SCARBOROUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

At a meeting to be held at 2.00 pm on Wednesday, 7th September, 2016, in the Cabinet Room at the Town Hall, Scarborough

AGENDA

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Pages 1 - 2)
   Members are reminded of the need to consider whether they have a personal or prejudicial interest to declare in any of the items on this agenda. If so, the nature of the interest must be declared at the start of the meeting. In addition, the attached form must be completed and passed to the Committee Administrator. The Officers will be pleased to advise, if necessary, and any request for assistance should be made, in the first instance, to the Committee Administrator whose name appears at the end of this agenda. Ideally, such advice should be sought before the day of the meeting so that time is available to consider any uncertainty that might arise.

2. MINUTES (Pages 3 - 6)
   To approve as a correct record and sign the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Board held on 27 July 2016.

3. PUBLIC QUESTIONS
   To consider public questions of which due notice has been given and which are relevant to the business of the Overview and Scrutiny Board.

4. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD WORK PROGRAMME (Pages 7 - 8)
   To consider the Board’s programme of work emerging from the 2016 Scrutiny Survey, the Cabinet Forward Plan and the Director’s Team.

5. LOCAL GULL POPULATIONS AND PUBLIC NUISANCE: PROJECT UPDATE (Pages 9 - 24)
   To consider a progress report on action taken to date on the Council’s project on gulls and kittiwakes (report ref. 16/193 attached).

   [Note: A further report will be submitted to this Board on 30 November 2016 to propose a revised action plan to take forward into 2017.]
(N.B. If you have any questions, need further information about the meeting or require special facilities in order to attend, please contact Heather Donaldson-Boldyn, Democratic Services Officer, Town Hall, St. Nicholas Street, Scarborough – Tel: 01723 232310 Fax 08702384159 or email heather.donaldson-boldyn@scarborough.gov.uk)
MEMBERS’ DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Name: 

Meeting: 

Date: 

Agenda No & Item 

Nature of Interest: 

If you are uncertain whether you have an interest, please seek officer advice before the meeting.

Is the interest: 
  a disclosable pecuniary interest? 
  personal and non-prejudicial? 
  personal and prejudicial? 

(Please put an X against the appropriate interest and email to the Clerk for the meeting)
Present:-
Councillors S Siddons (Chairman), G W Allanson, D L Billing, P Cross (as a substitute for J Ritchie), J Dodds, J E Mortimer (as a substitute for T W Fox), C Pearson, S Turner

Apologies
Councillors T W Fox, J Ritchie

In attendance:-
Councillors D V Cluer, M J Cockerill, J Jefferson

1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
There were no declarations of interest made.

2 MINUTES
RESOLVED: that the minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Board meeting held on 29 June 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3 PUBLIC QUESTIONS
There were no questions received from members of the public. The Chairman advised members of the public present at the meeting however, that he would welcome any points that they wished to make in relation to Agenda Item 6 (Dean Road Depot and Manor Road) at the time when the item was considered.

4 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD WORK PROGRAMME
The Board considered its current work programme which had been devised from the 2016 Scrutiny Survey circulated to all Councillors, the Cabinet Forward Plan, and items put forward by the Directors’ Team. Members noted that the work programme items had been allocated to Board dates wherever possible, with an additional listing in respect of the Garden Waste Collection Scheme under those items which were yet to be confirmed, and a post-consultation report on the Local Support for Council Tax Scheme for the Board’s meeting on 26 October 2016.

RESOLVED: that the report on the Board’s work programme be noted.
The Board considered the report of the Director, Mr N Edwards, which provided information on proposals for the Council’s Manor Road nursery and Dean Road depot. The report contained financial information and valuation reports, condition surveys, and indicative costings for co-locating both sites at Dean Road.

The Dean Road site was currently not considered to be a sale option due to no significant interest from prospective purchasers, the location of a listed jail block within its boundaries, and issues with contaminated land. Options for marketing the land as a retail site for larger stores had diminished in recent years to the extent that it was now largely proven to be no longer viable. The Dean Road site was currently occupied by several of the Council’s operational services, and had capacity for more of them to relocate there. In addition to the Council’s plant nursery function, the Manor Road nursery was the location of the Council’s Parks and Countryside service and various community groups.

Members considered the scope of a possible scrutiny review about consolidating both site operations on the Dean Road site, including whether the Council continued to grow greenhouse-based plant stock at Dean Road, or whether quality plants could be bought in from elsewhere. The following principal points were raised in discussion:

- Refurbishment and improvement works costing in the region of £200,000 would be required at the Dean Road site to make it fit for purpose for additional operational services. The Council was approximately half-way through the government’s austerity period and facing continuing budgetary pressure, and had limited capital for repair works. However, the Directors’ Team was of the opinion that optimum efficiency savings would be explored in preference to cuts wherever possible. Along with all of the Council’s services, operational services would be reviewed under the Council’s transformation programme.

- The Board acknowledged that the Parks Department provided an excellent service, and had engaged effectively with local community groups to such an extent that they were regarded as a fundamental part of the Council’s public service. One option, should the Council relocate the Manor Road facilities to Dean Road, would be to create an access via Columbus Ravine, thereby enabling continued community group involvement.

- The Board agreed that a task group should be formed to consider the issues surrounding both sites and to make recommendations to Cabinet. The scope could potentially be broadened from the recommendations contained within the report to include closely exploring all possible
costings options and the Council’s budget, matters of environmental sustainability, what to do with each site and which services should be located where, whether an equivalent Parks Department could be run solely from Dean Road, and sensitivities around the service. The Chairman was agreeable to the Board hearing from a member of the public who wished to speak at this point, and the speaker requested that the Board considered some of the common aspects of information gathered from a previous review in respect of Manor Road nursery. The Board indicated that it would do this.

A robust business case would need to be made for any preferred option put forward which also took account of the views of the community groups and looked at ways to maintain their engagement. The review should be time-limited as deemed appropriate, in part due to the seasonal nature of the work carried out by the service area and also to ensure efficient progress of the Board’s work programme.

Members felt that the precise scope of the review required more detailed work outside of the meeting, and delegated responsibility for a full scoping exercise to the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and relevant officers. The pool of members who had indicated a willingness to participate in scrutiny reviews would be asked to apply with a supporting statement for a place on the group, with a view to convening a first meeting during September 2016. The task group would be required to report on progress at every Board meeting.

RESOLVED: that

(i) a scrutiny review of Manor Road nursery and Dean Road depot be commissioned, with the precise scope being determined by the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman and relevant officers;

(ii) members of the pool of non-executive councillors be invited to nominate themselves to serve on the task group with an accompanying statement in support of their nomination; and

(iii) the task group will aim to begin its review in September 2016, complete it within three months of being convened, and will submit a progress report to every Overview and Scrutiny Board meeting.

Chairman
## Overview and Scrutiny Board: Work Programme 2016/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each meeting</td>
<td>Work Programme and Cabinet Forward Plan Report</td>
<td>Regular review and update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 June 2016</td>
<td>The Council’s Car Parking Strategy</td>
<td>High PICK score. Car Parking Working Group re-established with new remit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review topic agreed on 29 June 2016.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 July 2016</td>
<td>Manor Road and Dean Road Depots</td>
<td>High PICK score. Review commissioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>this review to be considered by the Board on 7 September 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 October 2016</td>
<td>Local Support for Council Tax Scheme</td>
<td>Post-Consultation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street Entertainment/Busking</td>
<td>Board to be consulted on proposals. Also to be included in the Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Briefing Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Budget: 4-Year Efficiency Statement</td>
<td>Board to be consulted on proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of Garden Waste Collection Scheme 2016/17 and proposals for</td>
<td>Board to be consulted on proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 November 2016</td>
<td>North Yorkshire Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Annual report on Police and Crime Plan, crime and disorder matters,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>safeguarding strategic overview and future plans for consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cemetery/Crematorium Memorial Decoration</td>
<td>Officer report on the Council’s policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gulls and Kittiwakes</td>
<td>Further Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be confirmed</td>
<td>Scarborough’s Hotel Stock and Quality</td>
<td>To be researched.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 106 Agreements: Planning and Development</td>
<td>To be researched.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revitalising local democracy</td>
<td>To be researched.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Conveniences (Urban and Rural)</td>
<td>Board to be consulted on the results of a public consultation of the draft policy approved by Cabinet in February 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Grants</td>
<td>Policy to be reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Watching brief:</strong></td>
<td>Bridlington Hospital Shuttle Bus Service</td>
<td>Further updates to be reported to the O&amp;S Board in due course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Part of the Board’s consultation remit. Any emerging issues to be considered as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercialisation</td>
<td>Included in the Council’s Transformation Programme. Emerging issues to be considered as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Assets and income Generation</td>
<td>Included in the Council’s Transformation Programme. Emerging issues to be considered as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Council’s Telephony System</td>
<td>Included in the Council’s Transformation Programme. Emerging issues to be considered as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Corporate Priority:

**People** - to have a safe, happy, healthy population with people who feel valued and included

**Place** – to protect and improve our environment, now and for the future

**Prosperity** – to develop a prosperous and innovative Borough, with a highly skilled and aspirational workforce

**Council** – to be an efficient and effective council which is financially sustainable for the future

---

**Key Decision:** No  
**Forward Plan Ref No:** n/a  
**Cabinet Portfolio Holder:** Cllr. Helen Mallory

---

**REPORT OF: THE DIRECTOR (TW) – 16/193**

**WARDS AFFECTED:** All

**SUBJECT:** LOCAL GULL POPULATIONS AND PUBLIC NUISANCE PROJECT UPDATE

**RECOMMENDATION(S):** To note the contents of this report, and progress with the action plan agreed by the Council’s Environment and Economy Scrutiny Committee on 30 November 2015.

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION (S):**
The purpose of this report is to update members on action taken to date on this project. A further report will be submitted to this Board on 30 November 2016 to propose a revised action plan to take forward into 2017.

**HIGHLIGHTED RISKS:**
Risk to the Council’s reputation by not effectively addressing the ongoing public nuisance issues caused by the local gulls population.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Members will recall that a proposed Action plan for minimising the public nuisance impact of local gull populations was submitted to and approved by the Council’s Environment and Economy Scrutiny Committee on 30 November 2015 (reference 15/320).

1.2 Since then a number of Council officers, from across a number of services, have assisted the Environment and Regulation Manager in implementing the various actions in this plan. The original Action plan, along with what has been subsequently carried out is reproduced in Appendix A.

2. CORPORATE AIMS/PRIORITIES AND THE COMMUNITY PLAN

2.1 Minimising the impact of public nuisance caused by the local gull populations contributes to “People” and “Place” priorities within the Council’s Corporate Plan.

3. BACKGROUND AND ISSUES

3.1 Although most of the agreed actions reproduced in Appendix A have been successfully implemented it is clear that this is an on-going project that will require further measures to be implemented over a number of years to effectively minimise, in the long term, the public nuisance caused by the local gull populations. It is important to stress that this is not the sole responsibility of the Council. It is the collective responsibility of all building owners and occupiers (proofing against gull nesting) and residents, visitors, local businesses (not to feed the gulls and not leaving litter/waste which encourages scavenging).

3.2 At the end of July 2016 Council officers started a poster campaign to promote the two key messages relating to reducing the public nuisance caused by seagulls – i.e. “Never feed the gulls” and “Never drop litter”. Two posters were produced (see Appendices B and C) and Council officers distributed them to seafront businesses in Whitby and Scarborough. Further posters were distributed to Filey Town Council to arrange their display on community noticeboards and local businesses. At the time of writing this report plans were being made to produce signage to fix onto public bins in the three coastal Towns in the borough.

3.3 There are some actions included in the plan last year that will need to be carried forward into 2017 that have not been fully addressed so far. This was mainly due to them being long term strategic aims that need much wider coordination or consultation with external agencies and likely to require more staff/financial resources than were available when last year’s plan was approved. For example: exploring a coordinated displacement programme of Scarborough’s urban nesting kittiwakes back to Castle Headland. There is also a need to complete the programme of erecting signage across the three main coastal Towns before next spring.
3.4 One of the actions to this project was to introduce a “gull mugging” reporting form that enabled victims of seagulls, who were either directly attacked or had food stolen from them, to inform us so an evidence base could be established to assess the size of this problem. From March to the end of August 2016 a total of 22 such reports were made to the Council. The following data was obtained from these reports:

a) 19 of the 22 reports of gull muggings came from the Scarborough area. A further two came from Whitby and one from Filey. The most common locations where reported muggings took place in Scarborough were on Westborough (four), around seafront sites (four) such as Foreshore Road; the Quay; and South Beach and Vernon Road (three).

b) 13 victims described food being stolen from them by seagulls and the other nine only mentioned being directly attacked by gulls.

c) The breakdown of reported gull muggings by month were: 1 in March; 2 in May; 6 in June; 11 in July and 2 in August. As can be seen most reported incidents took place in the months of June and July.

3.5 It is too early to reach firm conclusions from the data collected on gull muggings. However, it is intended to continue to obtain data over the next 12 months and to undertake research from other similar coastal local authorities to compare data of this nature. A further reason for undertaking this work would be to share good practice and any follow up action others have taken to reduce this issue.

3.6 In June 2016 the Council distributed approximately 2,200 gull proof outer refuse sacks to properties across the borough that were unable to use wheelie bins to deposit waste in. Initial feedback is positive in terms of residents/businesses making use of these sacks, and reduction in scattered waste material on our streets.

4. CONSULTATION

4.1 Please see paragraph 7.1 of this report.

5. ASSESSMENT

5.1 Please see paragraphs 3.1 to 3.6 of this report. It is proposed to produce an updated action plan for members approval on 30 November 2016.

6. IMPLICATIONS

Policy

6.1 There are no new policy implications for the Council that arise from this report.

Financial Implications

6.2 There are no new financial implications for the Council that arise from this report at this time. All actions already undertaken in relation to this project have been carried out within existing staff/financial resources.
Legal
6.3 The Council has a range of legal and discretionary powers in relation to addressing public and statutory nuisance caused by the activities of local gull populations. There are no new legal implications arising from this report.

Crime and Disorder
6.4 Under s17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 the Council has a duty to exercise its functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area.

Equality and Diversity
6.5 No implications.

7. ACTION PLAN
7.1 It is intended to submit a revised and updated Action plan to the Overview and Scrutiny Board for approval on 30 November 2016.

Trevor Watson
Director

Author: Jonathan Bramley
Telephone No: 01723 232506
E-mail address: jonathan.bramley@scarborough.gov.uk

Background Papers:
None.

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUERIES ABOUT THIS REPORT OR WISH TO INSPECT ANY OF THE BACKGROUND PAPERS, PLEASE CONTACT THE AUTHOR VIA HIS TELEPHONE NUMBER OR EMAIL ADDRESS GIVEN ABOVE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Ref</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Current Risk Score</th>
<th>Target Score</th>
<th>Service Unit Manager/Responsibility Officer</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td>Risk to the Council’s reputation by not effectively addressing the ongoing public nuisance issues caused by the local gulls population.</td>
<td>Poor media coverage and increased demands on service.</td>
<td>Approve and implement an amended action plan (in November 2016) to proactively address the issues.</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Jonathan Bramley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glossary of Terms
Risk An event which may prevent the Council achieving its objectives
Consequences The outcome if the risk materialised
Mitigation The processes and procedures that are in place to reduce the risk
Current Risk Score The likelihood and impact score with the current mitigation measures in place
Corporate Objectives An assessment of the Corporate Objectives that are affected by the risk identified.
Target Risk Score The likelihood and impact score that the Council is aiming to achieve
Service Unit Manager The Service Unit or Officer responsible for managing the risk
Action Plan The proposed actions to be implemented in order to reduce the risk to the target score

Risk Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A = Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B = Not Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C = Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>D = Very Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E = Almost Certain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Disaster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likelihood: Impact
Appendix A - Reducing public nuisance from the local gull populations

Background

The action plan below relating to the local gull populations and ways to minimise public nuisance caused by them was approved by the Council’s Environment and Economy Scrutiny Committee on 30 November 2015.

The table below reproduces this Action plan. The “Implementation comments” column provides a summary against each action of what was implemented and when:

Agreed Action Plan and summary of implementation programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Lead Officer(s)</th>
<th>Deadline date</th>
<th>Implementation comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Provide educational advice on the Council’s web-site (targeted at local residents, Schools and businesses) covering the following areas:</td>
<td>Jonathan Bramley (JMB)</td>
<td>On web-site by 27/11/15</td>
<td>The Council’s seagull web-page went “live” in January 2016. A link to this web-page is also provided in the “Welcome to Yorkshire” web-site. The web-page includes all the features outlined in the “Action” column. Residents/visitors have started to report incidents of gull muggings/aggressive behaviour via our on-line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Advice on property’s owners’ right to remove eggs and/or nests from herring gulls only. Also information on other licences that can be applied for via Natural England;</td>
<td>D) Advice on reducing human food supply for herring gulls.</td>
<td>E) Encourage people to report incidents of gull muggings.</td>
<td>forms. Since March 2016 a total of 25 such reports have been made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 2) Consider implementing a poster campaign in public buildings to highlight main messages in reducing public nuisance from gulls. | JMB in liaison with Tim Readman (TR), Jo Ireland (JI), GJ, Paul Thompson (PT) and JD. | TBC | New and high impact posters, highlighting key messages of “don’t feed the gulls” and “Never drop litter”, were distributed to seafront businesses in Whitby and Scarborough at the start of the summer season (end of July 2016). Posters were also erected on Council tourist/Community noticeboards across our three coastal towns. This has been followed up by a social media awareness campaign using the same imagery and messages. This will continue at regular |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3) Ensure SBC’s properties have been appropriately proofed against kittiwakes’ nesting</strong></td>
<td>Martin Pedley (MP)</td>
<td>Proofing programme completed by end of February 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proofing programme agreed before seagull nesting season began and implemented prior to the start of March 2016.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4) Identify other properties that have a history of being colonised by Kittiwakes nests and provide direct advice to property owners about effective proofing methods (and methods to avoid using) and importance of maintenance.</strong></td>
<td>JMB, with input from Graham Middleton (GM)</td>
<td>Before end of December 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A mailshot letter was distributed in January 2016 to commercial properties where there had been a history of public nuisance caused by nesting seagulls. The letter provided detailed advice about appropriate proofing methods to use to avoid future seagull nesting. This exercise will be repeated again this autumn and backed up by PR activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5) Explore coordinated displacement programme of Scarborough’s urban nesting kittiwakes back to Castle Headland</strong></td>
<td>JMB</td>
<td>End of February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This action is to be brought forward under a new Action plan. This is a long term strategic aim that needs detailed planning and coordination with Natural England, RSPB and other relevant wildlife experts. Furthermore, this aim is likely to require more staff/financial resources than were available when this plan was approved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6)</strong> Purchase more gull proof outer refuse sacks to roll out across other affected areas in SBC (£10,000 from identified budget in 2015/16</td>
<td><strong>PT</strong></td>
<td>Purchase extra outer refuse sacks before end of 2015/16 to roll out to identified areas/properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In June 2016 approximately 2,200 gull proof outer refuse sacks were distributed to properties across the borough that were unable to use wheelie bins to deposit waste in. Initial feedback is positive in terms of residents/businesses making use of these sacks and reduction in scattered waste material on our streets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **7)** a) Explore possibility of using the planning system to inhibit gulls nesting through structural design on new builds.  
   b) Phased replacement of seafront bins (within existing budgets) using ones designed to discourage gulls resting on them. | **JMB, David Walker (DW) and Marcus Whitmore (MW).**  
**PT and Nick Taylor** | **27/11/15** |
| Advice on planning aspects to inhibit gulls nesting on buildings was incorporated onto the Council seagull webpage.  
This is a long term, on-going aim of the project and will be carried forward into the next action plan. |
| **8)** Liaise with Food and Occupational Safety, Environmental Regulation and Cleansing Teams to carry out educational | **JMB Julie Peirson (JP), GM and PT** | Complete plan for initiative by end of February 2016. |
| This is a long term, on-going aim of the project and will be carried forward into the next action plan. These matters are routinely addressed during food hygiene inspections |
initiative at appropriate commercial properties (e.g. food businesses; other non-food businesses – B&B/offices/retail shops, etc.) to promote good practices in waste management.

| 9) Review current signage in use to see if it needs to be improved upon to get message across more clearly. | JMB and input from GM, PT and TR. Also liaise with South Bay Traders Association (John Senior and James Corrigan) and other seaside businesses in Whitby (Cllr Alf Abbott and John Woodhead, Engineer for SBC based in Whitby) and Filey (Gina Robinson, Town Clerk). | Complete review by end of January 2016. | New designs for seagull signage have been completed. The first phase of erecting signage is currently being undertaken whereby they are to be fixed to public bins at seafront location across the three main coastal towns in the borough.
Whitby Town Council have also made arrangements to erect seagull signage with the key message of “Don’t feed the seagulls” at selected locations near Whitby harbour.

This action is to be carried forward into the next action plan to complete the process before Spring 2017. |
Resource implications for implementing the above action plan

As stated in the report to members on 30 November 2015 most of the resources entailed in implementing the above plan involved Council staff time, but with some financial outlay. The financial resources involved the following:

1) Implementing a seagull proofing programme at certain Council buildings (action point 3).
2) Capital costs of purchasing gull-proof outer refuse sacks and signage in appropriate seafront locations (action points 6) and 9)). This came to £10,000. As stated in the 2015 report any on-going costs in relation to replacement of damaged sacks and signage, which may be approximately 10% of £10,000 (£1,000) will be met by affected businesses.
3) Cost of promotional material in the form of posters and notices (action points 2) and 8)). So far the costs of printing and ordering the posters and signage for the current campaign have come to approximately £300.

In future, options will be explored to minimise financial costs highlighted above by approaching other organisations who may be persuaded to act as sponsors.

Document by: Jonathan Bramley, Environment and Regulation Manager, 01723 232506, jonathan.bramley@scarborough.gov.uk
Contributors to the action above from: Julie Pierson and Food and Occupational Safety team; Graham Middleton and Environmental Regulation team; Gabrielle Jandzio; Harry Briggs; Paul Thompson; Martin Pedley, Trevor Watson; Marcus Whitmore/Karen Lawton; Tim Furness; Janet Deacon; Parking services.

Date: September 2016.
APPENDIX B

YOUR FOOD
is not their food

Help stop attacks
Never feed the gulls