the trend is downwards, thus given the 252 FPN's issued as stated in DOC88739 for the first six month of this FY it would be reasonable to project the figure for the rest of this FY to more likely around 500 so almost half of the figures presented in DOC87761. It would therefore I believe be better to use these figures in any future forecast.

Comments that DOC87761 are highly speculative as were forecasts for 22/23 – so of course speculative as relating to what might happen in the future.

But in 2, Cllr Hocking argues that DOC88739 which uses accurate data could be pro-rata'd up to mean approx. 500 for the financial year and as half approx. of DOC86603. This is reasonable and indeed also reflects DOC87761 which he referred to as speculative.

3. DOC88739 states at line 7.1. "EH often provide a single officer instead of two due to staff shortages (Holiday/Sickness/Recruitment Issues)" thus, again, any figures based on the "potential" cost outlined in DOC87761 are clearly not representative of the true position as the potential assumes 2 officers, 2 days per week, every day of the year, and any future forecast should represent this.

The arrangement is for 2 officers to be on patrol. This is the objective under the contract with East Hants – therefore this is the "liability" which SCC will need to provide for. The true position may reflect this in the future, and this

would be both parties' objective; in the event that there is sickness, then this would simply be a reduction on the monthly invoice at that time.

4. Line 4.2 of the report states "This means the number of FPN's issued does not neatly correlate with the income figure" but does not indicate the scale of the non-correlation. As an example, how many FPN's issued are rescinded for whatever reason, or, how many cases are taken forward to prosecution which result in a repayment plan of £2 per week as stated in 4.1(d)? Without this info it is not possible to ascertain the quality of the service provided.

FPNs that are rescinded after the event are not based on matters which the issuing officer would necessarily be aware of at that time. Eg. Issue of an FPN to a young person who turns out to be 17 and not 18. DOC86603 from East Hants shows that percentage paid as being around 60% to 80% - average 65%. Those taken to court and their outcomes are not reported to SCC (and unlikely to be reported to EH) as once in the court's arena, the decision as to whether to uphold may not be purely on the basis of the actual littering but on the ability to pay. If no ability to pay is found, no award will be given even if the FPN was accurately and properly issued.

5. Line 7.3 states "...it is hard to catch people in Salisbury". That can mean several things, but from each end of the spectrum, positively, the message has been received by the public who are thus not dropping so much litter, or negatively, EHDC officers are perhaps not looking in the right place.

The report coming to Committee, both DOC 88739 with the recommendations, and being supported by the proposed figures in DOC87761, are not sufficiently detailed, nor provide a realistic future forecast for an accurate assessment of the performance of the service financially, on which to base a retain (in some or any form)/discontinue decision on the service.

There is a realistic forecast in as much as that the report shows that 252 FPNs were issued in the 1<sup>st</sup> 6 months and that would therefore expand to approx. 500 per annum. It is not really the issue of the numbers of FPNs and the income generated which is the issue here, but the significant increase in costs which East Hants are proposing. I.e. from approx. £60k in costs to £93k in costs – namely in excess of a 50% increase in their enforcement charges.

Furthermore, at the ECC of 10<sup>th</sup> October it was minuted at 27.2. "The Committee agreed to defer the decision on whether to continue to discontinue Litter Enforcement until all options have been explored and considered." There is nothing in the reports for the upcoming meeting of what other options have been explored or considered.

Based on all the above, please could the following be provided:-

1. A forecast of income vs expenditure calculated from the available evidenced based data

Actual figures which we currently hold are for Months 1 to 7:

Month	Expenditure (not inc VAT) £	Income £
April	3,477	1,384
May	2,977	2,259
June	3,077	2,056
July	4,038	2,573
August	2,716	1,774
September	not rec'd	1,972
October	not rec'd	2,258
<b>Average per Month</b>	<b>3,257</b>	<b>2,039</b>

This shows that even before the price increases from East Hants, income is covering only 63% of the costs.

2. Details of what other options have been explored.

We are in contract with East Hants and either continue with the service and note the cost and make provision in the 2023/24 budget or terminate the contract noting the 6 month notice period.

We could look to see if another council with enforcement powers could provide this same service for less but this is unlikely as few neighbouring Councils offer this service.

3. A statement around whether Officers consider the effect of a complete discontinuation will increase the amount of litter on streets (especially with the current litter bn removal policy) when the public become aware the service has been discontinued.

Officers do not believe that discontinuation of the service would dramatically increase litter on the streets. However, this would be monitored and would request that the option to reintroduce the service at a later date is kept.