



ABUSE OF A WASTE EXEMPTION LEADING TO SITE BECOMING AN ILLEGAL ACTIVITY.

WHAT HAPPENED?	<p>An operator collecting and treating wood primarily for export registered two exemptions for the storage and treatment of wood at two locations.</p> <p>Both locations stored too much material, causing a fire hazard and detriment to the environment and local amenity. This failure to comply with the conditions of the exemption meant that the site was being operated illegally.</p>
OUTCOME	<p>In court the operator was fined £800 (£400 for each site) and ordered to pay £8000 in costs.</p>
CONTEXT	<p>Some waste activities do not need a permit because they're covered by waste exemptions. You can register online at the Environment Agency for permits and you must comply with the criteria within the registered exemption.</p> <p>Exemptions should not be seen by operators as a means to avoid scrutiny by regulators.</p>
WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY?	<p>The waste producer and the waste carrier, in undertaking their Duty of Care, should have checked where the waste was going. The operator should have sought advice and guidance from the regulator, which may have lead the operator towards applying for a permit where there was any doubt about the scale of the activity required.</p>



BEAUTY SALON FAILS TO SHINE.

<p>WHAT HAPPENED?</p>	<p>Two black sacks of rubbish abandoned on a Birmingham street landed the business owner in deep trouble. When environmental health officers carried out a search, the rubbish bags were found to contain waxing strips, boxes for latex gloves, spray tan liquid, receipts and other waste paraphernalia associated with a nearby beauty salon.</p> <p>The owner of the beauty salon was unable to provide evidence that a commercial waste removal contract was in place to legally dispose of rubbish from her premises. Instead, it appeared the company was illegally placing black binbags on the street for collection by the domestic waste service.</p>
<p>OUTCOME</p>	<p>The owner of the beauty salon was fined £525 and ordered to pay £2,734.20 towards court costs and a £53 victim surcharge.</p>
<p>CONTEXT</p>	<p>The company has subsequently signed up to Birmingham City Council's trade waste service, meaning the business is now legally compliant.</p>
<p>WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY?</p>	<p>Businesses cannot use a domestic waste collection service for commercial waste. All items consumed or used on business premises, even discarded tea bags and empty wrappers from lunchtime, are classed as commercial waste. Therefore, businesses must have a contract in place for the removal and disposal of this waste – not doing so is an offence.</p>



COULD NOT BE BOTHERED TO TAKE MY WASTE BACK HOME

WHAT HAPPENED?	<p>A householder in Slough pleaded guilty to an offence of dumping household waste illegally. She explained that she had excess household waste and said there had been no household waste collection between Christmas and New Year. She had driven the waste (seven black bags) herself hoping to use the recycling site at Langley, but had found it shut as it was during the evening after work. She admitted depositing the waste at the roadside further down Trenches Lane.</p>
OUTCOME	<p>Magistrates fined the householder £1,216, and ordered clean-up and prosecution costs to be paid in the sum of £485. A victim surcharge of £121 was also levied- making a total to pay of £1,822.</p>
CONTEXT	<p>All of Buckinghamshire's household recycling centres are open every day of the year except Christmas Day, Boxing Day and New Year's Day. No charge is made for householders dealing with their own household waste.</p>
WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY?	<p>Local authorities put opening hours of their recycling centres on their websites, residents should check that their nearest centre will be open before they embark on a journey, especially if it involves a large amount of waste. If the facility is not open when you get there your waste should be driven back to your premises and taken when the facility is next open.</p>



**£34,899
SAVED**

DECISIONS DURING CONSTRUCTION PHASE LEAD TO REDUCED WASTE AND HUGE SAVINGS

<p>WHAT HAPPENED?</p>	<p>A project to part-convert, part-new build a business park had plenty of scope to minimise waste by identifying opportunities early on.</p> <p>The project was fairly large, with a floor area of 2682m² and a total cost of £1,750,000.</p>
<p>OUTCOME</p>	<p>Targets to reduce waste by 10%, recycle 60%, and send no more than 25% to landfill were easily achieved. 140 tonnes of inert waste was forecast, but no inert waste was sent from site during construction, and non-hazardous waste was only 38 tonnes.</p> <p>Mixed waste leaving site easily achieved a recycling rate of 60%.</p> <p>These waste reductions helped the project enjoy a significant cost saving of £34,899 – the equivalent of 2% of the total project costs.</p>
<p>CONTEXT</p>	<p>Several decisions were taken during the construction phase to help reduce waste and save money, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crushing and reusing material from the demolition phase • Recycling timber waste on site in the biogas boiler • Reusing inert material arisings for bunds on site • Reusing existing paved areas
<p>LESSONS LEARNT</p>	<p>The significant saving in costs was achieved with decisions during construction. The main lessons learnt were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Segregated skips will always be considered for future projects as they reduce costs • Only waste contractors with high offsite recycling rates will be used, to ensure best practice and reduction of waste to landfill • In-house forecasting data will be developed to ensure pre-construction plans align as closely as possible to actual waste arisings data • Further improvements will be sought through addressing the procurement strategy



DOCTOR DOES NOT KNOW BEST

<p>WHAT HAPPENED?</p>	<p>A non-practicing doctor used a small room in his home for occasional consulting activities. On two occasions the local council found items in the bins next to the property (empty syringe boxes, non-surgical latex gloves, business letters and appointment sheets among other items). The local council served a notice requesting copies of the waste transfer documentation but no response was received and a fixed penalty notice was issued. No payment for the notice was then received.</p> <p>The doctor was taken to court and then sought to appeal the original verdict. But the leave to appeal was dismissed.</p>
<p>OUTCOME</p>	<p>The doctor received a £100 fine for failing to comply with his duty to transfer commercial waste and a further £100 fine for a failure to furnish appropriate documents and was ordered to pay costs of £11,280.</p>
<p>CONTEXT</p>	<p>Although there was no argument that no more than 10% of the domestic dwelling was used for business use and that only for 1-2 days per week, the business premises was deemed the consulting room itself and the business had a duty to manage its waste and to keep appropriate records.</p>
<p>WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY?</p>	<p>Business cannot use a domestic waste collection service for commercial waste. The waste generated by the business should have been kept separate from the domestic waste and appropriate collection and treatment services and documentation should have been created and maintained.</p>



DON'T RELY ON FAMILY TO DO THE RIGHT THING

<p>WHAT HAPPENED?</p>	<p>An hotelier admitted he was “being ignorant” to where mattresses, bed cases, carpets and furniture were disposed of following a refurbishment.</p> <p>His father agreed to get rid of the waste but his son was caught when the sign to his business ‘The White Hart Hotel’ was left with the piles of rubbish where it was dumped in a country lane in Staffordshire.</p>
<p>OUTCOME</p>	<p>The hotelier was fined £440 and ordered to pay £567.53 costs and a £44 victim surcharge after he was found guilty under the Environmental Protection Act 1990.</p> <p>His father failed to attend an interview and was found guilty of obstruction offences contrary to Section 110 of the Environment Act 1995 at a previous hearing and was fined £220.</p>
<p>CONTEXT</p>	<p>To transport waste the person transporting the waste needs to be a registered waste carrier.</p> <p>An environmental permit or registered exemption needs to be in place which allows for the keeping or treating of such waste contrary to S.33 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990</p>
<p>WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY?</p>	<p>Waste segregation would have enabled material that was suitable for recycling to be recycled – saving on landfill tax costs. A waste management company should have been engaged to determine the best route for the material. A registered waste carrier should have been used to transport the material and the material should have been taken to an exempt or permitted facility for treatment.</p>



right
waste

right
place

**HEFTY FINES IN
THE REGION OF
£20,000 TOTAL
WERE GIVEN TO
ALL THE PARTIES
INVOLVED**

ILLEGAL DUMPING LEADS TO HEFTY FINES FOR ALL INVOLVED.

WHAT HAPPENED?	<p>In this case, 3000 tonnes of 'trommel fines' were illegally disposed of on farmland. The material came from a licenced waste transfer station and the Environment Agency was alerted to the illegal dumping when a member of the public noticed a high number of lorries carrying what was thought to be waste entering the farm.</p> <p>There were a number of parties implicated in this activity; the landowner, the waste carrier and the business from which the waste originated from.</p>
OUTCOME	<p>Hefty fines in the region of £20,000 total were given to all the parties involved.</p>
CONTEXT	<p>'Trommel fines' is a widely known phrase in the waste industry to describe material such as stones, aggregates, glass and soil arising out of the treatment of waste. It can also contain contaminants such as plaster board.</p>
WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY?	<p>The landowner should not have allowed illegal material to be dumped on his land without a valid permit; the waste carrier should have exercised due diligence in ensuring the waste had been properly described and that it was taken to an authorised facility; and the waste transfer station should have ensured its waste was managed in such a way as to protect the environment.</p>



ILLEGAL EXPORT OF ELECTRONIC WASTE LEADS TO PRISON.

<p>WHAT HAPPENED?</p>	<p>A company providing professional shipping services for used electrical goods attempted to transport six containers of waste electrical and electronic equipment to West African countries.</p> <p>The items included cathode ray tubes, televisions and fridge freezers, which contain hazardous components. It is illegal to export hazardous waste to countries which lack the capacity and infrastructure to ensure the items are treated without risk to human health or the environment.</p>
<p>OUTCOME</p>	<p>The company director was sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment, suspended for two years. He was also fined nearly £8000 and ordered to pay a contribution of £5000 to the costs of the Environment Agency investigation and prosecution.</p>
<p>CONTEXT</p>	<p>Duty of Care applies to any establishment or business that produces, transports, treats or disposes of waste as a result of its activities. There are UK and European rules governing how you can ship waste into or out of the country. If you fail to follow them, you may be committing a criminal offence and risk prosecution, financial penalties, and/or imprisonment.</p>
<p>WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY?</p>	<p>It is not illegal to export working, used electronics, but electrical waste can contain hazardous materials and can pose a serious risk to people's health and environment if not disposed of correctly. The controls that apply to waste shipment will depend on the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • treatment planned for the waste when it reaches its destination • country of destination and the transport route • waste type <p>Under your Duty of Care obligations you should ask if your waste is being exported and if so where to.</p> <p>If in doubt, contact the Environment Agency's International Waste Shipments team: shipments@environment-agency.gov.uk</p>



ILLEGAL WASTE EXPORT TO A DEVELOPING COUNTRY.

<p>WHAT HAPPENED?</p>	<p>A UK-based waste treatment facility, repairing and refurbishing various types of waste electrical and electronic equipment, was found to be illegally exporting electronic waste.</p> <p>The owner of the business hired a 40ft shipping container, telling the shipping company he was transporting bicycles to Ghana. The container was stopped and searched, and was found to contain waste electronic equipment being sent to Ghana for disposal. It is illegal to export waste for disposal to developing countries such as Ghana.</p>
<p>OUTCOME</p>	<p>The business owner received a Community Order, requiring him to do 200 hours of unpaid work. He also received a fine in excess of £500.</p>
<p>CONTEXT</p>	<p>Duty of Care applies to any establishment or business that produces, transports, treats or disposes of waste as a result of its activities. There are UK and European rules governing how you can ship waste into or out of the country. If you fail to follow them, you may be committing a criminal offence and risk prosecution, financial penalties, and/or imprisonment.</p>
<p>WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY?</p>	<p>It is not illegal to export working, used electronics provided that they are in working order., Electrical waste can contain hazardous materials and can pose a serious risk to people’s health and environment if not disposed of correctly. The controls that apply to waste shipment will depend on the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • treatment planned for the waste when it reaches its destination • country of destination and the transport route • waste type <p>If in doubt, contact the Environment Agency’s International Waste Shipments team: shipments@environment-agency.gov.uk</p>



right
waste

right
place

**THE FARMER
RECEIVED AN
18 WEEK PRISON
SENTENCE
SUSPENDED
FOR TWO YEARS.**

THE IMPORTANCE OF COMPLYING WITH PERMIT CONDITIONS.

WHAT HAPPENED?	A routine inspection by the Environment Agency found that a Devon farmer was incorrectly storing liquid food and abattoir waste. The farmer was in breach of his permit, and had a history of similar offences at sites he operated.
OUTCOME	The farmer received an 18 week prison sentence suspended for two years. He was also ordered to carry out 100 hours community service and pay £1000 costs after pleading guilty to a total of five offences under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010.
CONTEXT	These liquids are usually used as a fertiliser, but they can pose a risk to human health and the environment – See Need to Know guide: storage.
WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY?	If you have a permit to store waste, it is your responsibility to ensure you are complying with the conditions of that permit. The Environment Agency will inspect your site to check and if you are not following regulations, you may be committing a criminal offence and risk prosecution, financial penalties, and/or imprisonment.



LENDING OUT YOUR VEHICLE COULD LAND YOU IN TROUBLE

<p>WHAT HAPPENED?</p>	<p>A charity Chief Executive has been prosecuted for loaning a vehicle to someone who used it to fly-tip waste.</p> <p>A court heard that on or around 13 April 2016 an individual linked to the charity illegally deposited waste in Swiss Valley and Clifton Terrace, Llanelli.</p> <p>The Chief Exec loaned the vehicle to the individual, who had already been prosecuted by Carmarthenshire Council.</p> <p>The individual was provided with a tipper truck and a phone which had the phone number that is printed on flyers for we-garden-landscape-anything.com which undertakes general landscaping, paving, fencing and we move anything.com which deals with house clearance, rubbish, hardcore and garden waste removal.</p> <p>According to the defendant, the individual would be paid directly by customers and the money passed to the charity which has a lower tier waste carriers licence issued by the Environment Agency.</p> <p>At intervals between May 16 and June 7, 2016, waste was seen deposited on the yard adjacent to Chooselife, and two oil drums were also seen burning in the yard.</p> <p>The total cost to the council for the removal and disposal of waste illegally deposited at Swiss Valley and Clifton Terrace was £467.85</p>
<p>OUTCOME</p>	<p>The Chief Executive was given a 12-month conditional discharge and ordered to pay £400 costs</p>
<p>CONTEXT</p>	<p>An environmental permit needs to be in place which allows for the keeping or treating of such waste contrary to S.33 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990</p>
<p>WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY?</p>	<p>Waste has to be carried by a registered waste carrier and deposited at a permitted or exempt facility that is permitted or exempted to take the waste.</p>



LOCAL AUTHORITY CRACKS DOWN ON FLY-TIPPING.

<p>WHAT HAPPENED?</p>	<p>District Councils in South Oxfordshire have installed CCTV to catch fly-tippers in action, leading to 27 prosecutions and £25,000-worth of fines over the past financial year (2015).</p>
<p>OUTCOME</p>	<p>The number of fly-tip cases reported to district councils in the Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire in the last three years is down 20 per cent and 26 per cent respectively.</p>
<p>CONTEXT</p>	<p>In 2014/15, the estimated cost of clearance of fly-tipping to local authorities in England was £50 million and the cost of fly-tipping on private land was between £50 - £150 million.</p> <p>Fly-tipping is a criminal offence. At a Magistrates Court you can be fined up to £50,000 and / or 6 months in prison per offence. At Crown Court fines can be unlimited with the maximum imprisonment term rising to 5 years.</p>
<p>WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY?</p>	<p>Fly-tipping refers to dumping waste illegally instead of using an authorised method such as relying on kerbside collection or using an authorised rubbish dump. Fly-tipping is illegal, and anti-social and can harm the environment.</p> <p>When you employ someone to take your waste away you still have a responsibility to take all reasonable steps to ensure that the waste is managed correctly and legally throughout its complete journey to disposal or recovery.</p> <p>You can do this by checking that the person who takes the waste is authorised to do so, and carrying out more detailed checks if you suspect the waste is not being handled in line with the duty of care. For example you could request evidence that your waste has arrived at the intended destination and the waste has been accurately described.</p> <p>It is also advisable to obtain a receipt with the full details of the person taking the waste, along with the registration number of the vehicle used to transport the waste.</p>



£535
SAVED

PLANNING AHEAD SAVES CASH ON CONSTRUCTION WASTE

<p>WHAT HAPPENED?</p>	<p>A Control Room in Reading with a floor area of approximately 1250m² needed fitting out, with lots of waste material needing to be disposed of. A specialist waste reduction company was brought in, and opportunities to minimize waste were identified at the pre-construction phase of the site waste management plan (SWMP).</p>
<p>OUTCOME</p>	<p>Planning ahead meant the project surpassed its waste targets, reduced anticipated waste arisings by 21 times, and saved £535 – 59% of the project’s waste budget.</p>
<p>CONTEXT</p>	<p>The waste reduction and savings were achieved by planning ahead, and seeking inventive solutions to waste problems. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targets to reduce waste by 10%, recycle 80%, and only send 10% to landfill were set early on • Waste carpet tiles, originally destined for landfill, were recycled locally with a nearby manufacturer • Only five skips were used in the project, and all were used for segregated waste
<p>LESSONS LEARNT</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only waste contractors with high offsite recycling rates will be used, to ensure best practice and reduction of waste to landfill • Segregated skips will always be considered for future projects as they reduce costs • Recycling of carpet tiles will always be considered, as it is simple to implement • In-house forecasting data will be developed to ensure pre-construction plans align as closely as possible to actual waste arisings data



ROGUE TRADER DUMPS HOUSEHOLDER'S WASTE

WHAT HAPPENED?	<p>A Newport householder was caught out when he did not check the person offering to take his waste away. He told Newport City Council officers he had been carrying out work on his property when he was approached by a man with a white van and a trailer, who said he would take away rubbish for £50. Although he said the man had told him he had a permit, he was unable to back this up.</p> <p>Unfortunately for the householder the rogue trader illegally dumped it in Chapel Road, Nash.</p>
OUTCOME	<p>The householder pleaded guilty to breaching the Environmental Protection Act by knowingly causing controlled waste to be dumped without a permit and failing to ensure the rubbish was handed over to an authorised person.</p> <p>The court handed him a two-year conditional discharge, reduced from three years for his early guilty plea, and ordered him to pay council costs of £561.24 and a victim surcharge of £20.</p>
CONTEXT	<p>Anyone who carries waste needs to have a registered waste carriers licence issued by the environmental regulator. This can be checked on the environmental regulator's website as part of the public register.</p>
WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY?	<p>Waste has to be carried by a registered waste carrier and deposited at a permitted or exempt facility that is permitted or exempted to take the waste.</p>



SERIAL FLY-TIPPER PUT BEHIND BARS

<p>WHAT HAPPENED?</p>	<p>A notorious fly-tipper made national news when he was caught on camera tipping a truck-load of rubble, wood and other building waste while driving along a quiet road in Croydon.</p> <p>The shocking footage of three tonnes of waste spilling out onto the road – which you can view here – landed the thoughtless enviro-criminal in court.</p>
<p>OUTCOME</p>	<p>At the trial, the District Judge allowed a ‘bad-character’ application from Croydon Council, taking into account the fly-tipper’s previous conviction for similar offences in Surrey the same year.</p> <p>The fly-tipper was found guilty of dumping the waste along with three other fly-tipping offences, resulting in a year-long prison sentence.</p>
<p>CONTEXT</p>	<p>At sentencing on 25 January 2017, the Judge made clear that continuous offending would lead to prison time.</p> <p>She also emphasised the damage done to communities in Croydon by fly-tipping and the costs that must be met by the Council.</p>
<p>WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY?</p>	<p>The fly-tipper was making a considerable profit by dumping waste illegally, and had done so for a long period of time.</p> <p>The waste should have been disposed of properly by a registered waste carrier, and should have been taken to a place permitted to accept it.</p> <p>Waste producers should always check that the person they are handing waste to is properly registered to carry it, and they should know where the waste is going to be taken.</p>



£30,256
SAVED

SMALL CHANGES ADD UP TO BIG SAVINGS IN REFURBISHMENT PROJECT

<p>WHAT HAPPENED?</p>	<p>Solihull Community Fire Station needed refurbishing, with a floor area of approximately 1740m². There was plenty of scope to minimise waste, and opportunities were identified early on in the project.</p>
<p>OUTCOME</p>	<p>Targets to reduce waste by 10%, recycle 70% and send no more than 20% to landfill were easily achieved.</p> <p>Inert waste was forecasted to be 339 tonnes, but no inert waste was sent from site during construction, with only 114 tonnes of non-hazardous waste – remarkable for such a large project.</p> <p>This reduction in waste, and resulting reduction in skip costs, led to a cost saving of £30,256.</p>
<p>CONTEXT</p>	<p>Numerous waste minimisation decisions were taken, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The removal of existing materials was carried out economically while limiting damage • Mechanical cutting techniques were used to ensure reduced waste • Timber waste was reduced by reusing pallets through procurement • Tape/joint finishes were used instead of plastering, reducing excessive waste • Waste arisings were segregated on site <p>The total effect of these decisions was a large reduction in waste and a significant cost saving.</p>
<p>LESSONS LEARNT</p>	<p>The large cost saving was made by implementing many small decisions to reduce waste, but major lessons learnt include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only waste contractors with high offsite recycling rates will be used, to ensure best practice and reduction of waste to landfill • Segregated skips will always be considered for future projects as they reduce costs • In-house forecasting data will be developed to ensure pre-construction plans align as closely as possible to actual waste arisings data



AS PART OF YOUR DUTY OF CARE OBLIGATIONS YOU MAY NEED AN ENVIRONMENTAL PERMIT

THE NEED FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS.

WHAT HAPPENED?	A landowner in Bicester accumulated an extensive amount of waste wood (including pallets and shredded wood) on his agricultural smallholding, thus creating a fire hazard.
OUTCOME	The landowner was fined £2000, ordered to pay costs of £3000 and a £120 victim surcharge.
CONTEXT	Some waste activities do not need a permit because they're covered by waste exemptions. You can register online at the Environment Agency for permits and you must comply with the criteria within the registered exemption.
WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY?	As part of your Duty of Care obligations you may need an environmental permit if your establishment or business uses, treats, recovers, stores or disposes of waste. The waste producer and the waste carrier, in undertaking their Duty of Care, should have checked where the waste was going.



TRADESMAN LEARNS COSTLY LESSON.

<p>WHAT HAPPENED?</p>	<p>A tradesman employed by a householder to remove and dispose of waste following house renovation work passed it onto a third party to get rid of it. The waste was subsequently fly-tipped. The tradesman failed to ensure the material was disposed of responsibly, and therefore failed in his duty of care.</p>
<p>OUTCOME</p>	<p>The tradesman was fined in excess of £5000. Fly-tipping is illegal, anti-social and can harm the environment. In 2014/15, the estimated cost of clearance of fly-tipping to local authorities in England was £50 million and the cost of fly-tipping on private land was between £50 - £150 million.</p>
<p>CONTEXT</p>	<p>Fly-tipping is a criminal offence. At a Magistrates Court you can be fined up to £50,000 and / or 6 months in prison per offence. At Crown Court fines can be unlimited with the maximum imprisonment term rising to 5 years.</p>
<p>WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY?</p>	<p>When you employ someone to take your waste away you still have a responsibility to take all reasonable steps to ensure that the waste is managed correctly and legally throughout its complete journey to disposal or recovery. You can do this by: checking that the person who takes the waste is authorised to do so carrying out more detailed checks if you suspect the waste is not being handled in line with the duty of care. For example you could request evidence that your waste has arrived at the intended destination and the waste has been accurately described. It is also advisable to obtain a receipt with the full details of the person taking the waste, along with the registration number of the vehicle used to transport the waste.</p>



WASTE DUMPED ON WELSH MOUNTAINSIDE

WHAT HAPPENED?	<p>Two men have been fined for fly-tipping offences. According to Blaenau Gwent council, the first man pleaded guilty after it was found he dumped waste on a mountainside in the area.</p> <p>The council said the second man pleaded guilty as it was found he allowed the use of his van for the illegal disposal of controlled waste, including building waste, at land near the West Mon Golf Course in Nantyglo.</p>
OUTCOME	<p>Both were prosecuted under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 – the first was fined £40, ordered to pay £300 in costs, and a £20 victim surcharge. The second was captured using CCTV surveillance, and charged with allowing the escape of waste from a vehicle under his control in August 2015. He was fined £200, ordered to pay £782.59 in costs, and a £20 victim surcharge.</p>
CONTEXT	<p>An environmental permit needs to be in place which allows for the keeping or treating of such waste contrary to S.33 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.</p>
WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY?	<p>Waste has to be carried by a registered waste carrier and deposited at a permitted or exempt facility that is permitted or exempted to take the waste.</p>