



Harry Blake-Herbert  
Governance and Scrutiny Team  
Direct: 020 8132 0807  
e-mail: Harry.Blake-Herbert@enfield.gov.uk

## **ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE ACTION SCRUTINY PANEL**

**Tuesday, 24th October, 2023 at 7.00 pm in the Conference Room,  
Civic Centre, Silver Street, Enfield, EN1 3XA**

### **Membership:**

co: Hivran Dalkaya (Chair), Nia Stevens (Vice Chair), Maria Alexandrou, Patricia Gregory, Ahmet Hasan, Mohammad Islam, Destiny Karakus, and Joanne Laban.

### **AGENDA – PART 1**

**1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES**

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members are asked to declare any disclosable pecuniary, other pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests relating to items on the agenda.

**3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Pages 1 - 6)**

To receive and agree the minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 14 March 2023.

**4. UPDATE ON WASTE (Pages 7 - 12)**

To receive an update on Waste, to include:

- Recycling;
- Mandatory food waste segregation for businesses;
- and Fly tipping.

**5. WORK PROGRAMME 2023/24 (Pages 13 - 16)**

To note the Environment & Climate Action Work Programme for 2023/24.

**6. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

To note the dates of the future meetings as follows:

Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2024

Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> March 2024

And an additional date to be agreed by the Panel.

**ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE ACTION SCRUTINY PANEL - 14.3.2023****MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE ACTION SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON TUESDAY, 14TH MARCH, 2023**

**MEMBERS:** Councillors: Mahmut Aksanoglu, Maria Alexandrou, Hivran Dalkaya, Peter Fallart, Joanne Laban, Nia Stevens and Eylem Yuruk

**Officers:** Doug Wilkinson (Director of Environment & Operational Services), Richard Eason (Healthy Streets Programme Director), Jon Sharkey (Head of Public Realm Services), Ned Johnson (Principal Officer for Health, Safety & Pollution), Nicola Lowther (Governance Manager), Harry Blake-Herbert (Governance Officer)

**Also Attending:** Councillor Rick Jewell, Cabinet Member for Environment, Press, and members of the public.

**1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Ozer (Chair) and Cllr James (Vice-Chair). Cllr Aksanoglu, substituting for Cllr James, nominated himself to Chair the meeting. This was seconded, and it was **AGREED** that Cllr Aksanoglu would Chair the meeting in the absence of the Chair.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest received regarding any items on the agenda.

**3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

**AGREED** the minutes of the previous meeting held on 17 January 2023.

**4. REVIEW THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SCHOOL STREETS**

Richard Eason, Healthy Streets Programme Director introduced some of the key points in the report, which reviewed the implementation of School Streets.

In response, members commented as follows:

1. Cllr Laban asked if a safety assessment had been completed, looking into the impact of moving from a volunteer-based scheme to using AMPR cameras. Officers responded that most schools had initially used marshals, and one still did, but that this was not sustainable for the majority of them, thus they had to adapt to use AMPR cameras. Whilst this was perhaps not as

## ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE ACTION SCRUTINY PANEL - 14.3.2023

safe as having a physical barrier on the site, it still proved effective at reducing traffic and was far safer than having the School Streets scheme rescinded at these various locations.

2. Cllr Laban queried specifically about Worcester's School, citing that residents around the area felt they had been somewhat cut off by the School Street there; the Cllr questioned what engagement had taken place with residents, and how the diversions put in place matched with the Council's air quality objectives. Officers replied that the scheme had been met with broad support; they accepted the programme had posed some issues for a minority of residents but stressed that there was always some alternative means of access. It was pointed out that while the scheme initially imposed set blanket times; schools had now reduced these to make them more specific/ targeted, thus alleviating some of the inconvenience. Officers reiterated that each location has its own challenges and the scheme, like any other, was a balancing act between trying to extrapolate the maximum benefit whilst also aiming to reduce the inconvenience to residents. It was stressed that feedback was always monitored, and modifications could be made.

3. Cllr Yuruk asked whether Prince of Wales Primary School would be included in the scheme. Officers responded that the school was part of the STARS programme, and an expression of interest had been received, thus they met the criteria, and would be considered as a candidate in future rounds.

4. Cllr Alexandrou queried whether inset days were considered by the School Streets programme; if Wren Academy had applied; and whether more advanced signage could be placed by the School Street located off Cannon Hill. Officers replied that signage on Cannon Hill would be investigated. **ACTION** for Richard Eason. They explained that typically School Streets covered term time, as inset days were difficult to take account of, because each school does them differently; they emphasised that schools individually managed when the scheme was in operation. They confirmed Wren Academy was a part of the STARS scheme and had expressed interest in becoming a School Street, but that challenges such as it being situated on a bus route to the hospital, meant that alternatives, like improvements to pedestrian crossings, may have to be considered instead.

5. Cllr Stevens asked about the problems with the rollout at Hazelwood School and queried what lessons had been learned for the future. Officers apologised for the issues, assured members that communication had been improved and that these problems were being rectified. They explained the rollout had not gone smoothly due to a variety of factors, but that they had put systems in place to ensure this would not be repeated in the future. They said the scheme would go live at the end of the month, with residents having been made aware of this, and that permit applications were now open and ongoing.

6. Cllr Stevens queried whether at School Streets where it was more difficult to maintain volunteers/marshals, if at least the left-hand lane of the roads could be blocked with barriers. Officers responded that it may be possible in some locations, and was something they could try to encourage, but that they could not enforce it.

7. Cllr Dalkaya asked if where potential School Street locations fell on bus routes, whether bus gates could be used. Officers replied that it may be possible in some quieter locations, but would be more challenging in others,

## **ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE ACTION SCRUTINY PANEL - 14.3.2023**

i.e., on principal road networks, as closing them in rush hour would have a huge impact. Ark John Keeps School was mentioned as an example that could be investigated. It was also noted that where School Streets were not possible, alternative interventions, would be looked at, like reducing speed limits.

8. Cllr Laban asked for data regarding the percentage of children that walked and or cycled to schools as opposed to other means of transport. Officers advised that schools collected this data as part of the STARS programme, and that this data was not to hand, but could be followed up with. They added that even in instances where cars were being used in the school run, parents were parking further away, thus the concentration of emissions at schools were being dispersed further away.

9. Cllr Stevens queried whether an update on the Quieter Neighbourhoods scheme was available to which Officers responded this was still a work in progress.

10. The Chair asked how Raglan School Street would be implemented given the difficulties of the site. Officers explained that this location did present some challenges but that there were always things they could look at doing; the difficulty they said often came in balancing what schools wanted to see and what is practical.

11. Cllr Fallart asked if a 20mph zone around the aforementioned site could be considered as an alternative, to which Officers explained that it was one intervention they were considering at locations where School Streets were not workable.

### **5. WASTE RECYCLING MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE**

Jon Sharkey, Head of Public Realm Services gave a presentation and highlighted some of the key points and updates with regards to Waste Recycling Management Performance.

In response, members commented as follows:

1. Cllr Fallart asked what measures the Council was taking to prevent fly-tippers from targeting communal bins. Officers responded that with communal bins, it was hard to assign blame to parties who were not disposing of their waste properly, thus taking action and educating those guilty of it, was difficult. They expressed the Council were trialling new communal bin locations away from main roads where they are less likely to be targeted by fly-tippers, but that it was difficult to find such convenient locations where collection teams could still empty them regularly. Officers assured members that the Council employs Waste Enforcement Teams who are dedicated to housing, and that this and other similar issues were being monitored.

2. Cllr Yuruk queried whether the Council was still providing refuse bins to residents free of charge; what the Council's position was on collecting bins that were overfilled, and if more public bins could be added to Ordnance Road. Officers replied that bins were provided free of charge, but additional criteria had to be met for residents wanting a larger black bin. They explained that the collection of overfilled bins was at the discretion of Officers, and that while they do usually collect them, the Council website makes clear that bins

**ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE ACTION SCRUTINY PANEL - 14.3.2023**

should not be overfilled; and if this becomes a routine problem it would be recorded, and they may not be collected. Officers stressed that when refuse is not collected, due to bins being overfilled, this is not down to Officers being awkward, but instead because the mechanism on refuse collection trucks is designed for bins that are closed, and open lids could catch, thus represent a safety risk. **ACTION** for Jon Sharkey - to look at the potential for adding more bins to Ordnance Road.

3. Cllr Laban highlighted that the percentage of refuse being recycled in the borough had fallen since 2019 and questioned whether Officers felt the move to fortnightly collections had been a mistake. Officers explained that the Covid-19 pandemic had significantly impacted on residents' behaviour and meant they did not have an opportunity to embed their new practices, thus felt a straight comparison of these figures without context was unreflective. They stressed that compared to other Local Authorities, Enfield's recycling statistics were fairly good, and that they would continue to drive their waste management strategy forwards.

4. Cllr Laban asked what impact the change in contractor from Biffa to NLWA, who were more generous with their rejection threshold, would have on waste performance statistics. Officers confirmed that they hoped this would mean a greater quantity of refuse would be recognised and treated as recycling, thus reducing unnecessary waste.

5. Cllr Laban then queried whether it would be possible to get waste performance statistics on a ward-by-ward basis for comparisons. Officers responded that collection rounds were optimised according to the best routes and were not done on a ward-by-ward basis, thus it would be very difficult to separate the refuse and statistics in this way.

6. Cllr Alexandrou asked if more clothes swap events and 'fix it factory' style initiatives could be introduced. Officers replied that as part of their category 2 initiatives, they were looking at increasing the frequency of such events/ facilities including a 'library of things' where residents could go to trade and make use of each other's various items.

7. Cllr Dalkaya pointed out that for many residents in the Borough, their first language was not English, and so asked if more could be done in the way of bi-lingual communication. Officers responded that work was ongoing to develop the Council's webpages to ensure its information and messages were accessible in all key languages spoken in the borough. Cllr Jewell pointed out that particular emphasis had been placed on working with schools, so that children, who he felt were very aware of and engaged by environmental issues, took these messages home and shared them with their families.

8. The Chair queried whether an update regarding the parks' recycling initiative was available, to which Officers replied that they were still analysing the data which they hoped would be available over the next few weeks, but that the initial feedback suggested this pilot scheme had been used well.

9. Cllr Stevens asked to what extent the Council was consulting with residents about the barriers to and challenges of recycling. Officers responded that they engaged with residents at libraries over mis-collections and consulted with them as and when changes were made, but that the scope for this could be widened to receive more/ better feedback. They explained that things were still gradually returning to normal following Covid and as changes come about in the new financial year, it would be a good time to engage more with the

## **ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE ACTION SCRUTINY PANEL - 14.3.2023**

community. Officers said they were always welcome to suggestions and new ideas from the public.

10. Cllr Fallart queried whether a comparison looking at collections on different days of the week might be an option, which Officers conveyed was something they had been considering looking into.

11. Cllr Laban asked how closely the Environment Team worked with Planning, particularly with regards to new tower blocks, and whether a recycling shoot, like those already in use for general waste, could be installed in new blocks going forwards. Officers expressed that they were in constant conversation with other departments including Planning, and that talks often centred around what could be done with new developments to 'design-in' recycling facilities. They explained that these talks were ongoing, as was communication with other Local Authorities about their green ideas and initiatives, but that cost and viability restrictions often constrained what they were capable of doing.

### **6. AIR QUALITY ACTION PLAN**

Ned Johnson, Principal Officer for Health, Safety & Pollution, gave an update on some of the key points in the Air Quality Action Plan.

In response, members commented as follows:

1. Cllr Laban queried why the Council had not challenged the Mayor of London over the expansion of the Ultra-Low Emission Zone which she described; came with a cost of £250m, would hurt the poorest residents in the borough and would have a negligible impact on air quality. Cllr Laban argued the Council should instead invest in schemes like zero emission bus routes. Cllr Jewell responded that the statistics suggest the ULEZ expansion will have the desired impact on air quality, that the Council had engaged with and asked questions of the Mayor of London regarding the scheme, and that they had not opposed it because it fits with the Council's environmental objectives.

2. Cllr Laban reiterated her concerns regarding the ULEZ expansion before moving on to question the Council's approach on Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, which forced more cars onto already polluted roads. Officers replied that the objective of LTNs was to direct traffic out of residential streets and onto roads that were designed to deal with a greater volume of vehicles, in turn encouraging people to switch the modes of transport they choose to take, which is what they were seeing happen.

3. Cllr Alexandrou highlighted the increases in traffic on several roads, before moving on to query if the Council would hold another anti-idling campaign; and enquired if air quality could be measured just outside of LTNs, on busy roads and outside schools. Officers responded that the anti-idling campaign for London had ended last year but the Council were keen to continue it in the borough; in particular, they were keen for this to partner its engagement with schools, as that is where it had been most effective. They explained the monitoring of air quality could take place in more specific locations but that without previous comparisons the data would not be as useful.

4. Cllr Stevens asked about the green wall outside Bowes School, and whether something similar could be adopted along the A10 and A406. Officers

## **ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE ACTION SCRUTINY PANEL - 14.3.2023**

replied that the ivy wall outside Bowes School, which had been attached with nitrogen dioxide analysers, had resulted in a 22% reduction in emissions. However, they expressed that green walls would not work everywhere, that they required a lot of maintenance, and that the A406 was only part controlled by Enfield, thus was a difficult site to do much with.

5. Cllr Stevens enquired what contribution the waste incinerator was having, to which Officers expressed they did not have these figures to hand.

6. Cllr Alexandrou asked how the Council were protecting poorer residents in the borough from the incinerator's emissions. Officers responded that the facility was one of the cleanest in Europe, with strict environmental regulations attached to its operations, which it would more than meet. They asked that members be careful with the language they use to describe the facility, so as to not cause undue concern where none need exist, and confirmed that general community funding was available to a number of eligible residents.

7. At the discretion of the Chair, members of the public asked questions about the monitoring of emissions in the Borough and Officers present responded to them accordingly.

8. Cllr Laban asked why some of the borough's environmental infrastructure/ greenbelts, such as farmland and golf courses, were being considered as areas to build new developments on. Cllr Jewell replied that the Council was doing lots of work on its environmental infrastructure including: planting trees, creating forests, introducing beavers, building wetland areas, implementing Quieter Neighbourhoods, and developing public transport etc. He explained that some areas of land, like Vicarage Farm were being reviewed as potential areas of development but that nothing had been decided or moved forward with. Officers added that there was a balance of tensions between the Council's various different objectives; and that trade-offs, like housing and the environment existed, with the Council having to consider how to obtain the best overall outcomes for residents.

### **7. WORK PROGRAMME**

**NOTED** the completion of the Work Programme for 2022/23 and that the Environment & Climate Action Scrutiny Panel Work Programme for 2023/24 will be discussed at the first meeting of the new municipal year.

### **8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

**NOTED** the dates of future meetings for the Environment & Climate Action Scrutiny Panel will be confirmed following Annual Council on Wednesday 10 May 2023.

The Chair thanked everyone for their time and brought the meeting to a close.

The meeting ended at 9.16 pm.





## London Borough of Enfield

<b>Report Title</b>	<i>Recycling Overview and Performance, Mandatory Food Segregation for Businesses Position and Fly Tipping Update</i>
<b>Report to</b>	<i>Environment &amp; Climate Action Scrutiny Panel</i>
<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<i>24<sup>th</sup> October 2023</i>
<b>Cabinet Member</b>	<i>Cllr Rick Jewell</i>
<b>Executive Director / Director</b>	<i>Simon Pollock / Doug Wilkinson</i>
<b>Report Author</b>	<i>Jon Sharkey (jon.sharkey@enfield.gov.uk)</i>
<b>Ward(s) affected</b>	
<b>Classification</b>	<i>Part 1 Public</i>
<b>Reason for exemption</b>	<i>Not Applicable</i>

### Purpose of Report

1. To update the panel on the work undertaken across the Council in relation to:
  - The Council's recycling service and how this is communicated to residents
  - The Council's recycling performance
  - Mandatory food waste segregation for businesses
  - Fly tipping and enforcement

### Main Considerations for the Panel

2. To consider the current approach to how the recycling service is communicated to residents
3. To consider the Council's recycling performance

4. To consider the approach to recycling of waste produced by commercial properties
5. To consider the ongoing strategy of preventing fly tipping in the first instance; and then where this occurs the investigation and enforcement options available

## **Background and Options**

### ***Recycling Service:***

6. Every tonne of waste recycled saves the Council around c.£85-90. These savings can be realised from diverting waste from the residual waste stream to the dry recycling stream. Every 1% of refuse diverted to recycling would save c.£85,000-95,000 per year.
7. The waste sector is currently undergoing significant changes with regards to legislation. The requirements under this new legislation are around increasing recycling in communal situations for example, adopting more circular economy approaches, and enhancing the service offering to residents. The Council has set out its commitment to meeting the new requirements in its Reduction and Recycling Plan, which is a requirement of the Mayor of London's London Environment Strategy.
8. Enfield currently offer the following recycling and refuse services for residents:
  - Alternate weekly collection of recycling and refuse via wheeled bin or sacks (where wheeled bins are not suitable) for kerbside properties.
  - Food waste is collected weekend from kerbside properties weekly.
  - Charged garden waste service for kerbside properties. These are collected all year round, fortnightly and cost £80 per bin, per year.
  - Communal recycling and bins are used for flats and estates. These are collected twice weekly.
  - Free bulky waste service is available to all residents for up to 6 items
9. Recycling communications are developed in partnership with our corporate Communications Team. Materials are designed to provide important information for residents on how to use the recycling service and be as clear as possible using images and photos (please see examples below). Recently, we have developed our Rubbish and Recycling Collection Policy and made it available on our website. This breaks the collection service down into clearly labelled sections making it easier for residents to find the information required (link to the policy: [here](#)). Further, all residents have received our guide about Rubbish, Recycling and Food Waste – this is also available on our website for residents ([overview of our kerbside service](#)). The website also includes videos explaining how to use our services (with British Sign Language) and also clips from the Cllr Jewel video with information, tips and advice on the

services we provide. These are often shared on our social media platforms. The full video can be found on [YouTube](#).



10. DEFRA are proposing the introduction of new statutory requirements for Waste Collection Authorities in England. Under the terms of the new Environment Act 2021 and the National Resource and Waste Strategy for England, DEFRA aim to deliver on the ambition to achieve higher recycling rates, increased resource efficiency and a more circular economy. One of the proposed changes was 'Consistency in Collections' with all waste collection authorities to collect glass, metal, plastic, and paper & card in kerbside recycling collection services and provide the collection of separate food waste at least once a week. In a recent update from DEFRA, this has now been replaced by 'Simpler Recycling' which plans to ensure that all homes will 'recycle the same materials' and that those materials 'won't need to be separated at home'. This appears to suggest that commingling or twin stream (cardboard and paper in one bin and plastic, glass and cans in another) could be the preferred collection model. However, the industry is still waiting for clarity and confirmation about what the 'Simpler Recycling' rules will entail.

11. In 2021, Enfield commenced a trial at c.50 locations to increase the recycling rate that was being achieved from estates across the borough. Using research carried out by the London Waste and Recycling Board, we implemented several changes to sites that had been found to improve recycling performance, including reverse lidded bins, improved signage and increased engagement and support for residents. These improvements significantly reduced contamination levels at these locations. We now have a proven method for improving recycling performance in flats and estates and are prepared in readiness for the requirements that will be outlined as part of the National Resource and Waste Strategy. Dry recycling and food recycling will need to be offered to all communal properties by 2025 (although this may be delayed) and we will review once government has clarified the requirements and funding available.

12. The household recycling figure (NI 192) for 22/23 is due to be verified by Defra in the coming weeks. However, our own projections estimate that Enfield's performance will be 34.2%\* for 22/23. This is an increase of 3.3% on the previous year which was 30.9% - it is expected that Enfield will have the highest recycling rate of the seven North London Waste Authority boroughs

(Enfield, Barnet, Camden, Hackney, Haringey, Islington and Waltham Forest). Further, this increase appears to go against the projected trend across all of London with many boroughs predicting a decrease in their recycling rate this year – the NLWA boroughs except for Enfield are estimating an average reduction of c.1.8% this year compared to last year.

**\*All percentages are awaiting verification from waste data flow, however, are unlikely to change significantly.**

13. As part of the redevelopment of the Edmonton EcoPark, North London Waste Authority is constructing a new public Reuse and Recycling Centre (RRC) which will be available for residents of all NLWA constituent boroughs. It will be located in Enfield and will be in addition to Barrowell Green so Enfield residents will have a choice of using either site. It will have sufficient space to ensure the core range of items currently collected at NLWA RRCs for reuse and recycling can be taken to the new centre. This includes garden, DIY waste, furniture, mattresses, and electrical appliances. The centre will be under cover and users will not have to carry items up steps to throw them into containers, as the containers will be set below floor level. Construction is nearing completion. As the centre is within the wider North London Heat and Power Project construction site, it is anticipated that there will be a phased opening in 2024.

#### ***Mandatory Food Waste Segregation for Businesses:***

14. All businesses in England and Wales will be required to comply with the new legislation, with a particular emphasis on retail, hospitality, healthcare, and education sectors due to their higher volume of food waste production. Under the new legal framework, food waste must be separated from other waste streams within any business. However, currently the government is yet to announce a specific timeline for businesses operating in England.

15. The new legislation sets out that:

- All food waste must be separated into a different bin for collection.
- Food cannot be sent to landfill or incineration; it must be sent for recycling. The two methods that can be used are composting or anaerobic digestion.
- Macerators (units which chop and flush food down drains using high volumes of water) or liquidising digesters will be banned completely.
- Drying or dewatering systems will still be permitted as they help reduce the volume of food waste during collection.
- The responsibility for waste recycling fees lies with the business or its staff who generate the waste.

16. We are currently piloting a food waste collection service in some of the schools in the borough – this has been complimented by support from the Waste Services Team who have visited these schools and given presentations to the children on the benefits of recycling. This waste is collected in plastic 120l wheeled bin. Further, we have begun to look at piloting the scheme on a commercial basis, and are currently reviewing which

area/businesses to start this trial as we have to take into account that any contamination in the bins can make the whole load a problem for the disposal site.

17. The commercial waste team has 3 officers that manage an area each in the borough. Their duties consist mainly of building the customer base of commercial waste customers. Tailored quotations are given to prospective customers which include the cost of a recycling collection, the recycling collection is 42% cheaper than a standard refuse collection to encourage businesses to take up this service. We also offer a combination deal too that is competitively priced if the customer takes both a waste and recycling service. When talking to each customer we emphasise the point that their waste costs per year will be cheaper the more they recycle.

18. The Commercial Waste Team have undertaken a recent survey of the Enfield Town area and identified the following providers for the 203 businesses:

- LBE – 71 businesses
- Biffa – 67 businesses
- Others – 65 businesses

19. Biffa are clearly our main competitor in the area as they have a local depot, so their transport costs are kept to a minimum enabling them to price competitively against LBE. Further, many of the businesses in Enfield Town would fall under a national agreement with Biffa - e.g., Costa Coffee have a contract with Biffa as they are able to service all of their sites on a regional or national basis.

### ***Fly Tipping and Enforcement Update:***

20. Fly tipping dumped waste (e.g. black bags), and littering adversely affect the quality of the local environment and give a negative perception of the look and feel of the borough. These activities also influence how an area is perceived by residents, workers, visitors, and investors.

21. Local authorities have a duty to clear fly-tipped material from relevant land in their areas and deal with most of the fly-tipping on public land, investigating these and carrying out a range of preventative and enforcement actions.

22. To prevent fly tipping occurring in the first instance we provide information and advice to residents; a free bulky waste collection service; recycling opportunities including the provision of specific recycling centres (e.g. Barrowell Green).

23. Unfortunately, despite these attempts and where fly tipping persists then we will seek to investigate and undertake proportionate enforcement action. This will include the issue of Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs), Statutory Notices/Warnings and may ultimately result in prosecution through the Courts by virtue of the Single Justice Procedure (SJP). The SJP can be used where an individual has been charged with a minor criminal offence, then the case may be decided by a magistrate without going to court. Hence if an FPNs is

not paid then we may seek to prosecute the offender for the substantive offence (i.e., dropping litter/fly tipping).

24. The Waste Enforcement Team have also started to utilise CCTV to act as a visible deterrent and where possible assist in the investigation of waste offences.
25. The team have also launched the "Can You Help?" social media page. To date we have posted 18 episodes. Whilst this has not yielded any "tip offs" anecdotal feedback from colleagues in Press and New Media, is a shift in comments on social media away from blaming the Council for the fly tipping that is occurring across the Borough, and a recognition that we are taking measures to try and prevent this and will enforce where we have the evidence to do so.
26. Following a tendering process for a new Environmental Enforcement Services Contract, this was awarded to Kingdom Group Limited (Local Authority Support (LAS)). LAS will continue to issue FPNs for dropped litter (Cigarettes) and dumped waste (black bags) and fly tipping.

### **Relevance to Council Plans and Strategies**

27. Enfield's Council Plan 2023-2025 identifies Clean and Green Spaces as one of our priorities and specifically to 'keep our streets and public spaces clean and welcoming' and 'facilitate reuse of materials, reduce waste and increase recycling rates'.
28. Increased recycling performance can contribute positively to our strategic goals of making Enfield a healthier and greener place by providing services that can allow people to take greater responsibility for how they manage their waste and encourage recycling, composting and assist with meeting our ambitions for a clean green environment as stated in our Council Plan.

---

**Report Author:** Jon Sharkey  
Head of Public Realm  
jon.sharkey@enfield.gov.uk

### **Appendices**

### **Background Papers**

**Departmental reference number, if relevant:**

**ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE ACTION SCRUTINY PANEL 2023/24**

**CHAIR: Cllr Hivran Dalkaya**

<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Report Author</b>	<b>Lead Members</b>	<b>Executive Director/ Director</b>	<b>Scope</b>
<b>3 July 2023</b>	Work Programme Planning				
<b>24 Oct 2023</b>	Recycling	Jon Sharkey	Cllr Jewell	Doug Wilkinson/ Simon Pollock	To include: how information about what can be recycled is communicated to residents - the use of images/ stickers/ videos, the harmonisation/ standardisation of recycling, trial on recycling in council flats/ estates – the next step, recycling processes relative/ comparison to other local authorities – particularly those hitting the 50% London target, a second recycling centre being built/ opened at the North London Waste Authority
	Mandatory food waste segregation for businesses	Jon Sharkey	Cllr Jewell	Doug Wilkinson/ Simon Pollock	Suggested by the Executive Director, and something the Panel decided to discuss/ review/ scrutinise further.
	Fly tipping – to include enforcement and cameras	Jon Sharkey	Cllr Jewell	Doug Wilkinson/ Simon Pollock	Flytipping and enforcement are issues raised with members, and the committee would like to receive data and information on the numbers of offences, numbers of convictions, and areas of development.

<b>22 Jan 2024</b>	Climate Action Plan	Harriet Potemkin, Shaun Rogan	Cllr Ergin Erbil	Ian Davis	To present the updated document for Scrutiny
	Pilots Retrofitting Council Housing for Energy Efficiency	Rafe Bertram	Cllr Rick Jewell/ Cllr George Savva	Sarah Cary	With the price of energy increasing, members were keen to understand more about this issue.
<b>12 Mar 2024</b>	Biodiversity Net Gain	Gideon Whittington/ Karen Page	Cllr S Erbil	Brett Leahy/ Sarah Cary	There are new regulations and members wished to receive a briefing in this item.
	Quieter Neighbourhoods	Richard Eason	Cllr Jewell	Brett Leahy / Sarah Cary	Walking & Cycling Infrastructure – to include consultations that have taken place.
	Air Quality/Pollution & ULEZ	Ned Johnson/ Richard Eason	Cllr Jewell	Brett Leahy / Sarah Cary	Linked to the Quieter neighbourhoods issue, members wished to know if cycling routes were having any impact on air quality..
<b>Additional Meeting date tbc</b>	Rewilding –	Marcus Harvey/ Ian Russell	Cllr Anyanwu / Cllr Jewell	Cheryl Headon / Simon Pollock	To include Chase Landscape: Tree Planting, Wetlands, Beavers, and funding.
	Cattle Grazing at Forty Hall	Marcus Harvey/ Ian Russell	Cllr Anyanwu	Cheryl Headon / Simon Pollock	Linked to the above item, information on how this issue is progressing.
	Parks Management & Biodiversity –	Marcus Harvey	Cllr Anyanwu	Cheryl Headon / Simon	To include toilets (cleanliness & signage) and cafes in parks, grass



				Pollock	cutting, the move to tennis courts using a booking system, illegal tenting, and fishing at Grovelands Park, and parks and grass verges management more generally

This page is intentionally left blank