



Discussion around the implications for Principal Litter Authorities of complying with Section 91(1) and (2) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990

APSE Scottish Parks, Grounds, Street Services Advisory Group 27 February 2019

THE PRESS AND JOURNAL

From mountain to sea

George McCallum Niblock v Aberdeenshire Council

Aberdeen Sheriff Court

George McCallum Niblock as Convenor of Aberdeenshire Environmental Forum v Aberdeenshire Council

Decided 31 October 2018 [2019] SC ABE 10

Note 19 December 2018 (expenses) [2019] SC ABE 11

ENVIRONMENT

Clean-up campaigner loses litter court case

Ex-council boss fails to convince Sheriff that authority was lax

BY STEPHEN WALSH

Summer waste boss who accused Aberdeenshire Connett of falling to keep streets clean has lost his court buttle. George Niblock, Environment Forum, took the local authority to court

The order allows a member of the public to force landowners to clean up litter blackspota.

Mr Niblock, who is a retired council waste boss. previously threatened to take the authority and the Scottish Government to court over the state of the streets, alleging years of neglect. Solicitors acting on his

behalf subsequently filed an codes with the court which focused on the condition of the A96 Aberdeen to Inverness road The order is specific to a

near seven-nulle stretch of the road north of Inverurie. Mr Niblock alleged the authority continually falled to clear rubbish from the route, and believed this mirrored failings elsewhere

A number of people gave evidence during the hearing, at Aberdeen Sherlif Court, Including Mr Niblock and Philip McKay, the council's head of roads. The court heard that Mr Niblock had been resources to it.

campaigning on the issue

DIRTYPROTEST: George Niblock - pictured, right, with fellow compaigners - invoked a litter abatement order to get the A99 tidled up claimed showed litter and manages Scotland's trunk rubbish piled up along roads network. Sheriff Andrew Miller. the route, along with

adjacent footpaths. Mr McKay said the that the evidence did not authority complied with show the problem was a Its statutory duties to "consistent one" along the clean streets but also route. said budgetary pressures prevented him from Sheriff Miller said: "A devoting any further

It was also confirmed that the responsibility for at particular locations He presented 24 cutting back verges was along the road also appear with Bear Scotland, which to show, where the angle our system of inspections at all."

overgrown foliage covering presiding ruled in favour of the authority, stating

In his written decision, number of the photographs relied upon by him which show the presence of litter

permits, that such litter is localised rather than being, in any true sense, a consistent feature of this entire stretch of road.

Mr Niblock could not be A spokesman for Aberdeenshire Council

said: "We welcome the fact. that the sheriff refused to order and was of the view that Mr Niblock had falled

to prove his case.
"We were confident in

and the way we allocate area, and it is therefore unfortunate that public money had to be used to

defend this case those travelling around the area to dispose of any litter

responsibly: 'Our crews are subtect while litter-picking in such locations - which something which ideally



GARDEN M.

IN TIME FO

Bear echoes call for drivers to take more care with trash

case, but was mentioned several times in evidence.

Sheriff Andrew Miller said animal careasses on a "matter of urgency".

At one point during court therefore did not to ensuring Bear Scotland the appearance of

suggested by the council's legal team that Bear does Bear Scotland was not not give enough notice of formally part of the court planned roadworks, which me that if the defenders enables any litter to be

Sheriff Miller said: said animal carcasses on "I recognise that Bear Scotland of planned the road should be tacked Scotland were not roadworks, they should proceedings and that the Bear Scotland with a view

evidence, it was also have the benefit of their are made fully aware of Scotland's roadsides and response to the defenders' perspective.

"But it seems clear to perceive there to be a problem with the notice given to them by Bear pursue dialogue with

their concerns and that puts road workers safety any bases are addressed by both agencies so far as

possible." A spokeswoman for Bear said: "Unfortunately." some people continue to think that it is acceptable to throw litter from their

"This not only tarnishes.

at risk, but it also puts an increased strain on the

lasue, we continue to provide Aberdeenshire Council with our grass cutting and general works







Background

23rd Feb 2018 – Notice was served on Aberdeenshire Council under Section 91(5) of the EPA 1990.

'Our client is aggrieved by the defacement by litter and refuse as well as the want of cleanliness of the section of the A96 trunk road (including its central reservation, verges and adjacent footpaths) between the Blackburn Junction and the port Elphinstone junction near Inverurie, which section is shown delineated in blue on the plan annexed to this Notice.'





6.8 mile stretch of the A96







In January 2018 – Mr. Niblock took series of 24 photographs showing locations along the road, presence of litter at points along the road.























From mountain to sea







Extension due to weather

Notice under Section 91(5) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 A96: Blackburn Junction to Port Elphinstone Junction near Inverurie

We refer to the notice dated 23 February 2018, sent on behalf of Aberdeenshire Environmental Forum, a copy of which is attached for reference.

Given the recent winter weather conditions, we are instructed to extend the 5 day notice period, referred to in section 91(5) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, to Friday 16 March 2018, thereby allowing the Council further time to take remedial action before a complaint is lodged with the Sheriff Court.

If Aberdeenshire Council is in any doubt about these matters, we recommend that it seeks legal advice.





March 2018 – Council undertook cleaning works to various parts of the road including all bus stops and footpaths leading to those bus stops.









Verges – Ongoing program of litter picking when required an safe to do so. Prior to this notice being served, the verges had been litter picked on the week commencing 19th Jan 2018









From mountain to sea

Central Reservations – Monitored for debris that would cause a safety concern and levels of litter. If required to deploy staff to these areas, it would require lanes closures to ensure safety

of staff.







- March & April 2018 Mr. Niblock further inspected the road and took further photographs of various points along the road.
 - Photographs showed presence of litter on the road.
 - Photographs not disclosed to Council until lodged as productions.
- 11th April 2018 Initial Writ presented to Aberdeen Sheriff Court.
- 29th August 2018 Proof hearing.





- Mr. Niblock failed to establish that the road was defaced by litter or refuse or was wanting in cleanliness within the meaning of section 91(6) of the 1990 Act when the proceedings were raised or at the date of the proof in the proceedings.
- The Council proved that it had complied with its duties under section 89(1) and (2) as respects the road, in terms of section 91(7) of the 1990 Act.
- The sheriff subsequently found Mr. Niblock liable to the Council in the expenses of the cause.





Relevant provisions of the Environmental Protection Act 1990

Section 89— Duty to keep land and highways clear of litter etc.

- (1) It shall be the duty of ...
- (c) each principal litter authority, as respects its relevant land, ... to ensure that the land is, <u>so far as is practicable</u>, kept clear of litter and refuse.
- (2) ... it shall also be the duty of –
- (a) each local authority, as respects any relevant highway or relevant road for which it is responsible, ...

to ensure that the highway or road is, so far as is practicable, kept clean.





Relevant provisions of the Environmental Protection Act 1990

Section 91— Summary proceedings by persons aggrieved by litter.

- (1) A ... court may act under this section on a complaint made by any person on the ground that he is aggrieved by the defacement, by litter or refuse, of —
- (a) any relevant highway; ...
- (c) any relevant land of a principal litter authority; ...
- (2) A ... court may also act under this section on a complaint made by any person on the ground that he is aggrieved by the want of cleanliness of any relevant highway or any trunk road which is a special road.





Relevant provisions of the Environmental Protection Act 1990

Section 91— Summary proceedings by persons aggrieved by litter.

- (6) If the ... court is satisfied that the highway or land in question is defaced by litter or refuse or, in the case of a highway, is wanting in cleanliness, the court may, subject to subsection [(7)], make an order ("a litter abatement order") requiring the defendant to clear the litter or refuse away or, as the case may be, clean the highway within a time specified in the order.
- (7) The ... court shall not make a litter abatement order if the defendant proves that he has complied, as respects the highway or land in question, with his duty under section 89(1) and (2) above.





- The sheriff accepted that the Council:
 - had in place systems which ensure the regular inspection of the stretch of road;
 - acted upon any issues noted by their supervisors during those inspections; and
 - undertook litter-picking of sections of the land adjoining the road on a regular basis.
- In addition, the sheriff accepted that the Council reacts to reports from third parties of litter accumulation at particular locations along the road.





- It is legitimate for the Council to take into account various factors in allocating resources to address their duties under section 89(1) and 89(2) of the 1990 Act.
- The sheriff accepted that the Council:
 - was fully cognisant of its duties under section 89(1) and 89(2) of the 1990 Act;
 - had due regard to those duties in the allocation or resources;
 and
 - generally performed those duties to an acceptable standard.





- The sheriff was satisfied that the Council had proved it had complied with its duties under section 89(1) and 89(2) of the 1990 Act, so far as practicable, and therefore that any such issues affecting particular sites along this stretch of road are not the result of breach by the Council of those duties.
- For all of the above reasons, the sheriff was satisfied that it was not appropriate to make a litter abatement order against the Council.





George McCallum Niblock v Aberdeenshire Council Further suggestions

- If there were any issues with the presence of animal carcasses on the carriageway of this road, the Council should liaise with BEAR Scotland as a matter of urgency so that appropriate arrangements could be made by the relevant agency for their safe removal.
- If the Council perceived there to be a problem with the lack of notice given to them by BEAR Scotland of planned road works, it should pursue a dialogue with BEAR Scotland with a view to ensuring that BEAR Scotland are made fully aware of their concerns and that any issues are addressed by both agencies in so far as possible.





GEORGE McCALLUM NIBLOCK AS CONVENOR OF ABERDEENSHIRE ENVIRONMENTAL FORUM AGAINST ABERDEENSHIRE COUNCIL

Sheriff Court Judgments published 15 February 2019

Judgment – [2019] SC ABE 10 (Date of Judgment 31 October 2018):

http://www.scotcourts.gov.uk/docs/default-source/cos-general-docs/pdf-docs-for-opinions/2019scabe10.pdf?sfvrsn=0

Note – [2019] SC ABE 11 (Date of Judgment 19 December 2018):

http://www.scotcourts.gov.uk/docs/default-source/cos-general-docs/pdf-docs-for-opinions/2019scabe11.pdf?sfvrsn=0





Discussion







Thank you

Andrew Sheridan, Team Manager – Collections and Cleansing, Waste Services Martin Ingram, Senior Solicitor Legal and Governance

andrew.sheridan@aberdeenshire.gov.uk martin.ingram@aberdeenshire.gov.uk