

Draft “Seagull” Action Plan

Proposed Action	Comment	SLT Conclusion
Do Nothing	The Council currently has no agreed corporate approach. It is not a matter for 1 Service. There is currently no budget specifically allocated to dealing with seagulls.	Consensus that there is an issue and that reasonable/proportionate/low cost actions should be implemented covered by existing Service budgets.
Introduce a long term programme of culling (shooting, poisoning, trapping & disposing etc)	<p>No in-house resource. Would need to employ specialist contractors.</p> <p>Costs would be significant given the intensity and period of time.</p> <p>Licensed required from WG</p> <p>Impact of culling not proven (eg new birds move into the area to replace those culled)</p> <p>Inhumane and open to criticism</p>	No support for this approach.
Introduce a long term programme of destroying nests/eggs, replace with “dummy” eggs etc.	<p>No in-house resource. Would need to employ specialist contractors.</p> <p>Costs would be significant given the intensity and period of time.</p> <p>Licensed required from WG</p> <p>Some evidence that some positive impacts on population and behaviour.</p> <p>Inhumane and open to criticism</p>	No support for this approach based mainly on cost and limited impact.
Introduce a by-law or Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) preventing the feeding of gulls	<p>Could be added to other Env/ASB offences such as dog fouling, littering etc. (feeding birds is NOT littering)</p> <p>No evidence there is a particular problem of people feeding the gulls</p> <p>Difficult to enforce (eg people feeding gulls on private land, out of hours etc)</p> <p>Other Authorities have received objections based on human rights as certain religions promote the feeding of birds</p>	<p>SLT not particularly supportive but concluded on seeking the views of Scrutiny as to whether or not to carry out a formal public consultation exercise.</p> <p>Lead Service; Planning & Public Protection</p>
Introduce variety of methods to “scare”	Possible methods include loud bangs, play distress calls, introduce moving apparatus	Could be deployed in known problem areas.

birds in certain problem areas	(eg “angry bird” ballons), use of live hawks etc. May discourage birds in areas deployed, although they will only move nearby and the impact is short lived	Lead Service; Highways & Env
Introduce netting/bunting over public spaces	Limited locations where this could be introduced May require permission from private properties	Could be deployed in known problem areas. Lead Service; Highways & Env
Discourage “perching” in public realm	Ensure street furniture such as lampposts have spikes etc to prevent perching Limited impact Too expensive to retro fit	Already a consideration and is done. Lead Service; Highways & Env
Adapt existing Council buildings to help make them seagull proof	Introduce netting over roofs, spikes on window ledges etc at Council buildings such as offices, schools etc. Potentially very expensive and therefore only to be considered at extreme “problem” buildings	Officers to consider adaptation and capital funding on those buildings where there is an accepted problem. Lead Service; Property (+ Service responsible for building eg if a school, education)
Design new Council buildings to help make them seagull proof	Have a design criteria on all new Council buildings to consider preventing nesting/perching	New Council Policy to ensure this is done. Lead Service; Property
Introduce Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) to encourage all new buildings to consider being seagull proof at the design stage	Introduce “best practice” to “design out” gulls from new buildings (private sector). Probably not always enforceable at the planning decision stage, as only guidance.	Report to LDP Steering Group. Lead Service; Planning & Public Protection
Reduce availability of waste food through Council refuse collection	Ensure our public realm bins are seagull proof. Encourage all households to recycle all food in appropriate containers. Remove all bin bags from normal collection	Officers to have regard to these factors and seek improvements as possible Lead Service; Highways & Env
Reduce the availability of waste food at food business premises	Ensure food business premises dispose of their waste food appropriately and in seagull proof containers Work with food business to suggest ways of limiting food litter and where necessary	Officers to do more with food business premises to reduce food litter and availability of waste food for the gulls.

	more enforcement of the fast food litter legislation.	Lead Service; Highways & Env and Planning & Public Protection (food hygiene)
Have an ongoing campaign to educate the public/businesses not to feed gulls and to take more responsibility to deal with gull nests on their property	<p>Concerted PR campaign run every year to encourage none feeding of gulls, gull proofing properties, less food waste etc</p> <p>Provide leaflets for display in food business premises regarding not to feed the gulls and to take care when eating in the open</p>	<p>Officers to put together a PR campaign.</p> <p>Lead Service; Communications & Marketing</p> <p>Signs to be erected around relevant towns “do not feed the gulls”.</p> <p>Lead Service; Highways & Env and Planning & Public Protection</p> <p>Adverts for food business premises.</p> <p>Lead Service; Planning & Public Protection</p>
Lobby WG, WLGA and NRW to make the issue more of a national or at least regional campaign	Seek a more consistent national approach	<p>Lead Member to write to relevant organisations.</p> <p>Lead service; Planning & Public Protection</p>
Other actions, including role of Members, Community Council’s etc	Views of Members	?