

# Agenda

## *Review of Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse Steering Group – Meeting 2*

---

**Date: Monday 7<sup>th</sup> of September 2015**

**Time: 11:00-14:00**

**Location: Zero Waste Scotland, Moray House, Forthside Way, Stirling, FK8 1QZ**

### **Objectives:**

- To provide a forum for discussion of requirements for the review;
- Suggest and evaluate proposals for a new Code of Practice, on which the Scottish Government will consult, which reflects a shift in focus to prevention;
- Review early versions of the document, checking for both clarity and to offer an operational perspective; and
- Shape a draft version of the revised Code of Practice, to be approved by the Scottish Government ahead consultation with the full range of stakeholders.

### **Agenda Points**

| <b>Item No.</b> | <b>Item</b>   |
|-----------------|---|
| <b>1.</b>       | Welcome and Introductions   |
| <b>2.</b>       | Key Areas for Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Zones</li><li>• Prevention</li></ul>         |
| <b>Lunch</b>    |   |
| <b>3.</b>       | Key Areas for Review (Time Permitting) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Grades/standards</li></ul> |
| <b>4.</b>       | Summary of discussions and agreement of actions   |
| <b>5.</b>       | Date of Next Meeting and AOB  |

### **Attendees**

| <b>Name</b> | <b>Organisation</b>                        | <b>Initials</b> |
|-------------|--|-----------------|
| REDACTED    | Scottish Government                        | REDACTED        |
| REDACTED    | Zero Waste Scotland                        | REDACTED        |
| REDACTED    | Transport Scotland                         | REDACTED        |
| REDACTED    | Zero Waste Scotland (Secretariat)          | REDACTED        |
| REDACTED    | Scottish Canals                            | REDACTED        |
| REDACTED    | Chartered Institution of Wastes Management | REDACTED        |
| REDACTED    | Zero Waste Scotland (Chair)                | REDACTED        |
| REDACTED    | Christie Commission                        | REDACTED        |
| REDACTED    | Network Rail                               | REDACTED        |

|          |                         |          |
|----------|-------------------------|----------|
| REDACTED | APSE                    | REDACTED |
| REDACTED | APSE                    | REDACTED |
| REDACTED | Keep Scotland Beautiful | REDACTED |
| REDACTED | Zero Waste Scotland     | REDACTED |

## Apologies

REDACTED, COSLA;

|   | Key actions, agreements and decisions  | Who      | When           |
|---|--|----------|----------------|
| 1 | <p><b>Welcome and Introductions</b></p> <p><b>Previous Minutes</b><br/>Actions:<br/><b>REDACTED</b> to check with Scottish Government on actual definition of land covered by water. <b>Complete</b><br/><b>REDACTED</b> to circulate examples of grades, zones and response times for review ahead of next meeting. <b>Complete</b></p> <p>Previous minutes accepted as accurate.</p> <p>ALL agreed that <b>FL</b> can begin drafting agreed sections:<br/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>defining the duties</li> <li>Bodies to which the code applies</li> <li>Defining relevant land</li> <li>Classifying items within scope</li> </ul> </p>  | REDACTED | By end October |
| 2 | <p><b>Key Areas for Review:</b></p> <p><b>Zones</b><br/><b>REDACTED</b> provided an overview of the zoning briefing document noting the proposed method was based on previous feedback.<br/>Three questions for the group to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Does it makes sense to use data zones to identify priority areas?</b></li> <li><b>What do you use if you don't use data zones?</b></li> <li><b>How would you prioritise zones?</b></li> </ol> <p><b>Does it make sense to use data zones to identify priority areas?</b><br/><b>REDACTED</b> summarised the approach and the pros and cons to this methodology.<br/>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Links to monitoring activity</li> <li>Pre-defined areas reduce subjectivity</li> <li>Standardised and replicable data zones</li> </ul> |          |                |

| Key actions, agreements and decisions  | Who | When |
|--|-----|------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would match other data sets and can therefore be overlaid.</li> <li>• The number of datasets in Scotland would also remain at a manageable level (several hundred per Local Authority)</li> </ul> <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data zones are large and can cover a range of land types. This can be overcome by marking hotspots (single locations/streets etc) to designate zones as a local priority. This would mean the zone has a maximum time until it should be restored to an acceptable level, but the authority could prioritise cleansing in those areas to achieve a better response time.</li> </ul> <p>It is a priority that data can be accessed and used centrally for comparison and to measure progress, therefore standardisation is essential.</p> <p>General agreement that better data would be beneficial and that current benchmarking between areas is difficult.</p> <p>REDACTED/REDACTED raised points based on the briefing document issued prior to the meeting:</p> <p>Data is already collected for areas using current zoning categories in the Code of Practice (CoP). Current zones have been very effective in several councils (Stirling and Edinburgh) where the work has been done by experienced people with extensive local knowledge. Why is the new approach needed and what does it do differently?</p> <p>REDACTED suggested it would allow more robust evaluation of interventions within and between areas. There is currently a huge amount of local knowledge in authorities but limited transfer of this knowledge. An improved zoning method would allow better understanding of local issues, optimise allocation of resources and assist planning for targeted interventions. It would also provide a long-term, large-scale understanding of litter trends. Priority cleansing areas could still be identified based on local knowledge by assigning hotspots.</p> <p>REDACTED highlighted that current zones are based on individual assessment as monitoring is conducted and do not differentiate between areas which would currently be zoned the same but are markedly different in reality e.g. small town centres vs large city centres despite varying footfall, litter generated, litter generators etc. A standardised system provides a strengthened position for authorities e.g. if going to court as you are then comparing like-for-like.</p> <p>Concerns were raised over the ease of authorities applying zones based on footfall. Where would they</p> |     |      |

| Key actions, agreements and decisions   | Who | When |
|---|-----|------|
| <p>source that information and what level of sampling would be required?</p> <p>It was suggested that this be achieved through guidance for authorities including descriptions and examples of land use types and likely footfall numbers. The authority could then take a sample of like areas to ensure the actual footfall is in line with the prescribed limits for each zone. Concern raised that this would still be assumption based across potentially hundreds of areas.</p> <p>It was felt that current zone descriptions based on land use are easier for members of the public to understand. EL highlighted that the proposed method is based on requests for simplification and therefore uses footfall to standardise across areas. For comparison the English/Welsh systems use four categories: High, Medium, Low and Special.</p> <p><b>Should categories be defined by footfall and litter generated?</b></p> <p>No consensus. Some members felt this was the preferred method to ensure standardisation whilst others thought it unnecessary as the current method provides is suitable and it would be difficult for authorities to categorise by footfall correctly or effectively.</p> <p>REDACTED stated Scottish Canals were comfortable with the current zones which gave them clear guidance on cleansing times. Question raised on applying the proposed method to areas of the canal with different footfall and therefore cleansing requirements e.g. standard canal path vs large visitor attractions.</p> <p>REDACTED suggested 'line' land uses such as canals and railways could be treated differently or could be overcome through use of hotspots.</p> <p>REDACTED stated that current zoning takes account of access and health and safety for response times e.g. access to motorway verges.</p> <p><b>What could be used instead of proposed data zones?</b></p> <p>REDACTED stated the current zoning method is based on the use of the area and therefore likelihood to be littered e.g. footfall. ~10 Councils have fully zoned their area in accordance with current method. It was suggested this method is fit for purpose but the remaining authorities require a push to complete the task. Data zones will potentially require existing easily-categorised zones e.g. roads, to be split into a more complex mix of zones.</p> <p>REDACTED supported this view and felt there should be sufficient existing data available to allow analysis from local LEAMS scores. This should be combined with GPS data to provide the information needed.</p> |     |      |

| Key actions, agreements and decisions   | Who | When |
|---|-----|------|
| <p>REDACTED highlighted that this would not necessarily meet a requirement to assess the impact of an intervention within a defined area.</p> <p>REDACTED suggested Scottish Government would look to aid duty bodies/statutory undertakers with implementing the revised Code of Practice. The group agreed that the initial zoning would likely be resource intensive but ongoing update for new builds and change of land use should be manageable with review suggested every 5 years.</p> <p>REDACTED suggested the Community Empowerment Bill could allow greater ownership and involvement of local residents e.g. through Community Councils. There was some discussion of the potential gaps in coverage and the political nature of some councils. ALL felt it was important to involve local communities if possible e.g. in assigning hotspots and holding local authorities to account on cleansing times.</p> <p>Zoning scenarios based on discussions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Maintain the current system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Duty bodies/statutory undertakers define the zone size/boundary as they wish</li> <li>○ Zone category is applied using the descriptions identified in the current CoPLAR/similar – see <a href="#">attachment 1</a></li> <li>○ no central record of zoning kept currently, however propose central mapping of zones as part of review</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Maintain current system but with new category definitions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Duty bodies/statutory undertakers define the zone size/boundary as they wish</li> <li>○ Zone category is applied using defined criteria to allow greater comparability e.g. ZWS proposals on litter generators and footfall or other relevant criteria – See <a href="#">attachment 2</a></li> <li>○ propose central mapping of zones as part of review</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Centrally defined set of standardised zone areas/boundaries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Duty bodies/statutory undertakers define the zone using predefined boundaries e.g. data zones or Xm2</li> <li>○ Zone category is applied using defined criteria to allow greater comparability (e.g. ZWS proposals on litter generators and footfall or other relevant criteria) and</li> </ul> </li> </ol> |     |      |

| Key actions, agreements and decisions   | Who                        | When   |
|---|----------------------------|--|
| <p>priority hotspots identified within the zone where required for operational requirements – <a href="#">See attachment 2</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Recorded centrally using mapping software, predefined zones and defined criteria could allow direct comparison of areas of similar criteria and national analysis</li> </ul> <p>4. Centrally defined set of standardised zone areas/boundaries with current category definitions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Duty bodies/statutory undertakers define the zone using predefined boundaries e.g. data zones or Xm2</li> <li>○ Zone category is applied using the descriptions identified in the current CoPLAR/similar – <a href="#">see attachment 1</a></li> <li>○ Recorded centrally using mapping software this could allow the facilitation of comparison, analysis, and dissemination.</li> </ul> <p>It was suggested that the zoning data for Stirling and Edinburgh City Councils is sampled to determine the systems they use, how effective this is, whether it would meet the requirements set out above and whether it can be normalised for further analysis. This would also allow the impact of a new zoning method to be assessed. REDACTED stated that KSB have a considerable amount of data which could also be shared for this purpose.</p> <p><b>REDACTED</b> to map the zoning scenarios against the proposed outcomes of the CoP review. These will be circulated to group members for feedback and scoring against the criteria.</p> <p><b>ALL</b> to forward details of alternative zoning methods and criteria which should be considered to REDACTED as soon as possible.</p> <p><b>Prevention</b></p> <p>REDACTED reiterated agreement from previous meeting that the following areas would be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure</li> <li>• Enforcement</li> <li>• Communications</li> <li>• Engagement</li> <li>• Partnership Working</li> <li>• Improved Monitoring</li> </ul> | <p>REDACTED</p> <p>ALL</p> | <p>25<sup>th</sup> September</p> <p>21st September</p> |

|   | <b>Key actions, agreements and decisions</b>   | <b>Who</b> | <b>When</b> |
|---|--|------------|-------------|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service Optimisation</li> </ul> <p>It is intended to have a series of best practice case studies available.</p> <p>REDACTED suggested demand management should be included within these e.g. activities or initiatives which reduce the demand for street cleansing such as education and enforcement. Terminology already widely used by authorities.</p> <p>REDACTED asked how zoning relates to prevention.</p> <p>REDACTED stated that the duty was to keep area clear of refuse regardless of activity and budget assigned to prevention. Response times are still required, but it is hoped prevention activity can provide greater flexibility in how resources are used.</p> <p>Application of prevention weighting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Previous concern of shifting resources and difficulty of matching budget headings. REDACTED showed an example budget table and stated that examples of headings and activities would appear in the best practice guidance.</li> <li>• REDACTED stated that he would like to see the relationship between spend on prevention and total resource for litter and flytipping within the authority.</li> <li>• It was highlighted that some organisations may make the argument that all litter cleansing is a preventative measure in itself, and questions on how to classify some educational activities such as school/voluntary litter picking.</li> <li>• It was agreed that the CoP should clearly state that cleansing is not classed as a preventative measure.</li> <li>• Draft text to be written up and shared with group.</li> </ul> |            |             |
| 3 | <p><b>Key Areas for Review (Time Permitting):</b></p> <p><b>Grades</b></p> <p>Very brief discussion of potential grading system due to lack of time.</p> <p>REDACTED felt 7 grades would be too many as the public don't understand the 4 grades already in use. Also suggested the environmental impact of litter types should be taken into consideration e.g. cigarette butts have high environmental impact but little impact on grades.</p> <p>REDACTED highlighted evidence suggesting there should be greater gaps between grades to make them more transparent and easily understood. The acceptable/unacceptable grading used elsewhere was not</p>   |            |             |

|   | Key actions, agreements and decisions  | Who   | When   |
|---|--|---|--|
|   | <p>suitable for the CoP as cleansing response would apply for all unacceptable areas regardless of land use and footfall.</p> <p><b>REDACTED</b> to share drafted grading table for ALL to consider how clearer distinction can be achieved without excessive numbers of grades.</p> <p><b>ALL</b> to forward other criteria that should be considered for grading and the evidence base to support its inclusion.</p>   | <p>REDACTED</p> <p>ALL</p>  | <p>16th September</p> <p>21<sup>st</sup> September</p>   |
| 4 | <p><b>Summary of Discussions and Agreement of Actions</b></p> <p><b>REDACTED</b> to draft agreed sections for final document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>defining the duties –including text for fulfilling 2<sup>nd</sup> duty</li> <li>Bodies to which the code applies</li> <li>Defining relevant land</li> <li>Classifying items within scope</li> <li>Prevention</li> </ul> <p><b>REDACTED</b> to map the options for zoning discussed against the proposed outcomes of the CoP review and circulate for feedback.</p> <p><b>ALL</b> to forward details of alternative zoning methods and criteria which should be considered to EL as soon as possible.</p> <p><b>REDACTED</b> to share drafted grading table for ALL to consider (see attachment 3).</p> <p><b>ALL</b> to forward other criteria that should be considered for grading and the evidence base to support it's inclusion.</p> <p><b>REDACTED</b> to circulate potential dates for next meeting.</p> | <p>REDACTED</p> <p>REDACTED</p> <p>ALL</p> <p>REDACTED</p> <p>ALL</p> <p>REDACTED</p> | <p>31<sup>st</sup> Oct</p> <p>25th Sept</p> <p>21st Sept</p> <p>16th Sept</p> <p>21st September</p> <p>By 11<sup>th</sup> Sept</p> |
| 5 | <p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p><b>REDACTED</b> to circulate potential dates.</p> <p>AOB</p> <p>No items raised</p>   | <p>REDACTED</p>   | <p>By 11<sup>th</sup> Sept</p>   |

## Next meeting date:

TBC