

COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Wednesday, 25 March 2026 in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 6.00 pm

Members Present:

Cllr T Adams	Cllr P Bailey
Cllr K Bayes	Cllr D Birch
Cllr H Blathwayt	Cllr J Boyle
Cllr A Brown	Cllr S Bütikofer
Cllr C Cushing	Cllr N Dixon
Cllr P Fisher	Cllr A Fitch-Tillett
Cllr T FitzPatrick	Cllr A Fletcher
Cllr W Fredericks	Cllr M Gray
Cllr M Hankins	Cllr P Heinrich
Cllr V Holliday	Cllr K Leith
Cllr R Macdonald	Cllr P Neatherway
Cllr L Paterson	Cllr S Penfold
Cllr P Porter	Cllr J Punchard
Cllr C Ringer	Cllr C Rouse
Cllr L Shires	Cllr M Taylor
Cllr J Toye	Cllr K Toye
Cllr L Vickers	Cllr L Withington

Also in attendance: The Chief Executive, the S151 Officer, the Monitoring Officer, the Director for Service Delivery, the HR Manager and the Democratic Services and Governance Manager.

116 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllrs M Batey, C Heinink, N Housden, G Mancini-Boyle and A Varley.

117 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 18th February were approved as a correct record.

118 TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS FROM MEMBERS

None received.

119 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

120 CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Chair spoke about recent civic events that he and the Vice-Chair had attended:

27th February – South Norfolk District Council's Civic Reception

1st March – the Justice Service at King's Lynn Minster

6th March – Broadland District Council's Civic Reception

15th March – national Symphony Orchestra of Ukraine, Norwich Theatre Royal

121 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Leader began by saying that he welcomed the Government's 'minded to' decision to opt for a three unitary model for Norfolk. It provided clarity after a period of uncertainty. He believed that this model gave the best chance of securing visible and accessible local government. There were distinct economies, geographies and discretionary services across Norfolk and this provided the best opportunity to act on local needs. He acknowledged that the level of cooperation between authorities during the next phase, depended on the outcome of local elections in May. Work would continue in the meantime.

He said that he was very grateful to officers, the public, parish councils and businesses who had all contributed to developing the proposal submitted to central Government. There was still significant amount of work to do and attention would now be turned to that.

122 PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

None.

123 APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES, SUB-COMMITTEES, WORKING PARTIES & OUTSIDE BODIES

There were no changes to appointments to Committees, sub-committees, working parties and panels.

124 PORTFOLIO REPORTS

The Chair invited Members to ask questions:

Cllr A Fitch-Tillett asked Cllr H Blathwayt, Portfolio Holder for Coast why the Coastal Forum was no longer included in the calendar of meetings. Cllr H Blathwayt, Portfolio Holder for Coast, agreed with her concerns.

Cllr L Vickers asked the Leader, Cllr T Adams for an update on 9 Norwich Street, Fakenham. She said that she had campaigned tirelessly to get a resolution to the situation regarding this property and the local community had backed her and presented a petition to Full Council some months ago. At the last meeting, Cllr Punchard had asked for a confidential meeting with local members to discuss concerns but the Leader had refused. The MP, Mr J Mayhew had also not received a response. She said that she was concerned that no progress was being made and she sought assurance that the constant rebuttals and citing of confidentiality were not a smoke-screen for 'kicking the can down the road'. She asked when the Leader would be in a position to share information with democratically elected members for Fakenham. Cllr Adams said that he had previously met with Jerome Mayhew MP to discuss this matter but as reported at the last meeting of Full Council he was not in a position to share confidential legal information and that remained the case. When there was an announcement, he would share that information but he did not want to jeopardise the process. Cllr Vickers asked when this might happen. Cllr Adams replied that he could not reply at this time.

Cllr V Holliday asked Cllr J Boyle, Portfolio Holder for Housing and Benefits, about preparations made by the Council following a possible increase in homeless

households following the introduction of the Renter's Rights Act. Cllr Boyle replied that there had not been a surge so far but the situation would continue to be monitored.

Cllr K Bayes asked Cllr L Withington about the Town of Culture funding and which towns other than Sheringham and Cromer had been engaged with and what support the Council was offering to assist towns with preparing these applications. Cllr L Withington said there had been considerable interest from North Norfolk and so far Wells, north Walsham and Sheringham and Cromer (combined) had submitted applications. NNDC was the accountable body within the programme, with a deadline of the end of February to agree what this involved. Delivering the programmes was the responsibility of the Partnership scheme of the towns concerned.

Cllr T FitzPatrick asked Cllr A Brown, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Enforcement about the number of enforcement cases. He referred to a case regarding abandoned caravans at Hempton, which neighboured his ward and asked how the Council's issuing of enforcement notices and achieving results compared with other local authorities. Cllr Brown replied that he was not familiar with the case referred to and was not sure how NNDC compared to other authorities. He said that he would provide a written response.

Cllr C Cushing asked Cllr A Brown, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Enforcement, about the Fakenham urban extension which was a key element of the new Local Plan and a key factor in contributing to housing growth in the district. Phase 1 was for 950 houses but there had been no information at all regarding applications for the site and he asked when they might be forthcoming. Cllr Brown replied that he did not have any information as to when applications may be forthcoming. He said that there had been a discussion as to whether the site should progress in sections rather than the whole site. Regarding the number of homes to be built annually, Cllr Brown said that NNDC was subject to transitional arrangements for the Local Plan and this meant that the Council could 557 dwellings over the period of the Plan. However, a new Local Plan needed to be commenced almost immediately so this figure was likely to change again. He said that he would respond in writing regarding the site at Fakenham.

Cllr S Butikofer asked Cllr C Ringer, Portfolio Holder for IT, Environment & Waste, about the 'Duty of Care' initiative regarding trade waste that had been carried out in March and she wondered how well this had gone. Cllr Ringer replied that he had received an update and that it had been carried out in conjunction with colleagues from the Norfolk Waste Partnership. It had focused on reminding businesses that had a duty of care regarding the collection of trade waste. A few businesses were not currently complying and had been advised on their responsibilities.

Cllr N Dixon asked Cllr J Toye, Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Growth, about the informal discussion that had followed the question he had asked at the previous meeting and asked that a written answer would be provided to all members. Cllr Toye agreed. He went on to say that it was challenging to get to the granular detail for North Norfolk and even the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce was struggling to access this information. Cllr Dixon followed up by asking what evidence there was to support views regarding hospitality sector and youth unemployment and he would like the response to focus on these points.

The Leader, Cllr Adams, introduced this item. He began by saying that most elements of policy development had been removed from action plans given the development of local government reorganisation (LGR) with the exception of anything that had real benefit and longevity. The Workforce Development & People Strategy fell into this category. It was important to continue to support and develop staff up to the inception of the new unitary authority. NNDC sought to maintain recruitment and retention levels. He thanked staff for their input in developing the strategy, adding that it had been discussed by the Joint Staff Consultative Committee (JSCC).

It was proposed by Cllr T Adams, seconded by Cllr L Shires and

RESOLVED

To approve and adopt the Workforce Development and People Strategy, Learning and Development Strategy and Role Model Manager Framework.

126 MARKETS AND SEAFRONT SERVICE- REQUEST TO INCREASE HEADCOUNT.

Cllr L Withington, Portfolio Holder for Leisure, introduced this item. She explained that, as part of the Council's Leisure and Localities function, the Markets and Seafront Inspector currently undertook a dual-purpose role supporting both market operations and seafront management. This post was currently vacant, and a review of the service had identified that dividing the responsibilities into two distinct roles would provide significant benefits, particularly in relation to recruitment and the overall effectiveness of each function. This action would result in an increase in headcount for the organisation but will not increase the overall budget for the service.

Cllr C Cushing asked why this report was coming straight to Full Council. He said that two new posts were being created with no supporting information provided and no explanation of the financial benefits. He said that markets should be the responsibility of town councils. Fakenham market was managed by the town council and it was paid for via the precept, whereas the markets in this report were paid for by NNDC council tax. He concluded by saying that a new unitary authority would be unlikely to want to pay to manage these markets going forward and that an agreement with the relevant town councils should be reached.

Cllr L Shires, Portfolio Holder for Finance, referred Cllr Cushing to section 3.2 of the report which stated there was no increase to budget and that it was a full-time role being split into two part time roles. The S151 Officer explained that there was no additional financial strain on the Council and that as the summer months approached, it was deemed to be more practical to recruit two part time roles.

Cllr J Punchard asked why Wells was not included in the area covered by the Seafront Inspector. Cllr Withington replied that Wells seafront was the responsibility of Holkham Estate.

Cllr N Dixon said that it was a very brief report but the aspect of clarity was lacking and it would have been helpful to have the information requested in the report. Cllr Shires reiterated her earlier point regarding no increase in the budget and the proposal to split the role.

Cllr L Vickers said that other towns paid for their own market provision and managed them very well and she was frustrated that customer service provision had recently

been cut at the Fakenham Connect site but that no savings were being sought elsewhere. Cllr Adams replied that the reduction in service at Fakenham Connect was due to lack of demand. He went on to say that the report related to a minor operational issue, Full Council had to agree and increase in headcount and that was why it was being presented to members.

Cllr V Holliday said that it was not clear what the cost benefit of having two roles instead of one was.

Cllr T FitzPatrick commented that Overview & Scrutiny Committee should have considered the proposals and made recommendations to Full Council. He added that he did not believe a Market Officer was necessary and that these towns should be standing on their 'own two feet'.

The Chief Executive said that Members seemed to have lost focus on the thrust of the report. North Walsham and Fakenham were both charter markets with very long histories that were embedded in the towns. They were held in the market place on public land and highways were closed on market days. The report identified that the market at Sheringham was held on a District Council car park and although it covered its costs commercially, it needed to be managed by NNDC – as it had been for many years. The current role was combined with managing the seafront and it was not an easy role to recruit to. The report proposed a pragmatic approach at no extra financial cost.

Cllr L Withington said the report was brought forward as a savings option with a view to trying to move the markets into alternative management. It wasn't because of a lack of interest in the markets but down to a lack of capacity at this moment in time. The proposal before members protected businesses and town centres for the foreseeable future.

Cllr J Toye said that markets improved the economic vibrancy of the towns and were really important.

It was proposed by Cllr L Withington, seconded by Cllr J Toye and

RESOLVED

To adopt option 1 and agree to an increase in head count in the Leisure and Localities team to allow for the disaggregation of the Markets and Seafront Inspector roles.

1 member abstained.

127 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CABINET 9TH MARCH 2026

Recommendation 1:

1. Cabinet Agenda Item 8: Budget Monitoring Period 10 2025/2026:

Cllr L Shires, Portfolio Holder for Finance, Estates & Property Services, introduced this item. She said that the Budget Monitoring P10 report had been to Cabinet and Overview & Scrutiny Committee and she thanked the latter for their robust discussion.

Cllr Shires said that the following additional recommendation was being presented to

Full Council. It was coming through at short notice due to the situation in Iran which was impacting on oil prices:

- d) *Request the approval for £50,000 of the forecast underspend to be awarded to a domestic oil fuel poverty charity, to support residents across North Norfolk who are experiencing hardship because of current high oil prices*

Cllr Shires advised members to look at recommendations c, d, and e collectively. It was proposed that the Extended Responsibility Producer (ERP) grant was released from reserves to then use that against the service as would have been done if it had been budgeted with that in mind for the recycling expenditure and instead of putting the remainder of the money that was re-released from the recycling revenue budget straight into the general reserve (as had been proposed in previous reports) a small amount of this money would be set aside to help struggling households reliant on domestic heating oil. NNDC would be working with Norfolk Food Bank to provide support

Cllr Shires encouraged anyone facing financial hardship to come forward and seek help. Central Government had recently announced some support but it only amounted to £35 per household using heating oil and this wasn't enough. This was local support that could be put in place quickly.

Cllr Shires proposed the amendment. It was seconded by Cllr A Brown.

Cllr T FitzPatrick commented on the rapid increase in petrol and oil prices and he welcomed the additional recommendation. He sought assurance that the charity reached the far ends of the district. Cllr Shires said that it was important that every member promoted the fund and encouraged people to apply for help. Cllr Fitzpatrick suggested that a guide was shared with parish councils and local organisations.

Cllr Holliday commended the work of the Financial Inclusion Team and said they were extremely helpful.

Cllr J Toye said that some of the people affected by these issues were not those that would be expected and he reiterated the need to promote the fund to everyone.

Cllr S Butikofer asked how quickly the fund would be up and running. Cllr Shires replied that it would commence the following day.

The Chair asked members to vote on the amendment. It was supported unanimously.

The Chair of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, Cllr V Holliday, confirmed that the Committee had supported the recommendations at the meeting on 18th March.

The Chair then moved to the vote on the recommendations, as amended.

It was RESOLVED unanimously to

- a) Note the contents of the report and the current forecast year end position.
- b) Increase the 2025/26 capital budget for Disabled Facilities Grants to £2,317,266. This is to reflect the addition of £118,204 of grant award towards the scheme

- c) Agree to use the Extended Responsibility Producer grant of £1,312,840, which was previously forecasted to be an in-year contribution to reserves, to offset relevant in year recycling expenditure.
- d) Approve for £50,000 of the forecast underspend to be awarded to a domestic oil fuel poverty charity, to support residents across North Norfolk who are experiencing hardship because of current high oil prices
- e) That the resulting underspend of £1,262,840 in the respective recycling revenue budgets be transferred to the General Reserve to mitigate future unfunded new burdens.

Recommendation 2:

1. Cabinet Agenda Item 9: Treasury Management Q3 Report 2025/2026

Cllr Shires introduced this item. She said that it had been considered by Governance, Risk & Audit Committee (GRAC) and the recommendations were supported.

It was RESOLVED

That Full Council received the Treasury Q3 Report 2025/2026.

128 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 18 MARCH 2026

The Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee, Cllr V Holliday, confirmed there were no further recommendations to Full Council.

129 QUESTIONS RECEIVED FROM MEMBERS

None.

130 OPPOSITION BUSINESS

None received.

131 NOTICE(S) OF MOTION

Two Notices of Motion had been received. The Chair invited Cllr L Withington, proposer of the motion to introduce the first one.:

1. The Right to Play Pledge

Cllr Withington explained that Right to Play Pledge was being promoted by the Norfolk Youth Advisory Board through the Mancroft Advice Project (MAP), which sought to encourage organisations and public bodies to recognise and support children and young people's right to play. She said that the District Council had a strong track record of supporting high-quality public spaces, parks and play areas which benefitted residents, families and visitors across the district. As the Council approached Local Government Reorganisation (LGR), it was important that the value of accessible and inclusive play continued to be recognised within future local authority policy and place-making

She went on to say that play was fundamental to life but often undervalued. Accessibility and inclusivity were 'buzz words' but could be overlooked and consideration was not always given as to what they really meant. It was important to think about everybody having access to play parks. She spoke about all the children, young adults, parents and grandparents who would be accessing play areas and then spoke about the additional challenges faced by children with disabilities and additional needs, who struggled to access traditional play equipment. Sensory needs were also vital and there should be quieter spaces available too. Children should be able to play together, regardless of additional needs.

Cllr Withington said that the Council was already committed to fully accessible and inclusive play areas and the Leas in Sheringham was an example of this.

She commended the motion and said that it was a strong position statement as the Council moved towards a unitary model. Using the S106 money more effectively meant that the best value and benefits would be achieved for play spaces across the district.

Cllr L Shires seconded the motion and reserved her right to speak.

The Chair invited members to speak:

Cllr P Porter said that she wished to propose the following amendment:

Proposed amendments –

- **Add** wording in italics below
- **Remove** wording crossed out below

Council therefore resolves to:

1. **Sign the Right to Play Pledge**, demonstrating North Norfolk District Council's support for the principle that all children and young people should have access to safe, inclusive and welcoming opportunities for play.
2. **S106 Funding Playpark allocations and sports facilities**

That the Council adopts a policy approach whereby S106 play contributions may, where appropriate and legally permissible, be directed towards strategic play and activity spaces *within the same parish as the development* rather than solely within the boundary of the originating development.

This approach would allow funding to be pooled or directed to locations that:

- Deliver fully inclusive and accessible play equipment
- Provide larger, higher-quality activity spaces
- ~~Serve multiple developments and neighbourhoods~~
- Improve connectivity with walking and cycling routes
- Support family-friendly community spaces that encourage physical activity and social interaction

Cllr Porter said that she wanted to propose the amendment to ensure that smaller parishes were protected and to reduce the risk of funding generated by development in one part of the district being used to benefit communities in entirely different areas. It was a small but important change that would ensure that all parts of North Norfolk would retain access to play provision. By keeping S106 contributions linked

to the parish where development takes place, it could be ensured that the benefits of development were felt directly in the local community and supported a fairer and more transparent distribution of funding.

Cllr V Holliday seconded the amendment. Cllr Adams clarified that if the proposer and seconder agreed with the amendment it would form part of the substantive motion and no debate was required.

Cllr L Shires said that the suggested additional wording made sense for parishes but the deleted words could cause some issues in a larger place such as North Walsham where money could be pooled to create a better, more inclusive play area. She said that she would be happy to accept the highlighted additional wording, if the crossed-out/deleted wording was retained for larger areas. Cllr Withington said she had some concerns as one of the main challenges in creating inclusive play spaces was that the cost of floor space/area to make it fully accessible was very expensive and could even cost more than the play equipment. Small play areas were often not suitable for being made accessible and parishes may not be able to generate the funding to make genuinely accessible play areas.

Cllr Porter said that as it currently stood, the motion included town councils as well as parishes and she was concerned that S106 money from a development in a smaller parish could be used to fund a play area in a nearby town which may not be easy to access by village residents. Cllr Shires acknowledged this concern and suggested that the additional wording was included in the motion but said that serving multiple developments in neighbourhoods was key in towns. She proposed a compromise that villages were protected but that the wording for serving multiple developments and neighbourhoods in towns was retained.

Cllr C Cushing said that he was content to keep in the additional wording and not remove the wording relating to multiple developments.

The Monitoring Officer clarified that the additional wording would be included but that the proposed deletion would not proceed.

Cllr Porter proposed that the wording 'within the same parish as the development' but that 'serve multiple developments and neighbourhoods' was not deleted. This was seconded by Cllr V Holliday. When put to the vote, the amendment was supported unanimously and formed part of the substantive motion.

The Chair opened the debate on the substantive motion.

Cllr J Punchard said that having been involved in town council playgrounds over many years and the huge amount of money that had been spent to make them inclusive, it was often the case that play equipment was built on tarmac 'islands' which could not be reached by wheelchair users. This included carers and parents who supported their children's access to the equipment. He said that he supported the motion.

Cllr W Fredericks queried whether it was possible to change policy in the way that was proposed and queried whether the correct process was being followed. The Monitoring Officer advised that members voted in principle and that the detail would be assessed.

Cllr J Toye said that connectivity using walking and cycling routes was key for the towns but was also important between villages too.

Cllr S Penfold said that he was supportive of the motion and said that the Council had a strong record in this area through the Sustainable Communities Fund which had ensured that accessibility and inclusivity were a key part of the application process.

Cllr Shires then spoke as seconder of the motion. She thanked representatives of the Youth Advisory Board (YAB) and commended their commitment and focus, particularly on the right to play. She thanked them for their passion and engagement.

The Chair then moved to the vote and it was RESOLVED unanimously

Council therefore resolves to:

3. **Sign the Right to Play Pledge**, demonstrating North Norfolk District Council's support for the principle that all children and young people should have access to safe, inclusive and welcoming opportunities for play.
4. **106 Funding Playpark allocations and sports facilities**

That the Council adopts a policy approach whereby S106 play contributions may, where appropriate and legally permissible, be directed towards strategic play and activity spaces within the same parish as the development rather than solely within the boundary of the originating development.

This approach would allow funding to be pooled or directed to locations that:

- Deliver **fully inclusive and accessible play equipment**
- Provide **larger, higher-quality activity spaces**
- Serve **multiple developments and neighbourhoods**
- Improve **connectivity with walking and cycling routes**
- Support **family-friendly community spaces** that encourage physical activity and social interaction

Developers and planning officers would work together to ensure that residents of the contributing development continue to benefit from the facilities delivered.

5. **Request that officers prepare a short position statement for the authority** outlining the Council's commitment to inclusive and accessible play and highlighting the importance of continuing to ensure accessible and inclusive play, recreation and family-friendly public spaces continue to be prioritised as part of asset management, policy development and place planning through the Local Government Reorganisation process.

The Chair then moved on to the second notice of motion and asked Cllr Brown, the proposer to introduce it.

2. Motion to Council on Fly-tipping

Cllr Brown began saying that there was a developing problem in the district regarding fly-tipping and roadside littering due to years of Government complacency. Numbers were increasing year on year. There were 462 recorded fly tips on public land and 81 on private land between 2023 and 2026. So, the bulk of the liability to clear up fell to NNDC as it was responsible for removal from public land. Fly tipping caused a blight on communities and its removal cost huge amounts of money which could be spent on education, health and other critical services. Ultimately, littering could lead to an increase in council tax due to the rising costs of cleaning up.

Cllr Brown said that North Norfolk was the third best bio-diverse region in Britain and one of the biggest problems faced by wildlife was pollution in the form of waste and rubbish, causing death and serious injury. Roadside litter alone was estimated to kill 3m small animals in the UK every year. Schools should be encouraged to include personal responsibility for litter in their curriculums. Regarding fly-tipping, he said it had been exacerbated by Norfolk County Council's introduction of charging at recycling centres. This had since been replaced by a booking system and reduced opening hours which had contributed to a rise in both reported and unreported fly-tipping. So, the national fines imposed for fly-tipping should be reviewed to ensure that they were matching fixed penalty notices issued by the Council for the same offence. They were currently out of kilter with one another. Lower fines issues by the courts undermined deterrents, weakened enforcement powers and also left councils out of pocket. National sentencing guidelines therefore needed reviewing as a matter of urgency. He said that new legislation was coming through to strengthen powers and the Council needed to be prepared to align with the new measures.

Cllr Brown thanked the local Womble pickers and everyone who gave up their time to keep local communities free from litter. He commended the motion to members.

Cllr C Ringer seconded the motion and reserved his right to speak.

The Chair opened up the debate to members.

Cllr C Cushing said that he wished to propose the following small amendment:

To add the following as a fifth resolution to Cabinet:

v) Lobby the Government to amend the Environmental Protection Act 1990 so that the Government take financial responsibility for the removal of fly-tipping waste from private land.

Cllr Cushing said that he supported everything that Cllr Brown had said and this was a positive addition to the motion. He said that the figures for fly-tipping were shocking with over 1 million cases of fly-tipping reported on public highways alone in the last year and only 1500 of these were taken to court. He went onto say that Magistrate's courts could impose fines of up to £50k or 12 months imprisonment and the Crown court could impose unlimited fines or 5 years in prison. However, the average fine was £593. He said that the amendment focused on the people who paid the financial brunt of clearing up in many cases and that was private landowners as they were legally responsible for clearing rubbish on their land. He agreed with Cllr Brown that more Government intervention was needed and this may happen if they took financial responsibility for clearing rubbish from private land.

The Chair asked Cllr Brown, as proposer of the motion, if he accepted the amendment. Cllr Brown said that he accepted the intention of the motion but cautioned that private landowners often took out insurance for fly-tipping removal costs and he was concerned that the amendment may imply that private insurance should be removed. He said that he was concerned that it could lead to increases in central taxation because the money would need to come from somewhere.

Cllr V Holliday seconded the amendment. She said that the egregious fly-tipping that was being seen now was on private land and not all private land was owned by wealthy landowners. There were charities, community groups and public bodies that owned private land.

Cllr Brown agreed to accept the amendment and it therefore formed part of the substantive motion.

The Chair then opened the debate on the substantive motion:

Cllr S Butikofer said that it was a huge issue of concern to local residents. She reminded people not to try and tackle fly-tippers themselves but to take photographs where possible and report it to the District Council.

Cllr C Rouse said that he was supportive of the motion and he supported increasing the fines on fly-tipping. He also commended the Wombles for their hard work collecting litter.

Cllr J Toye said that he felt that fly-tipping was particularly prevalent in rural communities and it was important to acknowledge the damage caused to wildlife.

Cllr T FitzPatrick said that since he had been a member of the Council, he had always held it up as an exemplar in dealing with fly-tipping quickly and taking cases to court whenever possible. He reminded members that private land included people's gardens and parking spaces in front of houses and small shop. He was supportive of pushing for the highest possible penalties for fly-tipping.

Cllr Ringer then spoke as seconder of the motion. He said that the rising numbers regarding fly-tipping were quite stark. He had sympathy for private landowners, particularly small community groups. The large majority, however, was dumped on public land and it was the Council's responsibility to clear it up. The tools to effectively prosecute were needed. He highlighted a recent case in his ward where a numberplate had been left in a pile of rubbish but DVLA rules prevented the data linked to it being used without a witness present at the time it was dumped.

Something needed to change centrally to indicate that the government was serious about tackling environmental crime. He also thanked the Wombles and commended their hard work, along with other community groups who gave up their time. He reiterated the advice to leave fly-tipping where it was and report it as soon as possible.

Cllr Brown said that he had nothing further to add.

The Chair asked members to go to the vote and it was RESOLVED unanimously to:

Ask Cabinet to:

- i) Investigate fly-tipping instances and where suitable evidence exists, take appropriate enforcement action possible against those responsible.
- ii) Ensure all fixed penalty notices for littering and fly-tipping to the legal maximum as appropriate
- iii) Promote regularly the "Lets S.C.R.A.P. fly-tipping" campaign to increase awareness of the householder Duty of Care requirements so that they only use registered waste carriers to dispose of their waste.
- iv) Ensure that all businesses in the district have appropriate Duty of Care arrangements in place and take appropriate action where this is found not to be the case.
- v) Lobby the Government to amend the Environmental Protection Act 1990 so that the Government take financial responsibility for the removal of fly-tipping waste from private land

132 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

133 PRIVATE BUSINESS

The meeting ended at 7.51 pm.

Chairman