

PRIME MINISTERLITTER

You have an hour set aside on Monday afternoon to review progress. Ideas have developed quite a way since Mr. Ridley's original paper of 28 February to you.

It is a somewhat scrappy subject, and I suggest you follow the very good handling brief (Flag A) which Richard Wilson has provided. I have attached the other papers in the order he suggests in the handling brief:

Flag B

Mr. Ridley's 7 April minute expanding on his ideas for a new duty on local authorities to keep public land clean, and provision for fixed penalties for littering.

Flag C

A note from John Mills of the Policy Unit supporting Mr. Ridley's proposals and with some interesting ideas on how the private sector might be more closely involved. You will see he is sceptical of the Tidy Britain Group's abilities to deliver, and I think you will want to press Mr. Ridley and the Home Secretary on that. John Mills' note also contains some graphic photos of the litter left in yesterday's press enclosure opposite No.10 to show the scale of the task ahead.

Flag D

A note from the Home Secretary which opposes fixed penalty schemes. There is at first sight an inconsistency in his support for Westminster's "strategic approach" while ignoring the element within their overall approach which has ensured that even the less willing members of the public have cooperated in it. You might also ask whether it will give local authorities valid ground for arguing against Mr. Ridley's ideas if they are deprived of any new means of enforcement to help them meet their own duty.

Flag E

A note from Mr. Channon which you have already seen about the action on clearing litter from motorways.

Flags F and G

The exchange between Mr. Channon and Mr. Ridley on the relationship between central and local government on highway cleansing and changing the arrangements between the Department of Transport and local authorities. If the principle of moving away from agency agreements is agreed, you will want to check what the legislative implications are.

For completeness sake, I attach at Flag H Mr. Fowler's minute to you of last February with his proposal for a charitable company to give jobs to the young unemployed clearing litter; and at Flag I Mr. Ridley's original minute which prompted you to hold this meeting.



DM

7 April, 1989.



7 April 1989

LITTER

At Scarborough you declared war on litter in the name of the Government, local authorities and (above all) the active citizen, and you said our laws were not equal to the task. This commitment now has to be translated into action, covering both prevention and cure. The time is ripe for this since the media have given much prominence to your campaign and you have clearly struck a popular chord on an issue which affects people's daily lives. Nicholas Ridley's proposed legislation package, set out in his minute of 7 April, is an excellent response which should prove very popular.

PREVENTION

Educating people not to drop litter is an uphill struggle, but raising the profile in the way you have done is clearly having an effect, as the cutting below from Thursday's Daily Mail shows:



This maximum fine under the Litter Act 1983 is £400, but the average in recent years for the relatively small number of prosecutions has only been about £30. Sustained publicity should however have an impact over time on magistrates' decisions.



What needs to be done is to make people conscious that littering is a crime. It can be done: witness the changed attitude over the last decade or so to the seriousness of drunken driving.

But an example of the scale of the problem can unfortunately be seen very close to home. After your photocall with Mr Gorbachev on Thursday lunchtime outside No. 10 the press enclosure was strewn with litter: see the attached photos taken 10 minutes after you left.

A question to ask Nicholas Ridley is how confident he is of the Tidy Britain's Group's ability to make a sustained impact on the problem, with initiatives which can be followed through effectively after all the initial publicity. Confidence in this is crucial if the Group is to be successful in getting adequate commercial sponsorship to replace its dependence on public funds (£3 million this year).

Mcdonalds, for example, has privately expressed some doubt about the Group's effectiveness, and will continue with its own efforts (it is planning a major anti-litter poster campaign this year as a manifestation of its commitment to the issue).

We must be careful not to put all the eggs in the Tidy Britain Group's basket, but to ensure that business is actively encouraged to address the issue direct. Mcdonalds commitment to educating its young customers about litter, and to taking practical steps like putting out plenty of bins, is a welcome manifestation of this, which we need to persuade other major companies to emulate. The business community is keen to help: a high profile company such as Coca-Cola has made this very clear.



Hector Laing's Per Cent Club would be a good means of getting big business on board, especially major retailers. We should also get on board Rotary and local Chambers of Commerce, organisations anxious to demonstrate practical commitment to the local environment.

#### CURE

Nicholas Ridley's proposal for a new duty of care on local authorities backed up by a code of practice is a first-rate idea. It would force local authorities to make public commitments about meeting their obligations to clear up litter, and make actionable their failure to meet those objectives. And enabling powers to introduce fixed penalty schemes, as in Westminster, will give to local authorities the right back-up to fulfil their obligations.

A duty of care would also tie in with wider initiatives - for example the customer care duties imposed on the privatised utilities and the whole thrust of making local authorities more accountable to their voters. People should know clearly when their streets are to be swept and how often local authorities oblige their contractors to do it just like they (usually) know when their bins are meant to be emptied. The information should be published by authorities.

It would mean that ordinary people could monitor the performance of the local authority. Power to the elbow of community charge payers! And the same model could well be carried over into other areas such as road and council house repairs, thus entrenching people's right to high and transparent levels of service and allowing them to enforce it for themselves, via the law and the ballot box.



We agree with Nicholas Ridley that this would be a more effective legislative response than, for example, forcing shopkeepers to clear their frontages. That kind of compulsion could be unpopular given the problem of wind-blown litter and could conflict with local authorities existing duties to sweep streets. More to the point, all sensible shopkeepers keep frontages clean anyway because it is good for business.

#### MAKING USE OF DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT SCHEMES

This is a potentially valuable clearing litter especially at major blackspots. Norman Fowler proposed a year ago that a company along the lines of Community Industry could be set up to provide short-term jobs for unemployed people in collecting litter. You welcomed this. There has not been any further publicity about this and Norman Fowler should be invited to comment on the progress he has made. There must be good opportunity here to give unemployed youngsters some basic work experience and to achieve results.

#### GOVERNMENT COORDINATION

Virginia Bottomley's coordinating role is proving beneficial. She is enlisting the help of colleagues to ensure that the momentum now in train is effectively galvanised. One question to ask her is what scope there is for further harnessing the goodwill of the Guides and Scouts, and organisations such as the Duke of Edinburgh's Award Scheme, which already do much to get the message across to young people. This is an important complement to initiatives led by local business.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- Endorse Nicholas Ridley's duty of care/code of practice proposal as the best legislative option and commission detailed work. Ahead of this local authorities should be urged to publish their street cleaning schedules so that people know exactly what service is provided and can judge whether it is enough.
- Invite Norman Fowler to accelerate work on his proposal to give the unemployed short-term work experience through litter clearance.
- Commission detailed proposals on harnessing the goodwill of business and local organisations as part of your "war" against litter: for example, Rotary and Chambers of Commerce.
- Confirm the importance of Virginia Bottomley's coordinating role to keep the pressure on all Departments.

John Mills

JOHN MILLS

























PRIME MINISTER

## LITTER

You will wish to know how I am developing the ideas I espoused at Scarborough for dealing with litter. These proposals represent firm action by the Government to complement the litter initiatives being undertaken by the Tidy Britain Group and others and entail enhancing the duties of local authorities to deal with litter.

### Current Duties on Local Authorities

The main duties currently applicable to local authorities to keep their areas clean are limited to Section 22(2) of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 which requires district level councils to keep roads (including footpaths) in their areas clean, and to Section 5 of the Litter Act 1983 which requires litter authorities to empty and clean any litter bins they provide in their area. The duty on county councils imposed by Section 4 of the Litter Act to draw up litter plans has not been implemented. The Refuse Disposal (Amenity) Act 1978 gives local authorities a duty to deal with abandoned cars and powers to deal with abandoned articles. Part III of the Public Health Act 1936 requires local authorities to serve abatement notices where they consider accumulations or deposits of material to be prejudicial to health or a nuisance.

### Proposed Additional Duties

Most district councils in urban areas undertake street cleaning of some sort but many fail to achieve satisfactory standards.

Contracting out of cleansing services under the competition regime of the Local Government Act 1988 is a step in the right direction since local authorities will then be able to terminate contracts of poor performers. But we still need to address the question of standards.





I am assured by Professor Graham Ashworth of the Tidy Britain Group that the Group will be able to prepare, as a result of the pilot projects he is undertaking, standards for cleanliness which can be set out in codes of practice, for roads, commercial premises, public open spaces etc. I believe this important progress provides an opportunity for effective legislation. I propose to provide in the Autumn Green Bill:

- a. a duty on district councils to keep public land and other land in their ownership to which the public have access (in addition to roads) in their areas clean;
- b. a duty on local authorities to have regard to any code of practice I might issue and undertake their responsibility at (a); and
- c. a power enabling me to prepare, issue and revise as necessary codes of practice for these purposes (including roads).

I intend that the citizen will be able to take the local authority to court for breach of the duty at (a) and that failure to observe the terms of any code would be admissible as evidence of the breach of duty. Courts would be empowered to require discharge of the duty.

### Dogs

My proposals would also attack the problem of dog faeces. More local authorities are adopting Home Office byelaws applying to dog owners on the prevention of or removal of fouling by dogs. I see my proposal as complementary to these byelaws, in that the code of cleanliness should include the removal of faeces.





### Other Areas

I have looked at the problem of private land normally associated with commercial premises to which the public are permitted to have access which can be just as polluted with litter as other areas. I have in mind such spaces as supermarket forecourts, sports grounds and car parks. I am confident that the majority of owners of these premises would not object to the imposition of a duty on them to keep their areas clean nor to the drawing up of a code of practice providing that it was applied equitably. On the other hand, we are now talking about privately owned land. Nonetheless, I think we should provide similar powers in the Green Bill for such premises. Such provision might well encourage agreements between local authorities and land owners for the cleaning of such land by the local authority as provided for in Section 22(3) of the Control of Pollution Act 1974.

I have also considered private land to which the public are not generally permitted to have access, such as railway sidings and embankments which can be particular eyesores. This general category also includes private houses and I believe it is a difficult area to deal with in legislative and political terms in view of the implication of an invasion of privacy. I do not believe we should explore this avenue further.

However, our other initiatives may still have the desired effect in this difficult area. I will be exhorting the Government estate to adopt cleanliness standards as if they were private land to which the public had access and would expect the private landowners to follow suit as the climate against litter pollution increased. This exhortation would form part of the Government's Campaign activity.





### Fixed Penalties for Littering

I believe it will be necessary to complement the additional duties I will place on local authorities by providing powers to enable them to further secure public co-operation to help them maintain standards. I propose in the Green Bill to provide enabling powers for local authorities to introduce fixed penalty schemes, similar to that already being operated by Westminster City Council, for littering.

### Frontage Responsibility

I have looked closely at the additional benefit of imposing a responsibility on commercial premises to keep the pavements outside their premises clean. It is already a duty of district councils to keep these areas clean (as part of the highway) and I am going to enhance that duty; it is an offence under the Litter Act to litter such areas and I will be introducing fixed penalties to make enforcement easier; and previous experience suggests that a duty in respect of frontages would require the creation of a criminal offence to make it bite, but which would be quite impossible to enforce. I have therefore concluded that we should rely first on voluntary efforts by commercial premises - to keep the environs of their premises clean. Simon Burn's Bill, which we had proposed to support in principle, proposes fixed penalties and frontage responsibility. I propose to write separately to H Committee to indicate my conclusions.

### Litter Plans

Section 4 of the Litter Act requires county councils to draw up litter plans in consultation with interested bodies including district councils. The section has not yet been implemented. The preliminary results of the TBG's project on voluntary production of litter plans by local authorities suggests that such plans would not





be helpful since action on litter is at district level, and the drawing up of plans at county level would divert resources from the job of getting rid of litter. I propose therefore to pursue this no further.

### Conclusion

This represents my legislative package as part of the wider litter initiative. Early agreement of the above proposals will however, enable me to put in hand the instructions to lawyers in readiness for the Autumn Green Bill.

Virginia Bottomley will be meeting junior Ministers from other Government Departments on 10 April to discuss what contributions they can make to the initiative.

I am copying this letter to Douglas Hurd, Paul Channon, Norman Fowler and to Sir Robin Butler.

CE S Bush

ppNR

7 April 1989

(Approved by the Secretary of State and signed in his absence)



1 March 1989

LITTER ON MOTORWAYS AND TRUNK ROADS

The Department of Transport's response is not very forthcoming, and does not properly address the central issue the Prime Minister raised: the need to explore actively the scope for contracting out to the private sector.

There is clearly much scope for this. Although the immediate issue is litter, it begs the question of private sector involvement in all aspects of routine maintenance (eg pothole repairs, lane markings, grass cutting, gully emptying) of motorways and major trunk roads for which the Department is responsible. It currently spends £80 million per annum on this. Litter and debris clearance accounts for about £4 million (equally divided between motorways and trunk roads).

Almost all this money is paid to local authorities. The exception is the former metropolitan counties, like South Yorkshire, where on abolition routine maintenance work was handed over to consulting engineers as "managing agents", on a contractual basis. Thus there is a private sector model on which to build.

Routine maintenance by local authorities is not done under contract but under "agency agreements" with the Secretary of State. I am surprised to discover that a contractual relationship between the two is expressly not permitted under the Local Government Goods and Services Act 1970. The Department thus supplements agency agreements with a Code of Practice on routine maintenance. This sets out basic maintenance standards but these are open to variation according to local conditions. A copy is attached of the relevant section on litter.



The litter issue is complicated because the Department's interest is a road safety one not a public amenity one. Hence the COP requires sweeping of urban trunk roads normally only twice a year though in London, for example, it is done more often. This is to prevent build-up of muck which could, for example, block drains: it is not a standard for clearing-up ordinary litter. That remains the local authority's job in the normal way. The Department only pays what is necessary to meet road safety requirements. Clearing litter from the pavements of the North Circular Road, for example, remains a local authority function as with any other urban road. Only for motorways does the Department pay for all litter clearance.

The litter problem as far as the Department's roads are concerned is essentially an urban one, and concentrated on "all-purpose" trunk roads like the North Circular. There is generally a lesser problem (though plenty of blackspots) on motorways and rural trunk roads. Furthermore as far as the Department is concerned it is almost entirely a London problem: there are few urban trunk roads under its control in other areas.

The scope for inefficiency in these arrangements is manifest. This applies to all routine maintenance and not just litter. The absence of competition in the Department's arrangements also sits ill with last year's legislation on competitive tendering by local authorities. Starting this year, authorities will progressively have to put out work done under agency agreements to competitive tender. The Department is right that this will improve the situation on the ground, but it leaves unchanged the Department/authority relationship. This needs to be exposed too to private sector competition. Anything else would be anomalous given that local authorities themselves will be obliged to put their own road maintenance work out to competitive tender.



It is not a question of dropping local authorities altogether. As highway authorities in their own right they are well-placed to deal with routine maintenance. But there are well-equipped private sector firms in this area too. What is clearly needed is a situation where local authorities compete for the Department's business on an equal footing with the private sector, and perform the work they win in open competition on a fully contractual basis, in order to ensure value for money.

### Conclusion

Compulsory competitive tendering by local authorities will, over time, improve the litter problem on major urban roads, provided authorities lay down strict standards in their contracts and enforce them with cost penalties as need be. The Department needs the same disciplines to ensure high standards of litter clearance on motorways. The one-off initiatives described in the Department's letter are to be welcomed, but they do not go to the heart of the problem.

The litter issue has moreover highlighted the wider question of injecting competition into the provision of all routine road maintenance and it is on this, and not just litter, that the Department needs to be pressed.

  
JOHN MILLS



## 20. SWEEPING AND CLEANSING

20.1 The requirements of this section relate to the sweeping and cleansing of all channels and motorway hard shoulders, cleaning and removal of debris from traffic lanes, hard shoulders, verges and central reservations, removal of litter, and footway and cycle track sweeping. Carriageway sweeping should normally be carried out by mechanical means.

### 20.2 Requirements for Detailed Inspections

20.2.1 No detailed inspections shall be carried out and reliance shall be placed on the regular Safety Inspections (see Section 2.4) to decide when any special action needs to be taken.

### 20.3 Requirements for Maintenance

20.3.1 Unkerbed rural all-purpose trunk roads shall not be swept unless it is agreed with the Director (Transport) that there are special circumstances giving rise to hazardous conditions or which are detrimental to the maintenance of the highway, eg. detritus from agricultural accesses and gravel workings etc, which require a local variation under paragraph 1.6.

20.3.2 Kerbed rural all-purpose trunk roads shall not be swept more than once per year unless it is agreed with the Director (Transport) that there are special circumstances (see para 20.3.1) and a greater frequency is necessary as a local variation under paragraph 1.6.

20.3.3 Urban kerbed all-purpose trunk roads shall not be swept more than twice per year unless it is agreed with the Director (Transport) that there are special circumstances and a greater frequency is necessary as a local variation under paragraph 1.6. The notional cost of this requirement shall form the Department's contribution to the District Council for highway sweeping and cleansing needs where these functions are carried out by the District Council.

20.3.4 Where the growth of grass and other vegetation between the channel and kerb is likely to obstruct the flow of water or cause structural deterioration an application of total herbicide shall be made at intervals of 12 months. The application shall normally be incorporated with a sweeping operation and timed to give maximum effect.



shall be protected as far as is possible. As a normal minimum, the aim should be to display notices warning of the hazardous conditions before reporting to the base office at the earliest opportunity with a request for immediate action. Such action shall be completed within the shortest possible time of the notification to the base office.

20.3.13 All action taken in accordance with paragraph 20.3.12 shall be promptly recorded and details retained for 6 years.





ceB'nf

SPu

PRIME MINISTER

Nicholas Ridley copied to me his minute of 28 February about plans for continuing action to tackle the litter problem. Paul Channon will be interested in the road safety and maintenance issues which arise from litter on major roads. I have to examine the effect which greater enforcement of the litter law might have on the resources of the police and the time of the courts. But I agree that this is a national nuisance which has been getting rapidly worse to the point of disgrace.

About 1,900 people are proceeded against in the magistrates' courts each year for litter offences. This is fairly small - about 0.1% of total magistrates' courts prosecutions. We have been encouraging the police to make sensible choices about manpower, giving priority to terrorism, violence, serious property offences, drug trafficking and so on. There is now increasing insistence from our more knowledgeable supporters that we should intensify our pressure on the police to concentrate their effort against crime and I must not relax that pressure. Litter is not of the same order, even though the public are rightly concerned for this aspect of their local environment. We should look, therefore, for other means to gain effective enforcement at no extra burden to the criminal justice system. The Westminster scheme provides us with some clues.

The one-year experimental fixed penalty scheme for litter offences in Westminster is about to finish, and the results so far indicate that it has been a success: only four fixed penalty tickets were issued during the first nine months of the experiment, from 590 people being asked to pick up their litter. The scheme has involved a publicity campaign and the provision of a great number of litter bins, with 81 council officers authorised to enforce the scheme in the course of their normal duties. The effect on the police and the courts' workload has been nil. My fears in that respect have not been substantiated. Therefore, and subject to



analysis of the full year's results, we would expect not to be supporting the adoption by other local authorities of a fixed penalty scheme (which appears unnecessary), but suggesting that they adopt a strategic enforcement role like Westminster's (which seems to be successful). I think, therefore, that it would be wise, as Nicholas suggests, to put legislative decisions on hold until the autumn.

This ties in well with Nicholas' suggestion of more local activity under the guidance of the Tidy Britain group, harnessing the enforcement capabilities of local authorities, the financial and staff resources of business, and the concern and enthusiasm of local communities. That is a powerful partnership which has proved its effectiveness in crime prevention. The CBI should be encouraged to recognise its role here, too, in encouraging businesses to put something back into their communities, and to gain valuable national and local credit as a result. While accepting that operational priorities are for Chief Constables to decide in the light of other demands, we know that the police are responsive to local concerns and can be relied upon to co-operate in those local schemes which seem to need their help. Neighbourhood Watch schemes and the crime prevention panel network may be resources upon which the police could draw. The DTI's Task Forces and City Action Teams, although environmental improvements are not at present one of their direct priorities, could be a further source of help.

We will be able to give strong support to Virginia Bottomley's campaign to encourage a litter consciousness in Departments and their sponsored bodies and industries. I am sure the brewers and licencees will wish to set an example, and we need to put more pressure on fast food outlets. We can ourselves set an example through tidy police and fire stations and the like.

I am copying this minute to Nicholas Ridley and Paul Channon.

Douglas Hurd

8 March 1989





Prime Minister

LITTER

1. I have seen Nicholas Ridley's minute to you of 16 March.
2. I fully support his proposal to place an obligation on local authorities to have regard to a code of practice in the exercise of their duties under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 and the Litter Act 1983. This would help considerably in tackling the litter problem on trunk roads and on local roads, where these duties do not fall to the highway authority.
3. But I wonder if this goes far enough. We could, at the same time, examine whether the present division of responsibilities for cleansing roads, between highway authorities and District Councils in the Control of Pollution Act, could be replaced with something more effective. Having responsibilities divided in this way between tiers of local authority makes it difficult to apply and achieve the standards we want.
4. The Audit Commission have recommended that the responsibility for all highway cleansing should rest with District Councils. That may be the answer. I propose that my and Nicholas Ridley's officials should examine this in parallel with the other work proposed. Clearer responsibilities and duties will help. The new Local Government Act provisions will mean that more of the cleansing work goes to competitive tender and the private sector. But we should also tackle incompetence and inefficiency in the management of the service. I am commissioning management consultants immediately to examine the operation of the trunk road agency arrangements for London (those are the arrangements under which the London Boroughs manage all the maintenance of my





Department's roads). If this shows that maintenance could be done more efficiently in other ways, for example by contracting out the management, I will not hesitate to take action.

5. I am sending copies of this minute to Douglas Hurd and to Nicholas Ridley.

PC

PAUL CHANNON

21 March 1989



ku  
(Am was seen).

ccps  
cc Political  
✓ office  
2ND R  
WPY

Prime Minister

# LITTER

We spoke last week about the possibility of placing an obligation on local authorities to have regard to a Code of Practice in exercising their functions with regard to litter. You said that you were keen to make some reference to this in your speech in Scarborough on Saturday.

At present no general guidance on litter exists. My officials have given further thought to the proposal that we publish a Code of Practice. Our initial view is that it would be possible to place an obligation on local authorities to have regard to such a Code in the exercise of their duties under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 and the Litter Act 1973. This would give aggrieved residents the ability to apply for judicial review if the local authority was failing in its duty.

Obviously further work is needed to draw up the details of the Code of Practice. The Tidy Britain Group are already doing some work for us on standards as part of their scheme of pilot projects and I propose to ask them to extend this to cover the feasibility of a Code of Practice. If the results of their work are satisfactory we can then prepare to legislate.

A draft passage for your Scarborough speech is attached. If you are content, I will be referring to the proposal in greater detail in my own speech earlier in the day.

Copies of this go to Douglas Hurd and Paul Channon.

N R

16 March 1989



DRAFT PASSAGE ON LITTER FOR PM'S SCARBOROUGH SPEECH

If we are serious in our efforts to clean up Britain then we cannot go on covering our country with litter. This is a task which everyone can help with. But it is for local authorities to keep their public areas clean. The Government is fully behind the work of the Tidy Britain Group. We have asked the Group to advise us on what could form the basis of a local authority Code of Practice for dealing with litter. We will look closely at putting a duty on local authorities to comply with such a Code which will give people the power to call their local authority to account. But litter is a challenge I want you all to take up. Local authorities would be overwhelmed if they tried to solve the problem on their own. They need the co-operation of active citizens.

PRIME MINISTER

LITTER

Last March you launched a programme of pilot projects by the Tidy Britain Group (TBG) to test various approaches to tackle the problem. 27 projects are under way, each attracting a wide range of support. I expect to draw firm conclusions from the exercise in June but it is not too soon to plan for the follow-up, with 1990 being designated Tidy Britain Year with a subsequent Clean Nineties Campaign. I have asked Virginia Bottomley to lead and co-ordinate our efforts.

I envisage working towards a major announcement in the autumn, possibly at the Party Conference, which would clearly signal our determination to deal with the question decisively. Although we are still awaiting the results of the pilot projects I have in mind a three pronged approach:-

(a) to extend successful pilot projects more widely. TBG would be expected to provide guidance and advice on how to get local action going, pressuring local authorities, involving Chambers of Trade etc;

(b) a commitment by colleagues in every Department to contribute towards Tidy Britain Year by clean-up initiatives within their own fields and those of bodies they sponsor. Cleaner schools, hospitals, highways are examples; there should be others. In particular we must get Trunk Road Agency agreements to insist on clearing litter on trunk roads;

(c) possible legislative changes. Areas that we are examining are:

(i) extension of the fixed penalty system currently being monitored in the City of Westminster;



Prime Minister

Do you wish to discuss with Mr Ridley at this stage

Yes no

Wait until he + Mr Bottomley have framed up their plan with other departments?

Don  
1/3





- (ii) placing a duty on local authorities in the whole area of local environmental quality - litter, dog and pest control, including possibly a requirement for compulsory tendering out;
  - (iii) continental practice; regulations requiring shop frontagers to be responsible for the cleanliness of their frontage and enforcement thereof;
- (d) in addition we are considering
- (i) the costs and value of making counties prepare litter plans which we have power to do under Section 4 of the Litter Act 1983.
  - (ii) the costs and consequences of strict enforcement of the existing Litter Act;
  - (iii) systems and technology of municipal waste collection, particularly from shops and restaurants, with the aim of giving clear advice on best practice to authorities.

Given the pressures on the Parliamentary timetable, it is not clear what room there will be in next Session's Green Bill for the legislative options that emerge; we shall be better able to assess this in the autumn.

A programme on these lines will be popular and can be expected to attract strong support from all sectors of society, including the media. It will give a strong impetus to an ongoing Clean Nineties campaign designed to change the way people see, and care for, their own immediate environment.

Virginia Bottomley is calling a meeting of colleagues in other Departments next month to outline these proposals and canvass ideas



on contributions to Tidy Britain Year. A co-ordinated, concerted effort is needed to make a lasting impact. We shall give this matter priority. I would be happy to discuss with you if you wish.

I am copying this to Douglas Hurd and to Paul Channon.

A handwritten signature, likely of the Secretary of State, is written in dark ink. It is a stylized, cursive signature that appears to start with a capital 'N' and ends with a long, sweeping flourish.

NR

28 February 1989



CCBL



Prime Minister

PRIME MINISTER

LITTERContent for 12 folders  
to pursue this?Yes - very  
pleased not

26/2

Nicholas Ridley sent me a copy of his minute of 17 February to you on this subject. I am sure that it is right that the litter problem should be one of our major objectives and that it needs to be tackled in a variety of ways, including stiffer penalties where necessary.

I agree that UK 2000 has been a disappointment and that it is right to switch the main emphasis elsewhere. However, I think we need to go further than this and find a way of directly involving unemployed people in clearing up litter. This would complement the proposals in Nicholas Ridley's minute.

The model I have in mind is Community Industry. This is a company which is a registered charity but financed largely by my Department. It has a contract with my Department to provide employment for up to 12 months for about 10,000 disadvantaged young people each year. The employees are paid wages which are related to age and not the rate for the job.

I envisage setting up a similar company, perhaps to operate under the aegis of the Tidy Britain Group or a similar organisation, which could be contracted to my Department to provide short term jobs for unemployed people. The employees would be paid a standard wage, would be of all ages and would be drawn from the long term unemployed. The prime candidates would be those who cannot find places in the training programme because employers are unwilling to take them on or who cannot find a job when they have finished their training course.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL



The company's employees would be engaged directly in litter clearance, for example, on streets and motorways. I would not want to exclude the possibility of the company entering into commercial contracts with local authorities and private organisations. However, I see dangers in using the company to clear up motorway service stations or sports grounds where the responsibility rests firmly with the operators or owners.

There is a lot of work to be done on this proposal but, if you agree, I would like to draw up plans on the lines I have described.

I am sending a copy of this minute to Douglas Hurd, Peter Walker, Nicholas Ridley, David Young, Kenneth Baker, Kenneth Clarke, Malcolm Rifkind, Paul Channon, John Major and Sir Robin Butler.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a large, stylized 'N' followed by a smaller 'F' and a long horizontal stroke.

N.F.

25 February 1988

CONFIDENTIAL





*Prime Minister*

*CCBG*

PRIME MINISTER

LITTER

*Do you want to launch  
this initiative personally. It will mean  
speaking at a press conference for in-cities?*

In December, I reported that I was considering a revised approach to the litter problem, which would motivate, and enlist the support of, the community at large and business interests in particular.

*210  
187  
2*

The weakness of earlier initiatives has been that they have been too diffuse. Thus, while we have backed the Tidy Britain Group (formerly Keep Britain Tidy Group), the involvement of UK 2000 under Richard Branson has confused the public in general and potential supporters and contributors in particular. As indicated in my earlier report, I intend to focus our efforts via Tidy Britain Group (TBG).

Professor Graham Ashworth, Director-General of TBG, has at my request prepared a list (attached) of 16 projects which are intended as pilots to be carried out in 1988/89. These are intended to test different approaches in a variety of locations, with "before" and "after" studies to determine effectiveness. Each project will be managed by TBG but the bulk of the input, in terms of finance, materials and labour, is intended to be provided by business sponsorship, volunteers and MSC. The direct Government contribution to the projects will be:

(a) finance for the TBG managerial input - about £530,000 (against a total cost of about £2.5m) which I can provide from existing resources.

(b) a high Ministerial profile to encourage support and contributions.

I intend to review progress at the end of this year. Successful projects will be used as models for an expanded series in 1989/90 and I will be discussing this with John Major in due course in the PESC round. The review will then determine a longer-term strategy





for the nineties. The objective then is that the clean-up process should become self-generating, as the public is encouraged to bring pressure to bear both on those who create litter and on those whose task it is to clean it up. Direct Government support in the 1990s would be scaled down to providing a small annual grant towards TBG general operational costs (as hitherto) with however continued high-profile Ministerial support.

While the pilot projects, demonstrating what can be done, are important in themselves, it is equally important that they take place in the right context. The scene was set by your New Year message which I propose to follow up with a press conference to launch the new initiative. If you felt able to attend and speak in person, it would clearly have the strongest impact. The launch will be followed up with a series of luncheons to which I and my Departmental colleagues will invite Chairmen and Directors from both public and private corporations to enlist their backing - in providing support in cash or kind for the TBG projects while also acting themselves within their own areas of operation. Among those I have in mind to approach are British Rail, Motorway Service Area operators and the major grocery and fast-food chains.

Although the focus of the new initiative will be on the Tidy Britain Group under my sponsorship, it should be seen as a Government initiative involving all appropriate Whitehall Departments. Thus I hope that colleagues will do all they can to co-operate with TBG not only in respect of the projects but also in assisting the Group in its on-going educational and promotional activities.

I am sending a copy of this memorandum to David Young, Norman Fowler, Kenneth Baker, Paul Channon, Douglas Hurd, Malcolm Rifkind, Peter Walker, Kenneth Clarke, John Major and Sir Robin Butler.

N R

17 February 1988



## Summary of Pilot Projects and Preparation Programme

### 1. TRANSPORT

- A. 2 Motorway Service Areas. Knutsford + another.
- B. 2 Trunk Roads. Riparian problem.
- C.1 Railway Terminus - and main route therefrom for 50 miles.

### 2. COMMERCIAL AREAS

- A. 4 High Streets in the Provinces. Birkenhead, Bristol, Brighton, Doncaster.
- B. 1 'Capital' High Street.
- C. 1 Industrial Estate. North East.

### 3. LOCAL GOVERNMENT

- A. 1 'Peripheral' City. Leeds
- B. 1 Litter Act Enforcement
- C. 2 'County' Litter Plan Programmes. Lancashire, inc. local parish council CEP.  
(('Berkshire' tri-county project))
- D. 1 Review of CEP (inc. local/parish council).

### 4. TOURISM

- A. 1 Capital 'Spot'. Trafalgar Square or Tower.
- B. 2 Coastline - including several 'Beach' authorities.
- C. 2 Tourist 'places'. Stonehenge Bath or Warwick

### 5. SPECIAL EVENTS

- A. 1 Sporting Occasion. Wimbledon or a Test Match.
- B. 1 'Entertainment' Occasion. Pop Festival or show!
- C. 1 'Festival' Glasgow Garden Festival.