

“Seagull” Action Plan

Proposed Action	Comment	SLT conclusion	Update
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.	N/A
Introduce a long term programme of culling (shooting, poisoning, trapping & disposing etc)	No in-house resource. Would need to employ specialist contractors. Costs would be significant given the intensity and period of time. Licensed required from WG Impact of culling not proven (eg new birds move into the area to replace those culled) Inhumane and open to criticism	No support for this approach.	N/A
Introduce a long term programme of destroying nests/eggs, replace with “dummy” eggs etc.	No in-house resource. Would need to employ specialist contractors. Costs would be significant given the intensity and period of time. Licensed required from WG Some evidence that some positive impacts on population and behaviour. Inhumane and open to criticism	No support for this approach based mainly on cost and limited impact.	N/A
Introduce a by-law or Public Space	Could be added to other Env/ASB offences such as dog fouling, littering etc.	SLT not particularly supportive but concluded on seeking the views of Scrutiny as to	Legal advice has been sought. A PSPO can only be introduced if

<p>Protection Order (PSPO) preventing the feeding of gulls</p>	<p>(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>whether or not to carry out a formal public consultation exercise.</p> <p>Lead Service; Planning & Public Protection</p>	<p>there is a justified need i.e a real problem with seagull feeding. We do not have the number of complaints to justify the PSPO or a bylaw. Other powers are available such as legal notices to serve on individuals regularly feeding seagulls and having a detrimental effect on others.</p>
<p>Introduce variety of methods to “scare” birds in certain problem areas</p>	<p>Possible methods include loud bangs, play distress calls, introduce moving apparatus (eg “angry bird” ballons), use of live hawks etc.</p> <p>May discourage birds in areas deployed, although they will only move nearby and the impact is short lived</p>	<p>Could be deployed in known problem areas.</p> <p>Lead Service; Highways & Env</p>	<p>This has been utilised in the past, but only has a limited (and temporary) impact. Evidence (from CRMs) suggests that this is not currently a major problem, as we only had 1 CRM about seagulls last year. It therefore doesn’t feel that there are currently any problem areas where we need to scare seagulls.</p>
<p>Introduce netting/bunting over public spaces</p>	<p>Limited locations where this could Introduced</p> <p>May require permission from private properties</p>	<p>Could be deployed in known problem areas.</p> <p>Lead Service; Highways & Env</p>	<p>We only have bunting on the High Street in Rhyl. We are not aware of any sites where similar bunting or netting is installed due to the lack of suitable fixing points.</p>
<p>Discourage “perching” in public realm</p>	<p>Ensure street furniture such as lampposts have spikes etc to prevent perching</p> <p>Limited impact</p> <p>Too expensive to retro fit</p>	<p>Already a consideration and is done.</p> <p>Lead Service; Highways & Env</p>	<p>We have fitted bird deterrents on most lighting columns in town centres, and also on areas where we have received reports through the CRM (which is very few). However, it should be noted that</p>

			deterrents on lighting columns have a limited impact. We have recently changed most street bins in our coastal town centre areas to stop seagulls from accessing their contents.
Adapt existing Council buildings to help make them seagull proof	<p>Introduce netting over roofs, spikes on window ledges etc at Council buildings such as offices, schools etc.</p> <p>Potentially very expensive and therefore only to be considered at extreme “problem” buildings</p>	<p>Officers to consider adaptation and capital funding on those buildings were there is an accepted problem.</p> <p>Lead Service; Property (+ Service responsible for building eg if a school, education)</p>	<p>We committed to do this if it was financially viable to do so and on the understanding it wouldn’t feature highly in our maintenance programme ahead of essential maintenance elsewhere. i.e it wouldn’t be at the expense of essential maintenance to our schools and public buildings. To date we have applied better solutions at Rhyl pavilion as an example, as part of a wider refurbishment programme. We do not have resources to seagull proof all our existing Council buildings. But when possible, we take the opportunity to do so, when refurbishing existing buildings and particularly when undertaking large capital works to rooflines.</p>
Design new Council buildings to help make them seagull proof	Have a design criteria on all new Council buildings to consider preventing nesting/perching	<p>New Council Policy to ensure this is done.</p> <p>Lead Service; Property</p>	<p>Yes we apply this rule to all new development concepts. Nova, was one example, and now the Waterpark is being seagull proofed as</p>

			much as practically possible within the design.
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	A new planning information sheet is being developed to provide guidance to applicants on seagull proofing measures.
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	Duty of Care inspections of food businesses to ensure that they have commercial waste disposal contracts, that they are using containers (which vermin cannot access) and that they have an adequate number of containers for the volume of waste they produce. In certain areas where we have specific problems with seagulls, Public Protection Officers are also checking refuse storage etc during food hygiene inspections of food businesses.
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 more enforcement of the fast food litter legislation.	Officers to do more with food business premises to reduce food litter and availability of waste food for the gulls. Lead Service; Highways & Env and Planning & Public Protection (food hygiene)	As above and specific work being done in Rhyl as part of the West Rhyl Neighbourhood Management Project.

<p>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>	<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>	<p>Communications Strategy developed to incorporate media messages, signs, engagement with the public, businesses, Members and others.</p>
<p>Lobby WG, WLGA and NRW to make the issue more of a national or at least regional campaign</p>	<p>Seek a more consistent national approach</p>	<p>Lead Member to write to relevant organisations.</p> <p>Lead service; Planning & Public Protection</p>	<p>To be undertaken</p>
<p>Other actions suggested by Members at the March 2017 Committee Meeting</p>	<p>Raise awareness through distributing the refuse calendars.</p> <p>Consider taking out of hours enforcement action if food waste is left out in an unsecure location/manner</p>	<p>Lead service: Highways and Env Services</p> <p>Lead Service: Highways and Env Services</p>	<p>We will undertake an awareness campaign the next time the calendars are released which will be Nov 2018. The wider communications strategy will also send messages out to residents.</p> <p>Very few domestic properties without food waste collections. All using gull proof caddies. No capacity to undertake out of hours enforcement action however any complaint should be submitted through CRM and will</p>

	Explore the effectiveness of contraceptives on the seagull population	Lead Service: Planning and Public Protection	be investigated by waste enforcement officers and recycling officers No licensed contraceptives for birds in the UK. Research to date suggests that they are ineffective.
--	---	---	--