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2. **Introduction**

2.1 Eden District Council’s (EDC) Scrutiny Committee approved this review as part of its Work Plan for 2005/06.

2.2 To try to enhance community involvement in the scrutiny process an advertisement had been placed in the ‘Eye on Eden’ for members of the public to forward their ideas for work plan topics. Of the many responses the Scrutiny Committee received, seven residents requested a street cleansing review.

2.3 The following members were elected to form a Review Group:
   - Councillor Ms J Brook
   - Councillor G Collingwood
   - Councillor G Nicolson
   - Councillor K Phillips
   - Councillor A P Richardson
   - Councillor Mrs M Robinson (Chairman)

2.3 Councillor Nicolson was elected Chairman at the penultimate meeting of the Group when Councillors K Phillips and Mrs M Robinson were elected on to policy committees at the Annual Meeting in May 2006. Under the Constitution the members could not retain their membership on the Review Group.

2.4 The Review Group held its first meeting on 22 November 2005 to scope the review and prepare a project plan.

2.5 The Terms of Reference agreed were:
   1. To review the current standards of street cleansing (time, frequency and standards) within the district of Eden.
   2. To investigate dog fouling problems and numbers of receptacles within the district of Eden.

2.6 The aims and objectives of the Group were:
   a. To investigate what constitutes an ‘adequate’ standard of cleansing and recommend benchmarks
   b. To investigate frequency of rounds versus contract specification
   c. To investigate monitoring, which appears to be sparse – are we getting value for money?
   d. To investigate the role of the public and businesses in street cleanliness
   e. To investigate fast food litter – could this be linked to licensing?
   f. To investigate chewing gum litter – is there a problem?
   g. To look at “Streetscene” and amenity – pride versus state of the area
   h. The Group also wished to investigate the problems with dog fouling – contracts, wardens and ‘poop scoop’ bins
   i. Finally, the Group agreed they must consider and be aware of resource implications concerning finance and staffing.

2.7 The review areas agreed for research and discussion were:
   i. The Street Cleaning Contract
ii. The Contract for Dog Warden Services
iii. The perceptions of the residents in the District
iv. The responses from Town and Parish Councils of the current position in the rural areas and of best practice

2.8 The Group met on seven further occasions, this included two Witness Sessions, one with officers of the Council and one with the current street cleaning contractor. The current contractor for Dog Warden Services was invited to attend a meeting with the Group but did not respond to the invitation.

2.9 Dennis George, Senior Assistant Director (Community Services) was appointed as Specialist Officer and assisted with statutory, financial and contractual investigations.

2.10 The residents who had responded to the ‘Eye on Eden’ request were invited to attend the meetings and participate. Later into the review an open invitation to residents in the district was issued via the Cumberland and Westmorland Herald newspaper and several more residents attended to take part.

2.11 The Group agreed to submit a report to the February Scrutiny Committee meeting to request a time extension for the review from April 2006 to July 2006. The extension allowed the Group to undertake a more thorough research of the topic and to extend public participation.

2.12 The Group examined documents, consultation evidence and sought the views of local councils, residents and contractors. The Group also sought and received assistance from officers of the Council in relation to the aims of this review.

2.13 A questionnaire was sent to all 71 Parish Clerks in the District and Voluntary Action Cumbria (VAC), who worked on behalf of EDC, collated the responses and produced a report of the findings, which also contributed to the aims of the review.

2.14 CN Research, a local company was employed to undertake a telephone survey. 300 members of the Community Voice Citizen Panel responded. The Community Voice Citizen Panel comprises of residents of Eden District who have previously agreed to respond to questionnaires.

2.15 Members of the public were invited to attend and participate at several meetings. This proved to be a popular subject and approximately ten people took regular part in the meetings with another 8 to 10 contributing via e mail, telephone and letter.

2.16 Reviews undertaken by other authorities, listed in the acknowledgements were used for research.

2.17 The draft report was issued to everyone who had assisted with the investigations for their comments before the final report was submitted to Scrutiny Committee.
Finally, this report and its recommendations will be assessed by Voluntary Action Cumbria under a Rural Proofing Pilot Scheme agreed at Scrutiny Committee in April 2006.
3. **Background**

3.1 Scrutiny Committee sets their Annual Work Programme at their July meeting each year. In 2005 it was the first year that members of the public had been invited to submit their proposals for topics to be included.

3.2 Over twenty responses were received from the public arising from an article printed in the ‘Eye on Eden’ issued to every household in the District in March 2005. Seven of those responses were requests to investigate littering in the district.

3.3 The topic was agreed as being of importance to the public and members of the Council and was timely as the contracts for both street cleaning and dog services are to expire in March 2007.

3.4 The review also fits with the Eden District Council Corporate Aims and Objectives of:

*To best serve the People of Eden* (Council overall aim)

Service Objectives

- CA05 – Support community projects to improve the local environment
- CB03 – Ensure waste and litter are dealt with efficiently
- EB02 – Provide and commission high quality and cost effective services

3.5 The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 was enacted and implemented during this review and had an impact on some of the recommendations that were finally agreed.

3.6 The review was timely in the fact that several members had received complaints during surgeries and meetings with electors whose perceptions of the cleanliness of the district were not very encouraging. Fast food litter, fly-tipping and dog fouling were primary complaints.

3.7 There is an awareness that fast food outlets are increasing, especially in Penrith, which are generators of litter and contribute to the public perceptions on littering.

3.8 There have been some uncomplimentary observations from residents on their perceptions of the cleanliness of the district via the letters page in the Cumberland and Westmorland Herald newspaper. The Group was informed by members of the public that Jeremy Vine had commented on his Radio 2 programme about the unsavoury state of Penrith on a recent visit he had made.

3.9 Fast food litter was the major complaint as was littering in general. The town centre of Penrith was perceived to be very untidy on Saturday and Sunday mornings and after school lunch breaks, even though it has been witnessed that the streets are being cleaned at 3am on a Saturday morning.
3.10 Chewing gum litter was highlighted but did not receive as much attention as was expected.

3.11 Litter on the highway grass verges and fly-tipping was a major cause for complaint but the area that received most of the complaints was dog fouling which was perceived as a district-wide problem.
4. Findings

4.1 The following statements have been made by the Local Government Association which was highlighting a national problem, including the burden on local authorities who are struggling to provide the finances to cover the increased costs.

4.2 Local Authorities in England manage almost 30 million tonnes of waste every year costing over £3 billion.

4.3 The amount of fast food litter, nationally on our streets rose by 12% in 2003.

4.4 Providing clean, green and safe neighbourhoods that local people expect will cost £313 million more in 2006/07.

4.5 The first objective of the Group was to look at the Street Contract for EDC. The Contract first went out to Tender under the Competitive Contract Tendering initiative in 1989 and was subsequently re-tendered as part of a package of contracts that was awarded to TFE Accord (part of Accord Ltd. – a national firm) in 1997 for a ten year term.

4.6 Street sweeping work is mandatory on the authority. The frequency with which a street is swept depends on the amount of litter expected and the cleanliness standards set out in the Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse published by the Secretary of State for the Environment under section 89(7) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. Streets and footpaths are cleansed to a scheduled frequency and on demand between scheduled cleanses if the cleanliness standard falls below acceptable levels.

4.7 Findings relating back to the aims and objectives of the review

4.8 A. To investigate what constitutes an ‘adequate’ standard of cleansing

4.9 The Code of Practice lays down national standards for determining the level of littering and these are expressed by a set of eight pictures and zoning statements, which are attached to this report at Appendix A.

4.10 Street Cleansing – What is it?
   • Mechanical sweeping
   • Litter picking
   • Empty litter bins
   • Cleanse recycling centres
   • Remove abandoned vehicles
   • Remove fly-tipping
   • Clean up after community events
   • Dog Fouling

4.11 Street Cleansing – Where?
   • All public roads (not M6), highway verges and footpaths
• All Council owned open space
• Council owned off street car parks
• Private land (abandoned vehicles on request only)
• District-wide for litter bins and dogs

4.12 Street Cleansing – How is it done?
• Scheduled frequencies of cleansing operations
• Reactive response arising from inspection or complaint
• Performance monitoring consistent with maintaining Grade A standards in litter zones 1 and 3
• Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI) 199

4.13 The litter zones applicable to Eden are:
• Zone 1 – Comprises the town centres of Alston, Appleby, Kirkby Stephen and Penrith
• Zone 3 – Comprises the immediate urban area outside the defined town centre areas for the locations in Zone 1
• Zone 4 – Applies to the remainder of the district other than the following exemptions:
  • Zone 6 – A66 and A685 trunk roads (Strategic Routes)
  • Zone 7 – All highways within the district including lengths through Zone 4 villages (Local Roads)

4.14 Littering in lay-bys appears to be a major problem. This was also brought forward by the district’s residents. There is a policy of no bins to be located in lay-bys.

4.15 There is confusion about county and district responsibilities. This was also brought forward by the County Highways Engineer, who is willing to work with EDC on awareness raising.

4.16 Members were informed during the review that offenders carrying out Community Service Orders were cleaning the area around ‘Bring’ recycling sites and that this was meeting with very favourable comments of a job well done. TFE Accord was agreeable to the possibility of this project being expanded.

4.17 B. To investigate frequency of rounds versus contract specification.

4.18 The Street Cleaning Contract costs approximately £190,000 per annum for the frequency based cleaning and additional reactive cleaning is paid as extra if required.

4.19 At the request of the Group the Senior Assistant Director (Community Services) visited Allerdale to look at their street cleansing contract as this district had been highlighted as having clean streets and highways.

4.20 C. To investigate monitoring, which appears to be sparse – are we getting value for money?
4.21 The findings of the visit were highlighted in a report given to the Group. It was confirmed that the spend per head of population in Eden is half the amount spent in Allerdale. It was stated that there is less mileage of roads in Allerdale nor do they have the same problems as Eden except in the main centres. There is a greater population in a smaller area in Allerdale. Eden has a population of approximately 50,000 spread over the second largest district area in England.

4.22 Allerdale has a different type of contract to Eden. The contract in Allerdale is for 14 years and they pay a sum of money for a specific number of staff and vehicles (a fixed resource) and the Council can direct the resource to tackle the problems it chooses in each of the main towns in the borough. Allerdale delivers similar streetscene services to Eden with a dedicated team of twenty staff. By comparison, Eden delivers the same range of services with 10.5 staff, who operate in a much larger geographical area.

4.23 It was clarified that Eden had only 1.5 inspectors to inspect and monitor four major contracts and were not simply available to monitor street cleansing.

4.24 During the Review it had been decided by the Council to extend the Street Cleansing Contract by five years and it was hoped that this review would help inform the parties of potential improvements to the contract. A meeting had already taken place with the Senior Assistant Director (Community Services) who stated he was looking for flexibility within the Contract.

4.25 The company is willing to review the current specification for improvements and as stated earlier this has already begun.

4.26 D. To investigate the role of the public and businesses in street cleanliness

4.27 The Group had asked TFE Accord for their recommendations for this review and their response was:

- Greater education in schools – Accord is willing to contribute
- Changes in the contract with no cost implications – higher standards mean increased costs – Accord to carry out a re-evaluation of service
- A ‘Pride in Eden’ media campaign – Accord would support with prizes for projects. Accord has a public relations department and is willing to use their staff to support any media campaign.
- They felt enforcement and ‘name and shame’ should be a vital part of the recommendations especially in relation to dog fouling. Enforcement can be sub contracted and Accord would be willing to look at producing a self financing service.

4.28 E. To investigate fast food litter – could this be linked to licensing?

4.29 Fast food litter was investigated in great detail but it was difficult to link to licensing.

4.30 F. To investigate chewing gum litter – is there a problem?
4.31 Chewing gum is a problem but did not rank highly with those participating in the review.

4.32 **G. To look at ‘streetscene’ and amenity – pride versus state of an area**

4.33 Extensive consultation was carried out with Town and Parish Councils, members of the public and the Community Voice Citizens Panel participating. The majority were positive about the services EDC provided. The most problems voiced by Town and Parish Councils were about dog fouling rather than the street cleansing service. 300 responses were received from the Community Voice Citizen Panel. Some of the statistics are listed below:

- 61% think increased publicity and education would help reduce litter problems.
- 84% think targeting areas for increased surveillance would reduce dog fouling problems
- Approximately 200 of the 300 respondents thought enforcement would reduce dog fouling problems
- 45% were prepared to inform on offenders
- 34% were prepared to take part in litter picking initiatives
- 15.5% thought there was a need for litter and dog bins

The full reports can be found at Appendices B and C.

4.34 Perceptions are that clean streets are fundamental to an attractive district and create the right environment to attract people to the area and to make their time here a pleasant experience.

4.35 Consultation exercises with the public and local councils indicated these services are perceived as a priority for improvement.

4.36 In the first instance those who attended wished to complain about certain areas but once this was over they were more than willing to assist in forwarding ideas for solutions, some being very innovative!

4.37 The areas receiving complaints were dealt with during the review but a list has been compiled and is attached as Appendix D to this report.

4.38 The local press has printed letters of complaint concerning litter in the district. They also printed the open invitation to attend the review meetings. The members are keen to involve them in ‘good news’ stories and campaigns.

4.39 The Group were also informed that Penrith had featured on the Radio 2 programme presented by Jeremy Vine who had been less than complimentary about the state of the town.

4.40 During the review the Group received a letter from one of those attending the meetings and had complained about litter and the lack of a waste bin. The letter thanked the Officers and said “there had been a 99.9% improvement”!

4.41 **H. The Group also wished to investigate the problems with dog fouling – contracts, wardens and ‘poop scoop’ bins**
4.42 The Dog Services are part of the Pest Control and Dog Warden Services Contract, which is currently contracted to K9 Euro Ltd. The Contract ends in March 2007.

4.43 It was explained that K9 had been the Council’s contractor from around 1998. After one contract period with another contractor, the contract had again been awarded to K9 in 2003.

4.44 The Group was told that the Council can only require the contractor to do those things which are specified in the Contract – the contractor is entitled to charge extra for anything over and above that. The perception is that the company’s attitude to the interpretation of the contract has changed and become stricter so that extra charges would be levied for any item not specifically covered in the contract.

4.45 It was found that there is only limited information readily available from the contractor and the service was more difficult to monitor now that the service has moved from using an answer phone in the Council offices to use of a K9 call-centre.

4.46 Officers stated that it is difficult to say whether Eden is receiving value for money. The Council is still receiving many dog related complaints but only those which are raised through the Council can be monitored through satisfaction forms.

4.47 The collection of dog waste from bins has been a success.

4.48 The Officers confirmed that there is an intention to re-draft and re-tender the contract and a new contract would be in place for April 2007 when the current contract ends. The process had started and staff are to use the expertise of colleagues in relation to the future contract. Officers were already aware that a more robust and comprehensive contract needs to be prepared and that penalty provisions should be different to those in the current contract.

4.49 Officers were asked if they would be happy to run an in-house contract. It was confirmed that they would be happy to do so although it was pointed out that if the contract was to be awarded purely on price it is unlikely that the in-house option would be viable.

4.50 Towards the end of the Review the Group was presented with an in-house draft tender. Sharon Wood, Environmental Health Officer for Eden gave an overview of a report being prepared for Committee.

4.51 The Clean Neighbourhood and Environment Act 2005 (CNEA) was highlighted as being significant legislation impacting on dog services. She went on to outline the recommendations which it was felt addressed the concerns of both the Members and the public.

4.52 The key points proposed for the new contract were:
• To satisfy the requirements specified in the CNEA and existing legislation and by-laws
• Improved reporting mechanisms
• Detailed specification of duties in service provision to cater to Council demands
• Two full time operatives to work on a flexi time basis to cover early mornings and late evenings
• Consideration is given to the Pest Control and Dog Warden Contracts being separated.

4.53 The Act will also transfer the registration of stray dogs to local authorities. New powers will enable local authorities and parish councils to designate areas where certain defined dog offences will be punishable.

4.54 One of the residents who regularly attended the meetings brought in biodegradable dog waste bags for inspection. The bags had been issued at Carlisle Spring Flower Show together with a questionnaire asking people if they would be prepared to pay a little extra for this type of bag and where they wished to purchase them. Members thought the bags were a good idea and intend to make reference to them in their recommendations.

4.55 I. To consider and be aware of resource implications to finance and staffing

4.56 In order to provide an effective response, it is recognised that resources will need to be allocated to the problem including resources for the provision of bins, signs, publicity and awareness raising activities. Scarcity of resources leads to the need to give careful thought, imagination and innovation to recommendations.

4.57 Enforcement and prosecutions will also require resources. The use of fixed penalty notices and potential sponsorship would generate income for the Council but this would be minimal.

4.58 There are likely to be implications, in terms of revised working methods and training needs for some staff in providing a combined approach to dog fouling, including awareness raising, enforcement and consultation.

4.59 An effective approach which succeeded in reducing the level of litter and dog fouling would improve the local environment and reduce health risks.

4.60 Other

4.61 Under the CNEA, offences involving litter and measures to clear litter will be extended and will also include private land. Litter controls will extend to mobile vendors and powers will be provided to restrict the distribution of leaflets. Chewing gum and all smoking materials will be classified as litter and councils will be able to issue fixed penalty notices (FPN’s) for litter offences.
5. **Conclusions and Recommendations**

5.1 The group concluded that the street cleansing contract was generally effective in addressing the district’s needs. There is a high level of commitment by council and contractor staff to dealing with litter, fly tipping and other street cleaning issues. However it is important to point out that financial constraints may limit the ability to fully meet public expectations. The review group believe that greater flexibility within the contract and increased enforcement action, without significant extra cost, will be significant extra factors in addressing public concerns.

5.2 The Group concluded that the key issues were the following:
   a. Publicity, awareness raising and education
   b. Effectiveness of signs including stencils
   c. Location of bins
   d. Enforcement

5.3 The recommendations would fall into three broad areas:
   i. Education
   ii. Publicity/Awareness raising
   iii. Contractual

5.4 From its consideration of all the evidence received, the Group reached the view that in order to be effective there needed to be a combined approach to dealing with littering and dog fouling, incorporating provision of bins and signs, publicity, education, awareness raising, clean-up and enforcement.

5.5 There was evidence in desktop research of several councils that had used temporary stencil signs in problem areas that had led to improvements and the Group supports this type of initiative for Eden District.

5.6 Based on evidence from other authorities, where a small number of well publicised successful prosecutions had resulted in changed public perceptions and expectations, the Group concluded that, where a prosecution succeeded, especially dog fouling, this should be publicised including ‘naming and shaming’ to highlight the Council’s serious intent to prosecute such cases to improve the district for residents and visitors.

5.7 In order to maximise the impact of the new provisions the Group concluded that enforcement efforts should initially be concentrated on those areas identified as ‘hotspots’, with a high level of publicity to any successful prosecutions achieved by it.

5.8 Enforcement works needs to be stepped up. Takeaways should be encouraged to make arrangements to clear up their own litter. In tandem with this, educational activities need to be carried out.

5.9 The Group was pleased to have been able to contribute to the general raising of awareness through the involvement of members of the public in its review and hopes to provide further publicity by involving schools in the District.
5.10 The Group was of the view that by involving the schools it would contribute to raising the level of awareness of the problems of littering and dog fouling, not only of the pupils but also families.

5.11 Businesses also need to be brought in to assist with improvement activities.

5.12 The Dog Services Contract needs to be completely revised before renewal in April 2007. This is already being prepared and the review will help inform contract revisions.

5.13 The members noted the draft ‘in-house’ tender proposal and are prepared to endorse it but the Group acknowledged they were not in a position to make the decision concerning the tendering process.

5.14 As stated above the recommendations fall into three broad themes (some overlapping) and those themes are used to set out the recommendations below.

5.15 **Educational:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ask the schools in the district (infant/junior and secondary) if they would be prepared to include littering and dog fouling topics in Citizenship lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inform schools that there are officers, members and contractors available to attend schools to talk about these social problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Use street theatre (Stage Coach/Eden Youth Alliance/Eden Arts etc.) for education through entertainment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.16 **Publicity and Awareness raising** – linked to education but bringing in the wider public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Produce information explaining the new legislation and powers (inclusive of speed limit zones re the Dog (Fouling of Land) Act 1996, if still relevant).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3        | 5   | Look for sponsorship for publicity/events.  
  - Produce posters – school children could enter a competition to design a poster/logo (TFE Accord said they would be willing to sponsor).  
  - Approach businesses to print winning logo on their bags.  
  - Ask all fast food outlets to put up posters/use bags requesting patrons to dispose of their litter responsibly.  
  - Have a range of posters/logo and phrases with a standard colour that can be easily recognised which can be produced as badges/car stickers. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 6.</td>
<td>Have a ‘Litter Pick’ Week involving voluntary groups such as the Rotary, Lions Scouts etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 7.</td>
<td>Invite Jeremy Vine back to Penrith to launch the litter pick week/logo/posters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 8.</td>
<td>Provide biodegradable poop scoop bags with a high profile launch (eg free issue at Penrith Show) that can be sold in various outlets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1 9.        | Request that the Communication Officer issue good news stories/articles about current good practice (litter picking initiatives/early morning street cleansing).  
| | - Contact with the media to maintain awareness raising  
| | - Primary aims – Prevention and to demonstrate that public services are responsive  
| | - Use ‘naming and shaming’ when a prosecution succeeds to show the Council is serious about enforcement and improving the current standards |
| 3 10        | Use temporary stencils on pavements for enforcement signs and logos. This will have to be discussed with Cumbria County Council (who are responsible for the pavements) and TFE Accord (the EDC Contractor). |

### 5.17 Contractual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 11        | The renewal of the Street Cleansing Contract and the re-tendering of the Dog Warden Services Contract should ensure they:  
| | - Provide value for money  
| | - Are responsive, flexible and enables variations without large cost implications  
| | - Aligning hours of activity to dog walking times (early mornings/evenings)  
| | - Empowering and training of field officers – provide digital cameras  
| | - Enforcement  
| | - Scoping of the contract taking into account new legislation  
| | - Flexibility, accountability and improved reporting mechanisms  
| | - That the dog waste bin emptying service provision should be considered for transfer to the Client Services Department as part of the street cleaning regime. |
| 1 12        | TFE Accord to be enabled to issue fines and re-invest the income into addressing problems/education. |

The Pest Control and Dog Warden Contracts are
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>considered for separation at the termination of the current contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>That Police and Community Support Officers (PCSO’s) are authorised via Council delegation to issue Fixed Penalty Notices in the promotion of policy framework directives BD01, CB04 and CB06.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1        | 15  | Undertake an audit of bins:  
|          |     | • Are they in the correct position?  
|          |     | • Are there litter bins beside public seats?  
|          |     | • If possible transfer bins to higher risk areas |
| 1        | 16  | Encourage ALL councillors to undertake training on the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 (especially pertinent to those on Licensing, Planning and Environment) |
Set A: hard surfaces

Grade A – No litter or refuse or detritus

Grade B - (For litter & refuse)
Predominately free of litter and refuse apart from some small items
- (For detritus)
Predominately free of detritus except for some light scattering

Grade C - Widespread distribution of litter, refuse and/or detritus with minor accumulations

Grade D - Heavily affected by litter, refuse and/or detritus with significant accumulations
Set B: soft surfaces

Grade A – No litter or refuse

Grade B – Predominately free of litter and refuse apart from some small items

Grade C – Widespread distribution of litter and refuse with minor accumulations

Grade D – Heavily littered with significant accumulations
**Litter Zones and Standards**

**How is litter measured?**

Every street and open space can be graded according to how much litter there is:

Grade A: An area is an area with no litter or refuse

Grade B: Area is predominantly free of litter and refuse apart from small items

Grade C: Area has a widespread distribution of litter and refuse with minor accumulations

Grade D: Heavily littered with severe accumulations

Grade A is the standard which a thorough conventional sweeping/litter-picking should achieve. Whilst Grade A is the aim, it is not reasonable to expect that standard to be maintained at all times.

**Litter Zones**

The Environmental Protection Act, 1990 and the associated Code of Practice define twelve litter zones relating to land use and response times to recover each zone to a Grade A level of cleanliness. The litter zone definitions and response times are shown in the cleanliness standards table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE</th>
<th>TYPE OF LAND</th>
<th>RESPONSE TIME TO RESTORE TO GRADE A STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Unless otherwise stated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter Duty: General Zones</td>
<td></td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Town centres, shopping centres &amp; shopping streets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major transport centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central car parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other busy public areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High density residential areas (e.g. terraced housing and flats)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Busy recreational land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban car parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban transport centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low density residential areas (e.g. detached/ semi-detached houses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other recreational land (including picnic areas and laybys)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other transport centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial estates with a low density of premises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Land attracting large numbers of people for specific events but otherwise not busy (e.g. sporting venues, land used for car</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>All other areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Litter Duty: Beaches

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Amenity beaches</td>
<td>As a minimum standard, amenity beaches should be generally clear of all types of litter and refuse between 1 May and 30 September inclusive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5*</td>
<td>Other beaches</td>
<td>Individual local authorities to decide the level of cleanliness that they are able to provide to any non-amenity beaches, and where practicable, beaches must be inspected from time to time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Litter Duty: Roads

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local roads in urban areas designated as zone 1</td>
<td>Hard surfaced areas</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>6 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grassed areas</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>grade B within 3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local roads in urban areas designated as zone 2</td>
<td>Hard surfaced areas</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>12 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grassed areas</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>grade B within 3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Local roads in urban areas designated as zone 3</td>
<td>Hard surfaced areas</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grassed areas</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>grade B within 12 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Motorways and strategic routes</td>
<td>Hard surfaced areas</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grassed areas</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>grade B within 4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Roads not falling within zones 1 to 3 or 6</td>
<td>Hard surfaced areas</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grassed areas</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>grade B within 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Litter Duty: Educational Land

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Relevant land of designated educational institutions during term time, other than weekends or half term holiday</td>
<td>Hard surfaced areas</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grassed areas</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>grade B within 24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant land of designated educational institutions when being used for a purpose authorised by governing body or managers during holidays</td>
<td>Hard surfaced areas</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grassed areas</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>grade B within 1 week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Litter Duty: Railway Land

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public areas in and around major passenger stations in cities and town centres</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>6 hours</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public areas in and around heavily used suburban and important town stations</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>12 hours</td>
<td>6 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public areas in and around intermediate suburban and small town stations</td>
<td>Staffed part of the time</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstaffed at all times</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>48 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Public areas in and around rural and small suburban stations</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational land within 100 metres of platform ends</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>grade B within 2 weeks</td>
<td>grade B within 5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Operational land within urban areas, not covered by other zones</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>grade B within 6 months</td>
<td>grade B within 5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Litter Duty: Canal and Inland Navigation Towpaths</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Towpaths to which the public has a right of access in urban areas</td>
<td>Paved areas</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grassed or non-paved areas</td>
<td>achieve after cleaning</td>
<td>grade B within 4 weeks</td>
<td>grade B within 1 week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The zones that are applicable to Eden are **1, 3, 4, 6 and 7**.

**Zone 1:** Comprises the town centres of Alston, Appleby, Kirkby Stephen and Penrith.

**Zone 3:** Comprises the immediate urban area outside of the defined town centre areas for the locations in Zone 1

**Zone 4:** Applies to the remainder of the district other than the following exemptions:

**Zone 6:** A66 and A685 trunk roads (Strategic Routes)

**Zone 7:** All highways within the district including lengths through Zone 4 villages (Local Roads)
Methodology

(1) A questionnaire was circulated to all seventy-one Parish Clerks in April 2006. Copy attached.

(2) The questionnaire requested a response to six questions.

(3) The questionnaire was accompanied by photographs to depict the various levels of litter.

(4) A reminder was circulated by e-mail to encourage late returns.

(5) The forty-three responses were compiled and are summarised below.

Executive Summary

Of the forty-three responses received the majority were positive about the services Eden District Council provide. Three respondents were entirely negative.

(1) Most of the litter problems lie along main roads and in lay-bys.
(2) There were confusions about County and District responsibilities with areas where fly-tipping had taken place.
(3) There were frustrations expressed with the ongoing dog fouling problems and a feeling that little can be done about irresponsible owners.
(4) Play areas appear to have problems with dog fouling.
(5) Over three-quarters of respondents shared information about community initiatives to litter pick.
Summary of Answers to Questions

**Question 1**
No litter or refuse
A The vast majority of respondents did not complete this section
B Predominantly free of litter or refuse from small items
   Seventeen responses – comments included:
   Mud and straw on the roads is more of a problem than litter.
   If litter bins were emptied more frequently there would be no problem.
C Widespread distribution of litter and refuse with minor accumulations
   Twenty-five responses
   Twelve - roads and verges between settlements and lay-bys
   Two – Play areas: Kirkoswald and Kirkby Stephen
   Two – Wooded areas: Henderson and Firsgale
   Two – Workshops: Skeilgillside and Tyne Willows
   Two – Car parks: Silver Street, Kendal and Dufton
   Two – Footpaths: Renwick to Hartside, Green Lane Stainton
   Other comments:
   Accumulation of leaves in Autumn when bins are not emptied
   Threlkeld, Boroughgate in Appleby

D Heavily littered with significant accumulations
   Ten responses
   Renwick – Fly-tipping at Thunderstones Quarry
   Lay-by by A6 Hesket – C3050 Railway contractors mess. Railtrack meeting but no change. Can Eden District Council play a part?
   Dufton Recycling area
   Lay-bys in Kirkby Stephen
   Jubilee Park in Kirkby Stephen
   Junction 38 – Grass areas, roundabout and service area

**Question 2**
Have you ever complained about litter, refuse or flytipping
Twenty responses
Five – Roads: A6 Clifton Cross to B6262 Junction
Old Belum Bridge lorry rest, no bins
Ousby Moor Old Road by A686

Two – Recycling Centres: Nenthead and Threlkeld

Eleven – Fly-tipping: Martindale, Langwathby, Culgaith Road, Quarry near A66 Stainmore, Robber Pond problem, Sportsman and Troutbeck – Hutton, Dacre, Tyne Willows playing field, Alston, Nateby, Cycle path – Mungrisedale, Renwick and Hartside

**Question 3** If so, were you satisfied
Eleven responses

Three Positive
Signs, bins, posters made available. Hesket and Lazonby were very satisfied

Nine Negative
Three confused regarding CCCor EDC responsibility - Brougham, Alston and Culgaith.

Please re-instate the litter bins in the lay-bys – Tebay

No response – Nateby

One problems with road kill

Had to pay to get rubbish removed as Parish Council own land – Alston

Got action with Councillor involvement – Hartside and Brougham

**Question 4** Complaints regarding Dog Fouling
Nineteen responses with details of areas complained about. Five of these relate to playing fields and childrens play areas

**Question 5** Were you satisfied
Twenty-Six responses!

Fourteen Positive
Detailing assistance with posters – nine
More presence from Dog Warden – four
Action from locals to look out for constant offenders
Comment that “Elizabeth was very helpful”

Twelve Negative
Bins were not made available and there was no practical help – five
Commenting that unless offenders are pursued through Court action is ineffective – three

No improvement – four

**Question 6** Information on best practice

Twenty-eight responses

Random litter picks by community groups as part of village activities. Some with EDC support, some without – fifteen

Commenting on current service requesting additional service – Great Strickland, Tebay, Martindale, Appleby and Culgaith, who also commented that locals were unaware of a street cleaning programme (information from Parish Plan 2005) – eight

Varied comments –
Police spoke to young people, EDC recycling officer responds positively to the challenges. Concern about insurance implications involving young people, education need for children - five
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INTRODUCTION

In May 2006, Eden District Council appointed CN Research to carry out a telephone survey with members of its Community Voice Panel. The panel were asked their views on a scheme to collect and compost kitchen waste, renewable energy and energy consumption and littering and dog fouling. This report looks in detail at responses from this survey.

METHODOLOGY

CN Research carried out the fieldwork, data entry, analysis and reporting of results. Fieldwork began on 04 May 2006 and ended on 17 May 2006, after at least 3 telephone attempts had been made to contact each panel member. Telephone questionnaires were carried out using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI). Altogether a total of 300 interviews was achieved from a possible 493 panel members, giving a response rate of 61%, with results representative to + or – 5.6% of Eden district council residents. 162 panel members were still non-contacts after between 3 to 6 recall attempts were made (33%). 31 panel members refused to take part (6%).

- 61% of the panel thinks that increased publicity and education would help reduce litter problems
- Around two thirds think that increased penalty fine signage will reduce dog fouling problems
- 84% think that targeting areas for increased surveillance would reduce dog fouling problems
- Around six out of ten think that spreading information through schools citizenship education and environmental awareness raising sessions will help the Council with litter/dog fouling problems
“Do you think increased publicity and education would help reduce litter problems?”

61% of the panel thinks that increased publicity and education would help reduce litter problems, see Chart 12:

Chart 12

Would increased publicity and education help reduce litter problems?

“Do you think increased penalty fine signage will reduce dog fouling problems?”

Around two thirds think that increased penalty fine signage will reduce dog fouling problems, see Chart 13:
Would increased penalty fine signage help reduce dog fouling problems?

84% think that targeting areas for increased surveillance would reduce dog fouling problems, see Chart 14:

Would targeting areas for increased surveillance reduce dog fouling problems?

Around six out of ten think that spreading information through schools citizenship education and environmental awareness raising sessions will help the Council with litter/dog fouling problems, just under half think that informing on offenders will help, a
third think that litter picking by residents would help, and over a fifth think that participating in community sessions enabled by the Council would help, see Table 14:

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you think residents could help the Council with litter?</th>
<th>Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping to spread information through schools citizenship education and environmental awareness raising sessions</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing on offenders</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter picking</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suggestions</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in community sessions enabled by the Council</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other suggestions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More dog/litter bins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigger fines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More wardens on the street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community working together &amp; picking up litter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge/confront offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More publicity to shame people (name &amp; shame)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People need to be more responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeaways should provide bins &amp; tidy up after customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem isn't bad where I live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforce the law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Are there any further comments you would like to add about litter/dog fouling in Eden District?”

A summary of comments can be found below, for a complete list of comments please refer to the literal report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No further comments</th>
<th>94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More dog waste &amp; litter bins</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a problem in my area</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines enforced</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Litter a problem in my area 16 6.1%
Dog fouling not an issue in my area 14 5.3%
Educate people/create awareness 10 3.8%
People should help pick up litter in their areas 8 3.1%
More wardens patrolling area/ better system 7 2.7%
People should be responsible for their dogs 5 2.0%
People could be more careful 4 1.5%
More street cleaning 4 1.5%
Confront the offender 4 1.5%
Dog fouling bad in my area 4 1.5%
Chewing gum is particularly bad 4 1.5%
Bins emptied more often 3 1.1%
Report culprits 3 1.1%
Should target roads and railways (litter) 3 1.1%
Food outlets should be more responsible 3 1.1%

263 100.0%

DEMOGRAPHICS

Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can I just check which age group you are in...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>36 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>66 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>130 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>68 23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And which of the following areas is closest to where you...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alston</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleby</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkby Stephen</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer: Is respondent male or female?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q22 How do you think residents could help the council with litter/dog fouling problems? (Other)

A scheme to support without offending. By reporting it and by setting a good example and by emptying litter bins which become over full, i.e. the bus shelter at Newton Reigny. We have Dog Wardens although we have no progress. Report people. Regarding the young people you tend to get verbal abuse off them if you address any issues. Heavier fines and more people to monitor. The person should be informed at the time and the issue addressed. An example from Chester City is attaching bags onto lampposts etc for dog owner’s use. Penalty laws should be enforced more often. People should be photographed and reported. All the above suggestions could help but would not be cost effective. I think it is common knowledge that it is not done. There need’s to be facilities for the disposing of dog fouling. A lot of people need to be more responsible. More vigorous enforcement of litter laws. More dog litter bins. People need to use 'Pooper scooper's' more and for them to be more attainable. Having a dog should be on the understanding that it is not let out alone and mess cleared up or penalties applied. Community pressure. Persistent foulers should be accosted. Owners must be responsible for dogs and fines enforced. Challenge offenders possibly by evil eye. Parents should be more responsible in teaching children not to drop litter. More education for our children, Parent’s need to be on board with the situation more. Parent’s should speak to their children and make a big issue about dropping litter. When I was at school we used to go around the area litter picking. This is a good idea and would make the children more aware of the problem and situation therefore they would think twice about doing it themselves. A dog bin in Clifton especially in field where “dogs are welcome near post box". (location) If the council placed more bins people would be more encouraged to put dog foul in bins. Perhaps a fine for littering would reduce it slightly. Education concerning the heath implications of dog foul might also reduce it because it has more problems than just been stood in. Maybe have a Web-Site. Providing dog fouling bins would encourage people to pick it up. I live in the country where there are not many people anyway. The problem isn’t too bad here.
More dog wardens.
Not have dogs.
More bins for litter
Getting more vocal against people who are fouling.
I don’t know.
There doesn’t seem to be any major problem with this in my area.
Dog waste bins are inadequate and poorly sited and infrequently emptied.
I think the education needs to come from the parents utmost.
Councils should try and run competitions to make people more aware of being
energy efficient you could have prizes for the most energy efficient houses or people
who come up with good ideas. Also we should have more town hall shows and get
children involved from an early age and then in the future they will already be energy
aware.
I think people should be charged for owning dogs especially as its the council that
has to clean it up.
ShOOT the dogs and find the owners! The fine should be doubled.
No but I never seem to see any of the proposed dog wardens in our area.
Pick it up.
It is an ethical issue and it should be the case that you should be able to say to your
neighbours about litter and dog mess but you can’t because of fear of abuse I think
more wardens on the street would make a big difference.
Bring back Christianity to schools, good Christian values stop people being selfish.
Kids today don’t know how to behave in a dignified manner and they certainly don’t
know how to be polite to other people opinions.
I think education begins at home.
We need to tell the Council where the main problems lie.
You just get verbal abuse. We live just behind a major supermarket and we tend to
get a lot of litter thrown into our garden. Bags and half eaten food are the main
things. We are a disabled couple and this is very upsetting for us.
The public should be able to take the law into our own hands. That would solve the
problem’s.
More bins for dog mess and litter.
More dog waste bins.
Challenge offenders.
No suggestions.
More litter and dog mess bins, sometimes especially after bank holiday weekends the
bin’s are overflowing so people have no choice as to where to put the rubbish.
Publicity seems to be working.
We need more bins in Appleby.
Challenge culprits.
Maybe volunteer dog wardens might help.
Transfer traffic wardens to litter wardens.
Naming and shaming offenders.
Don’t think people would attend community sessions. Education helps, but ideally
should start in the home. Shouldn’t expect schools to do everything.
Increase planning regulations re fast food outlets re corporate responsibility for litter.
People not dropping litter in the first place would help.
One village organised a monthly litter picking session ,but the insurance that they had
to take out was prohibitive.
Maybe a Neighbourhood Watch Scheme.
Making sure the Laws are enforced.
Start early in the Schools, advising. Maybe more advertising would help. It's a very big problem.
Provision of more litter and dog fouling bins.
Pick it up when seen and do not pass by.
Council needs to get people to have pride in their community.
As a community working together picking our litter
Part of community service clearing litter. Keeping grass verges clearer so making it safer for drivers
Teaching children as young as possible but needing to continue to educate during teenage years as well
Maybe setting up camera's might help.
Fairly high dog licensing fees
Food take-away shops should be made responsible for litter generated by them - provide bins, ensure they are emptied, tidy up after their clients.
More publicity - need to shame people out of littering.
Clearing up own litter etc. should be all that is required. We pay enough council tax without doing their job for them.
Informing on offenders but without having to give names of people informing

Q23 Are there any further comments you would like to add about litter/dog fouling in Eden District?

Not as bad as some districts especially near schools.
I think people who let their dogs do this are just lazy
I think the fast food outlets should take corporate responsibility and there should be more environmental education in schools.
I really do think that the information should start in schools and be carried on in secondary school.
People should be fined heavily if they allow their dog to foul on the pavement and people who drop litter should be spot fined.
None
No.
People who are caught dropping litter and dog fouling are often let off with a caution. There should be an on the spot fine. Between £50 and £100 fine to solve the problem.
No.
I don't believe that dog fouling is an issue.
I would not like to see signs warning people about fines in inappropriate places
I am a member of the Neighbourhood Watch scheme and we all agree that there is a definite need for more than one dog warden.
No.
No but I would like to add that there needs to be more parking made in Irving court in Pategill it is very hard to get parked.
None
The Chewing gum situation is at a bad way at the moment. No one seems to be doing anything about it. I have also noticed a lot of litter on the Appleby to Carlisle railway track.
No. but a very good questionnaire.
People know the law and will clear up when being watched. Leaflets and education will have little effect.
So many people hurl litter out of the window which can be very dangerous.
None
In Switzerland children may drop a sweet wrapper accidentally but will always go back and pick up and put it in their pocket, so I think that the problem needs to begin again by going back to education and telling children that they must take their own litter home and place it in their own rubbish bins. It may take years but would be worth it in the long run.
No.
Fines and dog wardens are all well and good but we need more bins for dog waste.
There doesn't seem to be much debate about dog fouling. It tends to be swept under the table. It seems to be a part of life for us nowadays. Also, the freedom of creating new and improved packaging in Supermarket's adds to the problem.
No.
A warning and fine for putting out litter too early.
Back to education and go back forty years and see how clean our streets and parks were and take it from there. The answer lies there.
I am a parent and you become more aware of the problem of dog dirt. There seems to be a lot about at the moment.
I think most people do pick up after their dogs, I seem to see a lot of people carrying little bags of poo.
The chewing gum problem is a very bad problem which must be addressed. Dog owners all know that the mess should be cleared up but most will not do it if not being watched.
No.
Our area is very clean as residents clean up their dog poo.
Even though the problem is bad, it is still not as bad as other area's.
This person runs a public house and has great problems in recycling cardboard. The Council tip makes a large charge for commercial waste even though the business pays higher Council tax. Also, due to the cost of households using the tip there is a lot of fly tipping.
No further comment litter and dog fouling is not to bad in our area.
No.
Cigarette smokers should be targeted for especial consideration on litter. Provide dustbins outside for smokers.
Schools should not have the extra task of teaching children not to drop litter.
I think people who litter and let there dogs foul don't care about being fined, they will just carry on doing it.
More litter bins please and more poo bins, more road sweepers.
I feel that the litter and the dog fouling situation tends to be worse in the winter rather than the summer. I really don't understand why. Possibly because it tends to be dark in the morning and the evening and it is less visible so then not a lot is done about the situation!
I think lorry drivers are littering at lay-by at Clifton A6.
In Kirkby Steven the dog fouling problem is worse in the winter when dogs cannot be walked in the fields. Fines for dog fouling must be enforced.
Litter In Alston is very bad.
No.
dog fouling not to bad in Penrith.
No.
If every body did their own little bit free of litter This would help.
Nothing is going to sort the problem of litter and dog fouling out unless parents take a roll in this by talking to their children.
No
It isn't really a big problem in the town of Penrith. Most people are very considerate and pick up after themselves. Also their is a high proportion of police about being near the head quarters, so I think that puts people off from doing anything too bad!!
I don't think there is a serious problem with dog fouling in my area.
No
I think everything as been well covered.
No other comments.
No
Litter will always be a problem until they educate children from an early age.
I have no further comments.
I think it's generally clean.
It's really bad, I don't know really, maybe bigger fines etc.
No further comments.
No further comment
There is a big problem with dog fouling in Appleby. I have called the dog wardens before and named pet owners of dog fouling but they won't do anything about it as they say I may just be being vindictive. So there is no point in calling the dog wardens as they don't help enough.
No.
If you have a dog you should take responsibility for it, in every way, even the most unpleasant things.
I live in the Country, I'm not really affected by those problems. I would like to add though, my Council Tax bill is horrendous, and I'm in band D. The Council don't even pick up my paper for Recycling, I have to take it myself. If this scheme is implemented, it should cover everywhere, that means Rural area's as well.
No further comment.
No, we just need more bins!
Dog fouling is so bad. Fast food businesses should have bins outside for litter.
Litter really isn't too much of a problem in the town centre itself, it's the residential streets that can be a mess. When the bin men come they leave rubbish behind or spill rubbish from the bins and in turn this makes for a messy environment. With the dog fouling, it is more of a problem in the public footpaths and open areas where people feel they can get away with not picking up after their dog. The town centre and residential areas are quite clean as people are aware of the people around them and feel more willing to pick it up!!
Litter horrendous in area of natural outstanding beauty. Agricultural machinery left rusting in fields. Fly tipping problem at the moment all around the Nenthead and Alston area and spreading up to Brampton area.
I'm not sure, I'm not really affected by those problems.
Perhaps place more bins.
we pick our rubbish up around our area unpaid work
I am a farmer and I have a farm and dog owners walk across it and they do not think it is a problem to let their dogs foul on the grass. They need to be made more aware that dog fouling on farms is really bad as cows eat the grass that has the dog fouling on.
The dog fouling is quite bad in this village.
Yes. Amount of litter is disgraceful.
In the Village where I live, which is Maulds Meaburn, there is an awful lot of litter. Most of the litter is left by Tourists. Saying that, there's not many litter bins either. Do think this has improved
There should be more litter bins.

It is disgusting that people don't pick up after their dogs. I think there should be a much bigger penalty for people. It's not the dog's fault!!

No further comments

No.

No - Not too bad where I live but seems to be shortage of bins for both litter and dog mess

No.

No other comments.

I see people picking up after their dogs, the problem is the dog dirt bins are always full to overflowing. They don't get emptied, they are disgraceful.

No. Up to individuals to keep areas tidy

I see people picking up after their dogs, the problem is the dog dirt bins are always full to overflowing. They don't get emptied, they are disgraceful.

No. Up to individuals to keep areas tidy

It is surprising to see the amount of litter in the most un-spoilt places. Litter and dog fouling needs to be addressed more so as to see a change. I would love to see a change, there is too much of it going on.

People in general could help by being more careful.

I think that they should name and shame people. Having posters of people who don't pick up after their dogs on sign posts under the dog fouling sign!!

I wonder whether a county-wide campaign about dog fouling, with the media involved would help. Near Armthwaite, we are trying to help the environment and traffic by walking our kids to school, but the whole way they are stepping in dog foul. Perhaps pictures of local kids in the paper making comments about the dog foul would help raise more attention to it.

I live in the Country. People bring their dogs and let them run wild, there’s no pride at all. The Country Code is just not followed. They bring their dogs here to do their mess.

I have no further comments.

No disregard for litter dropping.

None

There are not enough footpaths in our area and therefore people walk their dogs along the streets and it's not their fault they have nowhere else to walk their dogs.

But I wish more people would pick up after their dogs.

No.

It seems to be the main case of the north. People seem to just accept it. The target areas should be the roads and railway lines.

None

No.

Litter is becoming a real problem in our area especially in the summer.

None

We need more bins for litter and dog fouling

Dog fouling is very bad in Kirby Stephen.

There is a big problem with plastic bag's littering the area. Chip wrappers too. There should be information at chip shops and takeaway's regarding litter. The area between Crosby Raven's and Shap is particularly bad.

No.

We need more bins for litter and dog fouling and the ones we do have need to be emptied more often

No.

None.

Where I live there is a lot of litter thrown out of car windows and all the roadside verges and no-one seems to want to take the responsibility for it.
Action need's to be taken. There is a litter man who works with a 'clipper' which I feel
does nothing. Using one of those 'vacuum's' would certainly help.
An anon call line re dog fouling and reporting culprits would be helpful.
No.
It's hard to make people accountable, in terms of money and low means. Cars that
over speed are also very upsetting too.
I really feel very strongly about recycling and we currently recycle all our waste, but
I'm very angry to the fact that I have no garden waste bin, so how can we even begin
to discuss the need for recycling when the council won't even supply us with bins for
this reason. WHY ?.
The problem of rural districts is that there very few footpaths, so when we have to
walk somewhere we have to use bridle paths and that is where all the dog walkers go
so you have to be very careful where you stand.
No.
None
I live over the back from a school and a park. So many people go walking with their
dogs and when they pick up the rubbish they tend to throw it over my back fence. It
is terrible. Also, the South End Rd in Penrith is completely littered all the time.
Littering seems to be a bigger issue on the street's rather than the dog fouling.
No.
Eden doesn't do enough about dog fouling. No one seems to have been
prosecuted.
Put more containers out for dog dirt and litter sometimes if people can't see a litter or
dog dirt bins they tend just to throw things down.
No.
Litter is thrown out of car windows mainly fast food packaging.
The situation has improved largely due to residents challenging.
No.
Too many kept in small houses.
Why does Kirby Stephen charge the highest precept for all districts in our area (why).
No.
Chewing gum is particularly bad and school children need educating in not littering.
No but I would like to comment on the parking signs in Penrith, I think they are very
deceiving and a lot of visitors are confused as to how long they have to park and the
use of discs.
A few more dog waste bins and litter bins would be helpful. More activity from the dog
warden.
If we were to inform on people who leave litter or dog mess who do you inform them
too ??????
Litter picking groups need to be publicised and feel there is pride in their area.
No receptacles for dog waste in our area (Orton) - council should provide some
No.
Difficult to know how to tackle it - can't understand why people do it
The motorway is a problem for litter there should be increased surveillance
None.
Not enough waste bins.
No not really.
More dog wardens
We do feel marginalised as they main roads are cleaned but not the side roads where people still throw litter out of their car windows.
No.
Could do with more people patrolling streets
None.
More dog wardens.
No, I think all the basics have been covered.
Although there is signage about fines they are not enforced. 
No
Litter is a major pollution, it's taken far too lightly. Penalties for dropping litter should be increased dramatically in my opinion.
Enforcing the fines might help.
Something should be done, it's a really big problem.
Litter in Alston is terrible.
No
Sometimes on a weekend Penrith is terrible. Messy on a Sunday morning in particular
I think any fines for litter or dog fouling offences have to be seen to be carried out.
Problems with dumping in country lanes (fly tipping)
Where I live in Wordsworth Street, the dog dirt bins are overflowing. It's really not very nice to walk down the street and see all this mess sticking out of the bins. They should be emptied more often.
No
Too many dogs out unaccompanied
No.
Any fines have to be followed through, but other than that I do not know how the problems can be addressed.
I live at Clifton. There is a road runs past my house, everyone walks their dogs there. It's disgusting with dog dirt. There are only two signs maximum, no one takes any notice of them.
Not enough bins and collections.
None.
The fines should be carried out.
We don't have enough bins for dog walkers in Langwathby and those we do have are always full
None
None
None
None
Reporting problems to council often has no effect, they do not seem to be interested
There is a need for more bins for dog waste
Litter often thrown out of car windows - take away containers.
No, there is a lot of dog fouling in the area though.
Noticing more litter in hedgerows.
No
I am keen to see more advertising to reduce the problem, also more poo bins would be good.
No.
Not much of a problem in the Rosgill area of Penrith.
Not a problem where I live.
No
No.
In some areas we need more poo bins.
No.
As a lorry driver have noticed that Service Stations on the motorway i.e. Southwaite Services have litter strewn on the grass verges on the motorway - wondered who is responsible for picking up this litter i.e. Council or Service Station
The litter and dog fouling problem in the Morland area has improved in the recent years.
No comment
People should take personal responsibility and express disapproval when seeing litter and fouling. Also, fines for fouling should be enforced.
People should be able to tell offenders without fear of abuse.
No.
The Tebay area does not have a particular problem.
No.
Parents should be more responsible for teaching children not to drop litter.
More dog poo bins are needed, this seem to be a common complaint.
No.
I work in a shop in Penrith with a back lane and the other day there was a broken wine bottle left in the lane so I decided to pick it up and dispose of it so children or dogs would not get hurt by standing on it. On entering the shop to get a dustpan and brush I noticed that the customers all gave me a look as if I was mad to be picking up broken glass in the back lane. People should take more care and not leave things to others because they can't be bothered to do anything themselves - even though they can't be bothered to keep the streets tidy themselves they all moan about the state they are in. More dog wardens are needed and signs with a strong message might help.
No comment
The difficulty is catching people. More bins for litter and dog mess so it does not have to be carried too far.
Litter is a particular problem in the Thackthwaite area.
No further comments,
The Carlton Heights area has a particular problem with dog fouling on the pavements. Generally more dog mess bins are needed.
The Community session held recently in the Appleby area was very successful. Children and residents were supplied sacks by the council to clear an area.
Where I live people come to the tip with grass cuttings and general rubbish in carrier bags to dispose of but are turned away by workers who just stand there all day doing nothing as they are not disposing of the rubbish in recycling containers. Surely this should be allowed as people have collected their rubbish and are disposing of it at the council tip.
No.
Not enough poo bins.
Eden is a reasonably clean area these days.
No not really.
No
No further comments.
Where I live at Hilton near Appleby, there isn't much of a problem with litter and dog fouling.
The council don't seem to empty the dog mess bins often enough and people just drop the little bags full of dog much on the floor.
No
More poo bins are needed,
No not at the moment.
More cleaning of streets and making children more aware of litter dropping. More litter bins or facilities for litter especially in June during the Appleby Horse Fair.
No further comments,
Nothing
It is terrible for litter and chewing gum in Penrith and EDC not doing anything about it
No further comments,
It needs strong measures to get on top of the problem, in the Towns and rurally, it's a disgrace. Its fast food outlets like McDonalds that are the problem. They should be made to pay much more for their packaging. I live Rurally, people go by in their cars and throw all this McDonalds litter out of their car windows, I think we should collect it all up and dump it on McDonalds step, and see how they like it.
No
Nothing
No
More wardens, More poo bins,
I live in the centre of Penrith. Dog fouling at the moment is awful. I've even had it on my door step.
Make people aware that dropping litter they will be fined
Nothing
No
No
Dog warden system does not work as effectively as it should
No
No
Not too bad a problem in my area. Council should collect abandoned cars and electrical goods left at roadside more quickly.
Villages enter into best kept villages. Things brilliant for this but why do people not do this all year round? It is especially difficult to walk out with small children and avoiding dog fouling
Not a big problem in this particular area.
It is improving and people are more aware and less inclined to leave litter
Litter bad clean up road sides because that is where a lot of the litter seems to be
Not a huge problem. Keeping an area litter-free prevents further littering.
Roads need more attention - rubbish lies there for ages without being cleared up.
No
Lay-bys on A6 full of take-away stuff - especially from kebab shops after the pubs shut.
Not too bad in my area.
Nothing
When we have complained (about neighbour litter) we got no help from the council.
Generally we don't have too big a problem, but in built up areas more needs to be done about dog-fouling.
None
No
More litter bins and for dog fouling bags
Could do with more litter bins around villages, and more dog-mess bins.
Problem with people driving past in cars throwing things out of windows
Make people pay (increased fines) - it's the only way to make them take notice.
We recently collected 4 bin-bags of litter from a 2-mile walk around the village. I live in Lazonby, dog fouling is pretty bad in the grass verges. It’s the owners that are at fault, not the animals. I would like to see the provision of more litter bins everywhere. Maybe more publicity would help. I blame the fast food chains for a lot of the litter. Maybe C.C.T.V. camera's strategically placed would help also. I see a lot of dogs wandering around on their own. I would like to see more Wardens about.

I live Rurally, so I don't really have a great problem with litter or dog fouling. It's really bad where I live. I think the Council should provide bigger dog dirt bins, they are always overflowing. It’s not nice at all. The Council have got measures in place, the problem is not their fault. The problem lies with the public who basically couldn’t care less.
APPENDIX D

LIST OF HOT (GROT) SPOTS SUBMITTED TO THE REVIEW GROUP DURING THEIR INVESTIGATIONS

1. Roads and verges between settlements and lay-bys
2. Play areas: Kirkoswald and Kirkby Stephen
3. Wooded areas: Henderson and Firsgale
4. Workshops: Skeilgillside and Tyne Willows
5. Car parks: Silver Street, Kendal and Dufton
6. Footpaths: Renwick to Hartside, Green Lane Stainton
7. Accumulation of leaves in Autumn when bins are not emptied Threlkeld, Boroughgate in Appleby
8. Renwick – Fly-tipping at Thunderstones Quarry
9. Lay-by by A6 Hesket – C3050 Railway contractors mess. Railtrack meeting but no change. Can Eden District Council play a part?
10. Dufton Recycling area
11. Lay-bys in Kirkby Stephen
12. Jubilee Park in Kirkby Stephen
13. Junction 38 – Grass areas, roundabout and service area
14. A6 Clifton Cross to B6262 Junction
15. Old Belum Bridge lorry rest, no bins
16. Ousby Moor Old Road by A686
17. Recycling Centres: Nenthead and Threlkeld
18. Fly-tipping: Martindale, Langwithby, Culgaith Road, Quarry near A66 Stainmore, Robber Pond problem, Sportsman and Troutbeck – Hutton, Dacre, Tyne Willows playing field, Alston, Nateby, Cycle path – Mungrisedale, Renwick and Hartside

i. Hartside

ii. Cycle Routes
iii. Strickland Terrace
iv. Old Cross Keys A6
v. Southend Road
vi. 2 Lions Lane
vii. Friargate
viii. Sutton Yard
ix. Carleton Road
x. Behind Woolworths
xi. Public Toilets (district wide)
 xii. Path up Beacon Edge
 xiii. Scaws Drive – green space