**READING BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**REPORT BY DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOODS SERVICES**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **TO:** | **HOUSING, NEIGHBOURHOODS AND LEISURE COMMITTEE** | | |
| **DATE:** | **14 MARCH 2018** | **AGENDA ITEM:** | **9** |
| **TITLE:** | **PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDERS: CONSULTATION REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS** | | |
| **LEAD COUNCILLOR:** | **CLLR TERRY** | **PORTFOLIO:** | **NEIGHBOURHOODS** |
| **SERVICE:** | **HOUSING AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES** | **WARDS:** | **BOROUGHWIDE** |
| **LEAD OFFICER:** | **ANTHONY BRAIN** | **TEL:** | **0118 9373179** |
| **JOB TITLE:** | **COMMUNITY SAFETY AND ENABLEMENT MANAGER** | **E-MAIL:** | **Anthony.Brain@reading.gov.uk** |

## 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The report outlines the outcome of the consultation on the proposed introduction of a Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) in Reading.

1.2 The report makes recommendations on the number and nature of restrictions to be included within a PSPO, in the context of consultation feedback.

1.3 Appendices:

Appendix A – Consultation Questions
Appendix B – Summary of consultation results

## 2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

**2.1 That Housing, Neighbourhoods and Leisure Committee note the outcome of the consultation.**

**2.2 That Housing, Neighbourhoods and Leisure Committee agree the restrictions to be introduced as part of the PSPO as set out in paragraphs 4.5 – 4.13.**

## 3. POLICY CONTEXT

3.1 Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) were introduced under the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014 to deal with a particular nuisance or problem in a specific area that is detrimental to the local community's quality of life.

3.2 PSPOs have replaced powers to make Gating Orders, Designated Public Place Orders (street drinking restriction powers) and Dog Control Orders. In Reading, there are currently the following orders in place:

- 1 x Gating Order
- 1 x Dog Control Order (Borough Wide)
- 3 x Designated Public Place Orders

3.3 These orders automatically converted into PSPOs in October 2017. However, in the context of the changing nature of anti-social behaviour in the public realm, Housing, Neighbourhoods and Leisure Committee agreed on the 15th November 2017 to consult on the need to introduce a new PSPO to include conditions to tackle a wider variety of anti-social behaviour in Reading. These were:

- Begging
- Busking
- Dog Control
- Drug activity
- Public Urination and deification
- Street Drinking
- Littering
- Motor bike nuisance
- Mooring Restriction

## 4. CONSULTATION, EVIDENCE OF NEED AND RECOMMENDATION

4.1 The consultation ran between 1st December 2017 and 22nd January 2018 and was carried out online, face to face and via drop-in sessions. There were 685 responses to the consultation. Of those who responded 72% lived within the borough and a further 16% worked in Reading. Only 3% were visitors to the town.

4.2 A number of key consultees were identified both internally and externally. These are listed below:

Table 1: Consultees

| Internal | External |
|---|---|
| RBC Parks | Thames Valley Police |
| Environmental Protection | Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner |
| Licencing | South Oxfordshire District Council |
| Housing | West Berkshire Borough Council |
| Street Care | Wokingham Borough Council |
| Parking Services | Neighbourhood Action Groups |
| Births, Deaths and Marriages | Business Improvement District |
| Highways | IriS (Substance Misuse commissioned service provider) |
| | St Mungos (commissioned street outreach service) |
| | Launchpad |
| | Street Pastors (Reading) |
| | Environment Agency |
| | Liberty |
| | Dogs Trust |
| | Kennel Club |
| | British Transport Police |
| | Reading UK CIC |
| | British Bargee Association |

4.3 Overall the consultation feedback was in favour of the PSPO restrictions, with most people believing that these should generally cover the whole of the borough. There were some variations between restrictions which was expected. These variations are considered in more detail below.

4.4 In addition to the consultation a number of organisations' data was reviewed to identify the levels of calls for service in order to evidence the need for a restriction. However, the nature of the behaviour that impacts on the public realm means that much of the behaviour goes unreported. Therefore this information is used to compliment the consultation findings where it is available.

4.5 **Begging Restriction**

The following restrictions were consulted on:

1. No person shall aggressively beg. Aggressively begging includes begging near a cash machine or begging in a manner reasonably perceived to be intimidating or aggressive.

2. No person shall make any verbal, non-verbal or written request from a standing, sitting or lying-down position for money, donations or goods – including the placing of hats or containers.

**3.** No person shall sell any magazine which is already a free publication in Reading Town Centre. This restriction would not apply to anyone selling the Big Issue and who is officially "badged" to do so.

Evidence of need

Of those who responded to the consultation, 70% believed begging to be a fairly or very big problem within Reading, with 23% stating it is not a big

problem. Only 4% felt this was not a problem in Reading at all. 80% of all respondents supported the inclusion of begging restrictions in the order. However, analysis of the feedback identified that there were some concerns raised about the second restriction. Some who supported the overall objective felt this element was harsh.

Begging is not always reported to the police or the local authority as many people feel it is too trivial or that there is very little that can be done. This means that the quantitative measures based on the number of actual incidents is likely to be an under estimated. Despite this there were on average 8 incidents a month reported through the Reading Business Against Crime (RBAC) reporting system in the last year and 23 Reports to the police for the period March and October 2017. Reading UK CIC has reported that begging is one of the biggest concerns for their members.

In the recent community safety survey carried out on behalf of the Safer Neighbourhood Forums, begging was highlighted as being one of the top four biggest concerns for residents across Reading. This may reflect the visible impact of begging when residents use the town centre and other shopping areas.

Comments from the consultation:

"*I absolutely support this proposal. During the daytime begging is prevalent in the town centre; particularly the 'commuters walk' from the station and through the centre. It does seem to be more passive and polite during the day. However, as we enter the night time economy, begging is far more aggressive and intimidating; I'm often approached directly and up front as it gets past 6pm.*"

*"The begging in the town centre has really got out of hand and whilst I can empathise with some I can also empathise with the people that are being taken advantage of. Some of the beggars (certainly not all) can be very aggressive and intimidating and it also encourages drug dealers to blatantly sell their wares in town in front of young children."*

*"I fully agree with point 1 and 3. However, people who are sitting down and asking for money are not aggressive at all. They clearly need help."*

**Recommendation**

The general support for the introduction of the restriction matched by high levels of concern by both residents and businesses confirms the need to introduce a restriction as part of the PSPO. The consultation did highlight some public concerns around the second restriction meeting the definition of **aggressive** begging and a majority of respondents supported implementing the restriction as drafted. This restriction does, however, enable an additional opportunity for partners to engage with more entrenched and persistent beggars in an assertive way, with an aim of enabling and encouraging those who are begging to access the support services Reading has to offer and to exit a life on the street. Partnership work is not centred on enforcement but takes a holistic approach that is geared to helping the street population to access both accommodation and support.

It is recommended the restrictions as above are included in the order and cover the whole of the borough.

4.6 **Busking Restrictions:**

The following restriction was consulted on:

1. No person shall perform any type of street entertainment (also known as busking, which includes amplified or unamplified music and singing) that may cause a nuisance to nearby premises or members of the public within Reading Town Centre. This includes obstructing the highway or shop entrances, using street furniture including public seats, lamp posts, statues and railings, unless registered to do so by Reading UK CIC.

Evidence of need

Of those who responded to the consultation 70% believed this was **not** a big problem or a problem at all. This compared to 24% stating it was a very or fairly big problem. Further analysis of the comments showed that many of those who did not support these restrictions did support a licencing scheme of some kind and objected to amplified music where this was causing a nuisance. The Business Improvement District (BID) stated that amplified music impacted their members, not only shop staff but also the offices above ground level.

Reports of complaints against busking are relatively low. Where they are reported it is normally dealt with as noise nuisance. Intervention options through this process are limited as there is a need to show an ongoing problem from the same individual.

Comments from the consultation:

*"I think busking can bring tourists into town and give a little bit of character."*

*"You had a permit scheme for many years that worked very well. It was run by Reading CIC… Control busking but don't ban it entirely. It is very popular, that's why you have so many buskers because so many people give them money."*

*"Busking can be pleasant and provides a positive atmosphere if not amplified greatly"*

**Recommendation**

Where busking is causing nuisance there needs to be some effective means of managing it. This was reflected in some of the comments from the consultation, who whilst supporting busking did believe that should be some form of licencing in place. Our current voluntary licensing scheme is not working because there is no sanction against those unlicensed buskers or those who choose to busk in an anti-social way. To reflect the feedback from the

consultation and current limitations a revised restriction is being recommended.

It is recommended that the amended restriction set out below is included in the order and covers the whole of the borough:

1. No person shall perform any type of street entertainment (also known as busking) unless licenced to do so by Reading UK CIC and compliant with the conditions of the licence.

4.7 **Dog Control Restriction:**

The following restrictions were consulted on:

Any person in charge of a dog within the restricted area shall be in breach of the order if they:

1. Allow a dog to foul in a public place and then fail to remove the waste and dispose of it in an appropriate receptacle.

2. Do not comply with a direction given to him/her by an authorised officer of the authority to put and keep the dog on a fixed lead unless a) he/she has reasonable excuse for failing to do so; or b) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his/her failing to do so; c) an authorised officer of the authority may only give a direction under this order to put and keep a dog on a fixed lead if such a restraint is reasonably necessary to prevent a nuisance or behaviour by the dog likely to cause annoyance or disturbance to any person (on any land to which this order applies) or the worrying or disturbance of any animal or bird.

3. A person must not take more than four (4) dogs at the same time onto the land detailed, unless – (a) s/he has a reasonable excuse for failing to do so; or (b) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his failing to do so.

<u>Evidence of need</u>

Between May 2015 and May 2017 there were a total of 1,634 reports of dog fouling to the local authority. This data supports the findings of the consultation.
The majority of people who responded to the consultation said that one or more of these issues was a problem in Reading - 83% felt it was a fairly big or very big problem. 88% agreed with the restrictions consulted upon and the same percentage felt the restrictions should cover the whole of the borough. However, comments from individuals suggested that the greatest support was around the dog fouling element, and questioned the need to control or restrict the number of dogs a person can walk (which would impact on professional dog walkers). Local Authority enforcement officers felt that those controlling more than four dogs would find it difficult to monitor and pick up any dog mess.
Comments from the consultation:

*"I often take my daughters to school and there is dog mess on the pavement. People should be responsible dog owners."*

*"The first two bullet points are fair, but the restriction of the number of dogs allowed to be walked at one time by a single person seems rather unfair to professional dog walkers. As long as the dogs are kept under control I see no real reason for an upper limit."*

**Recommendation**

The consultation found that many believed that the restriction on the number of dogs any one person could walk at a time was not necessary. There is also little quantitative evidence to suggest that walking more than four dogs is a problem in Reading, therefore it is recommended that this element of the restriction is removed.

It is recommended that the amended restrictions set out below are included in the order and cover the whole of the borough:

Any person in charge of a dog within the restricted area shall be in breach of the order if they:

1. Allow a dog to foul in a public place and then fail to remove the waste and dispose of it in an appropriate receptacle.

2. Do not comply with a direction given to him/her by an authorised officer of the authority to put and keep the dog on a fixed lead unless a) he/she has reasonable excuse for failing to do so; or b) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his/her failing to do so; c) an authorised officer of the Authority may only give a direction under this order to put and keep a dog on a fixed lead if such a restraint is reasonably necessary to prevent a nuisance or behaviour by the dog likely to cause annoyance or disturbance to any person (on any land to which this order applies) or the worrying or disturbance of any animal or bird.

4.8 **Drug Activity Restriction:**

The following restrictions were consulted on:

1. No person shall ingest, inhale, inject, smoke, possess or otherwise use intoxicating substances in a public place.

Intoxicating Substances is given the following definition: any psychoactive substances i.e. substances with the capacity to stimulate or depress the central nervous system, excluding alcohol. Alcohol would be covered separately in the Street Drinking Restriction (see below).

Evidence of need

Of those who responded to the consultation nearly 80% said this was either a very big or fairly big problem in Reading, with 90% of people supporting the

restrictions. 97% believed this needed to cover the whole of the borough. Many also comment that they had personally seen or been affected by the issue. Comments made during the consultation highlighted some concerns that the wording of the restriction was ambiguous and might include e-cigarettes etc.

Between March and Oct 2017 there were 89 reports of drug taking and drug paraphernalia to the police.

In the recent community safety survey carried out on behalf of the Safer Neighbourhood Forums, drug taking and dealing was highlighted as being one of the top four biggest concerns for residents, this supports the borough wide need for the restriction.

As above, enforcement activity does not take place in isolation – partners seek to link individuals into specialist support services in the town.

Comments from the consultation:

*"Because my family and I have had a person injecting drugs in full view of public and children (in Newtown) on a consistent basis - Police have been dealing with this particular person."*

*"It is distressing to witness this."*

*"We as a business are constantly have to clear up needles by certain buildings in Reading and it's just so dangerous and awful. …. and unfortunately with this type of activity you also get crime, and we constantly have to invest in more CCTV etc"*

*"It is illegal and …. unsafe for children as drug users left needles behind."*

*"Again, 'criminalising' people is not the answer. Moving them on is not the answer. Supporting them to change is the answer but that takes money and we are no longer in a position to support people.*

**Recommendation**

The consultation and evidence has clearly demonstrated the need for a restriction around drug activity to be included within the PSPO. However, there were concerns regarding ambiguity within the wording consulted on. As a result the wording of the restriction has been changed to reflect this.

It is recommended that the amended restrictions set out below are included in the order and cover the whole of the borough:

1. No person shall ingest, inhale, inject, smoke, or otherwise use illegal drugs or psychoactive substances (formally known as legal highs), in a public place.

4.9 **Public Urination and Defecation:**

The following restriction was consulted upon.

1. No person shall urinate or defecate in a public place.

Evidence of need

Just over half of those who responded to the consultation felt this was a very or fairly big problem in Reading. Nearly 96% supported the restrictions set out within the consultation and of these 96% stated this should be borough wide. Of the small percentage of respondents who did not support the restriction, many stated that this was due to the *"inadequate provision of public toilets"* and would have supported the restriction otherwise.

Between March and October 2017 there were a total of 19 reports of public urination to the police and three to the local authorities ASB Team. Whilst levels of reporting are relatively low it is likely that much of this activity goes unreported, especially where this is linked to the night-time economy.

Comments from the consultation:

*"I have witnessed multiple people using the streets / alleys of the town centre as a toilet in the evenings, usually weekends. I believe we should provide more public toilet space though so people have no excuse. Some side streets / back alleys smell awful when you walk past them from all the people using them for toilet spaces"*

*"The car park where I live is also used as a toilet …. and the residents have to pay to clean up their mess"*

**Recommendation**

The consultation supports the need for a restriction around public urination and defecation to be included within the PSPO.

It is recommended the restrictions as above are included in the order and cover the whole of the borough.

4.10 **Street Drinking:**

The following restriction was consulted on:

1. No person shall refuse to stop drinking alcohol or hand over any containers (sealed or unsealed) which are believed to contain alcohol when required to do so by an authorised officer to prevent public nuisance or disorder.

Exemptions shall apply in cases where for the avoidance of doubt the consumption of alcohol is on premises or public space licenced under the Licensing Act 2003

Evidence of need

Around 65% of those who responded believed street drinking to be a very or fairly big problem in Reading and only 4% said it was not a problem at all. 92% agreed with the proposed restriction and 88% believed it should be introduced

borough wide. Comments from the consultation indicated the wider impact this can have with many people feeling intimidated by those street drinking.

Between March and October 2017 there were a total of 55 reports of street drinking to the police. This restriction is already in place as part of the previous Designated Public Space Order and the police have confirmed that the power offers them alternative options where arrest may not be appropriate.

Comments from the consultation:

*"Often see people wandering around early in the morning drinking cans of cider. It doesn't make the town feel safe when people can be drunk at an early hour"*

*"Its intimidating - people are unpredictable when they have had a drink."*

*"I've been injured by these people arguing and been drawn in. Needs to stop."*

*"Yes and no....you need to link up with IRiS. Whilst it is not ideal to have street drinkers, if they are alcohol dependent then removing the alcohol could place their lives in danger from potentially fatal seizures."*

**Recommendation**

The consultation both with residents and partners supports the continued restriction of the drinking of alcohol where this has or is likely to contribute to public nuisance or disorder.

It is recommended that the restriction as set out above is included in the order and covers the whole of the borough.

4.11 **Litter Restriction:**

The following restriction was consulted upon.

1. No person shall, for any duration of time, leave unattended in a public area any personal effects or belongings or any other material or paraphernalia including anything that may be considered discarded or waste material.

Evidence of need

74% of those who responded to the consultation believed littering to be a fairly or very big problem in Reading with only just over 2% stating it was not a problem at all. 90% supported the proposed condition within the PSPO, with nearly 90% believing this should cover the whole borough. Some of those who answered made a link between littering and homelessness as picked up in the comments below.

Comments from the consultation:

*"I'm frequently picking up used needles, sleeping bags, duvets, clothes, toiletries, all stored around my premises."*

*"If you are attempting to take away possessions of homeless people, which I believe is the purpose of the question, then no. This sadly is their entire life and a means of keeping relatively warm. Criminalising homelessness has to stop."*

*"People should put litter in bins provided. I see so much litter just dumped by people and it makes the environment horrible."*

**Recommendation**

The consultation, whilst clearly supportive of the introduction of this restriction as part of the PSPO, did raise concerns that it unduly effected Reading's homelessness population. It is acknowledged that there is already a substantial amount of cross agency work and communication in support of Reading's street population and that this will safeguard against any negative impact. Processes are already in place to identify the owner of items left on the street prior to removal; this includes discussion with support agencies.

It is recommended that the restriction set out as above is included in the order and covers the whole of the borough.

4.12 **Motorbike Nuisance Restriction:**

The following restriction was consulted on:

1. The effect of the Order is to prohibit the use of a mechanically propelled vehicle, intended or adapted for use on the road, in a way that has caused or may be capable of causing nuisance and annoyance anywhere on public land within the restricted area.

Evidence of need

39% of those who responded to the consultation believed this to be a very or fairly big problem for Reading with 12% believing it was not a problem at all. 92% agreed with the restrictions that were being consulted on and 90% believed that this should be introduced borough wide.

Between March and October 2017 there were 87 reports of motorbike nuisance to the police. During the consultation with partners it was identified that there are a number of areas that are particularly affected by this behaviour, which may reflect the lower number of people who believed this was a problem.

Partners highlighted that there were already a number of powers available to the police to tackle this type of nuisance.

Comments from the consultation:

*"We have had incidents of youths riding these bikes in our area it's very unsafe for pedestrians especially children"*

*"Rose kiln lane has a motorbike epidemic especially late at night or early morning (11 pm-4am) with overly loud and obnoxious motor engine noise. This should fix that."*

*"Although I support this motion I am not aware of any specific problem"*

**Recommendation**

Whilst a majority supported the proposed restrictions, only around 40% of those who responded to the consultation believed this to be a serious problem in Reading. On reflection and further discussion with partners, the inclusion of the restrictions in the PSPO would not provide any additional benefit not conferred by the range of powers already available to the Police. The challenges presented by this type of ASB are not due to an absence of appropriate powers. There are challenges both with identifying individuals on vehicles which do not carry license plates and issues associated with safely giving chase. It is therefore recommended that this restriction is **not** included within the order as it is not considered.

4.13 **Mooring Restriction:**

The following restriction was consulted on:

1. No person shall moor any boat or amphibious craft to any land without the consent of the landowner, or managing authority, or breach any condition imposed by the land owner or managing authority.

Evidence of need

Only 17% believed this was **not** a problem for Reading, whilst only 14% believed it to be a problem. Many of those who responded to the consultation had no view on this issue. This may reflect that the impact is limited to those who live along or use the river. Despite this 77% still said they supported the restriction being proposed, with 74% of those believing it should cover the whole borough.

The local authority has recently introduced a pilot enforcement scheme to control mooring on local authority controlled land.

Comments:

*"Not affected me at all"*

*"There are mooring areas in RDG - but like parking spaces people take advantage."*

*"Moorings are abused along stretches of the Thames & Kennet and need to be regularised to prevent rubbish dumping and ASB."*

**Recommendation**

Whilst accepting that illegal mooring and the associated ASB impacts on those living on or around the river, the numbers of those reporting it as a problem was low. Alongside this the local authority has already introduced an enforcement scheme to restrict this activity and prevent illegal mooring and the abuse of the temporary moorings available in the town (overstaying inhibits leisure use of these). The enforcement action being taken has begun to

reduce the impact of ASB that can be associated with some illegal mooring. Further enforcement is being considered where this is still a problem. After consultation with partner agencies it was felt that the current enforcement powers through this scheme should be sufficient. We will however continue to review the effectiveness of the current enforcement scheme.

It is recommended that this restriction is not included within the order.

## 5 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Whilst having an order in place will deter some ASB, there will be a need to enforce the restrictions. Following discussion with both Reading Borough Council services and the Police, and based on current delegated authorities, the main responsibilities for enforcing the restrictions would be as follows:

- Begging Restriction – Thames Valley Police
- Busking Restriction – Environmental Protection/Streetcare (RBC)
- Dog Control Restriction – Environmental Protection (RBC)
- Drug Activity Restriction – Thames Valley Police
- Street Drinking – Thames Valley Police
- Litter Restriction – Streetcare (RBC)

5.2 These new restrictions would be introduced at a time when both the Local Authority and the Police have reducing numbers of officers in a position to enforce them. The consultation with partners identified that it will not be possible to enforce all of the restrictions all of the time. It will be necessary to prioritise enforcement based on severity and need, whilst acknowledging that failing to enforce the orders may result in complaints from the public.

5.3 There will also be a requirement for the Local Authority's Legal Service to take action against non-payment of fines or persistent breaching of the restrictions. Other areas have not had a major problem with non-payment of fines. Oxford, who have had a similar PSPO in place since February 2016, have so far not had any non-payment of fines.

## 6 LEGAL

6.1 The Council may make a Public Spaces Protection Order where it is satisfied on reasonable grounds that activities carried on in a public place have had a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality, or that it is likely that activities will be carried on in a public place and that they will have a detrimental effect. In addition, the Council must be satisfied that the effect of the activities is persistent or continuing, that the activities are unreasonable, and that the effect justifies the restrictions imposed by the notice. The order may prohibit specified things being done, and/or require specified things to be done by persons carrying on specified activities.

## 7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 Other than the cost identified under section 5 above, the main cost involved in the introduction would be associated with the production and fitting of the

signage for the orders within the restricted areas. If it estimated that the cost of this signage will be around £5,000, however until the PSPO has been fully agreed my HNL Committee, including the area any new order will cover it is difficult to put an exact figure to this cost. Cost could be met from within the current Safer Communities capital budget.

## 8. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INFORMATION

8.1 A consultation was carried out between 1st December 2017 and 22nd January 2018 and was carried out both online, face to face and via drop in sessions. There were 685 replies to the consultation.

## 9. EQUALITIES ASSESSMENT

9.1 A pre-equalities impact assessment did not identify that the introduction of the PSPO would adversely impact on any of the groups covered by the equalities act.

9.2 The removal of the mooring restriction means that the bargee community will not be directly impacted by the PSPO.

9.3 It was identified that some of those begging or street drinking may have mental health concerns. A case management group of officers from the Police, Council and support services meet on a two weekly basis to discuss vulnerable individuals amongst the street population. The support needs of each individual are considered including their housing situation, physical and mental health needs. An appropriate plan is put in place to seek to move people off the streets and into accommodation and support. Where engagement with the large number of local support services fails, enforcement action may be taken as determined by the panel. This approach balances the needs of the individual, principally substance misuse, physical and mental health concerns, with the need to tackle anti-social behaviour, respond effectively to complaints from the public and take action against illegal activities. None of the people case managed by the panel is a child. Any child identified would be dealt with under the Police and Council's safeguarding policies.

## 10. CONTRIBUTION TO STRATEGIC AIMS

10.1 The introduction of any PSPO will contribute towards the following strategic aims:

1. Safeguarding and protecting those that are most vulnerable;
2. Keeping the town clean, safe, green and active.

## 12. BACKGROUND PAPERS

12.1 Report to Housing, Neighbourhood and Leisure Committee: Anti-Social Behaviour and Public Space Protection Orders dated 15th November 2017.

**Appendix A – Consultation Questions**

**Introduction**

**What is your name? (Responses can be provided anonymously)**

Name

**What is your email address? (Only provide if you wish to receive feedback on the outcome of the consultation)**

Email

**What is your organisation? (if applicable)**

Organisation

**About you**

Please select all that apply:

I live in the Reading Borough Area □

I live outside the Reading Borough Area □

I work in the Reading Borough Area □

I am a visitor to the Reading Borough Area □

Thinking about the town of Reading overall how much of a problem do you think each of the following are? (please tick)

| | A very big problem | A fairly big problem | Not a very big problem | Not a problem at all | No opinion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aggressive Begging | | | | | |
| Nuisance Busking | | | | | |
| Drug taking | | | | | |
| Dog Control & Dog Fouling | | | | | |
| Public urination & defecation | | | | | |
| Street drinking | | | | | |
| Litter relating to personal belongings | | | | | |
| Motorbike nuisance | | | | | |
| Illegal Mooring | | | | | |

**Begging Restriction**

We are proposing the following conditions to tackle aggressive begging in Reading:

· No person shall aggressively beg. Aggressively begging includes begging near a cash machine or begging in a manner reasonably perceived to be intimidating or aggressive.

· No person shall make any verbal, non-verbal or written request from a standing, sitting or lying-down position for money, donations or goods – including the placing of hats or containers.

· No person shall sell any magazine which is already a free publication in Reading Town Centre. This restriction would not apply to anyone selling the Big Issue and who is officially "badged" to do so.

Do you support the proposed conditions?

Please select only one item

Yes □ No □

Please give your reasons why:

Do you think these conditions should cover the whole borough?

Please select only one item

Yes □ No □

If you answered no, please specify ward (s), Road Name (s) or parks/open space(s) which you think the conditions should cover:

**Busking Restriction**

We are proposing the following condition to tackle nuisance busking in Reading:

- No person shall perform any type of street entertainment (also known as busking, which includes amplified or unamplified music & singing) that may cause a nuisance to nearby premises or members of the public within Reading Town Centre. This includes obstructing the highway or shop entrances, using street furniture including public seats, lamp posts, statues and railings, unless registered to do so by Reading UK CIC.

Do you support the proposed condition?

Please select only one item

Yes □ No □

Please give your reasons why:

Do you think this condition should cover the whole borough?

Please select only one item

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you answered no, please specify ward (s), Road Name (s) or parks/open space(s) which you think the conditions should cover:

**Dog Control Restrictions**

We are proposing the following conditions to tackle dog control issues and dog fouling in Reading:

Any person in charge of a dog within the restricted area shall be in breach of the order if they:

- Allow a dog to foul in a public place and then fail to remove the waste and dispose of it in an appropriate receptacle.
- Do not comply with a direction given to him/her by an authorised officer of the authority to put and keep the dog on a fixed lead unless a) he/she has reasonable excuse for failing to do so; or b) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his/her failing to do so; c) an authorised officer of the Authority may only give a direction under this order to put and keep a dog on a fixed lead if such a restraint is reasonably necessary to prevent a nuisance or behaviour by the dog likely to cause annoyance or disturbance to any person (on any land to which this order applies) or the worrying or disturbance of any animal or bird.
- A person must not take more than four (4) dogs at the same time onto the land detailed, unless – (a) s/he has a reasonable excuse for failing to do so; or (b) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his failing to do so.

Do you support the proposed condition?

Please select only one item

Yes ☐ No ☐

Please give your reasons why:

Do you think this condition should cover the whole borough?

Please select only one item

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you answered no, please specify ward (s), Road Name (s) or parks/open space(s) which you think the conditions should cover:

**Drug Activity Restriction**

We are proposing the following condition to tackle drug related activity in Reading:

- No person shall ingest, inhale, inject, smoke, possess or otherwise use intoxicating substances in a public place.

(Intoxicating Substances is given the following definition: any Psychoactive Substances i.e. substances with the capacity to stimulate or depress the central nervous system, excluding alcohol. Alcohol would be covered separately in the Street Drinking Restriction)

Do you support the proposed condition?

Please select only one item

Yes □ No □

Please give your reasons why:

Do you think this condition should cover the whole borough?

Please select only one item

Yes □ No □

If you answered no, please specify ward (s), Road Name (s) or parks/open space(s) which you think the conditions should cover:

**Public Urination and Defecation Restriction**

We are proposing the following condition to tackle public urination and defecation:

- No person shall urinate or defecate in a public place.

Do you support the proposed condition?

Please select only one item

Yes □ No □

Please give your reasons why:

Do you think this condition should cover the whole borough?

Please select only one item

Yes □ No □

If you answered no, please specify ward (s), Road Name (s) or parks/open space(s) which you think the conditions should cover:

**Street Drinking Restriction**

We are proposing the following condition to tackle street drinking in Reading:

- No person shall refuse to stop drinking alcohol or hand over any containers (sealed or unsealed) which are believed to contain alcohol when required to do so by an authorised officer in order to prevent public nuisance or disorder.

Exemptions shall apply in cases where for the avoidance of doubt the consumption of alcohol is on premises or public space licensed under the Licensing Act 2003.

Do you support the proposed condition?

Please select only one item

Yes ☐ No ☐

Please give your reasons why:

Do you think this condition should cover the whole borough?

Please select only one item

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you answered no, please specify ward (s), Road Name (s) or parks/open space(s) which you think the conditions should cover:

**Litter Restriction**

We are proposing the following condition to tackle littering associated with personal belongings in Reading:

- No person shall, for any duration of time, leave unattended in a public area any personal effects or belongings or any other material or paraphernalia including anything that may be considered discarded or waste material.

Do you support the proposed condition?

Please select only one item

Yes ☐ No ☐

Please give your reasons why:

Do you think this condition should cover the whole borough?

Please select only one item

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you answered no, please specify ward (s), Road Name (s) or parks/open space(s) which you think the conditions should cover:

**Motorbike Nuisance Restriction**

We are proposing the following condition to tackle motorbike nuisance in Reading:

- The effect of the Order is to prohibit the use of a mechanically propelled vehicle, intended or adapted for use on roads, in a way that has caused or may be capable of causing a nuisance and annoyance anywhere on public land within the Restricted Area.

Do you support the proposed condition?

Please select only one item

Yes ☐ No ☐

Please give your reasons why:

Do you think this condition should cover the whole borough?

Please select only one item

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you answered no, please specify ward (s), Road Name (s) or parks/open space(s) which you think the conditions should cover:

**Illegal Mooring Restriction**

We are proposing the following condition to tackle illegal mooring in Reading:

- No person shall moor any boat or amphibious craft to any land without the consent of the land owner, or managing authority, or breach any conditions imposed by the land owner or managing authority,

Note: There is currently a pilot scheme to manage mooring on local authority land. The PSPO restriction will be reviewed if the pilot is successful.

Do you support the proposed condition?

Please select only one item

Yes ☐ No ☐

Please give your reasons why:

Do you think this condition should cover the whole borough?

Please select only one item

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you answered no, please specify ward (s), Road Name (s) or parks/open space(s) which you think the conditions should cover:

Appendix B - PSPO Consultation results.

**Total number of respondents:** 685

Introduction question responses:

**About You:**

Total number of responses: 683

| Option | Total responses | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| I live in the Reading Borough Area | 494 | 72.12% |
| I live outside the Reading Borough Area | 109 | 15.91% |
| I working in the Reading Borough Area | 305 | 44.53% |
| I am a visitor to the Reading Borough Area | 21 | 3.07% |
| Not answered | 2 | 0.29% |

N.B. This was a multiple response question.

**Thinking about the town of Reading, Overall, how much of a problem to you think each of the following are:**

Total number of responses: 683

| | A very big problem | A fairly big problem | Not a very big problem | Not a problem at all | No opinion | Not answered |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Begging total | 241 | 241 | 160 | 31 | 6 | 6 |
| Begging % | 35.18% | 35.18% | 23.36% | 4.526% | 0.8759% | 0.8759% |
| Nuisance busking total | 56 | 115 | 300 | 186 | 18 | 10 |
| Nuisance busking % | 8.175% | 16.79 | 43.80% | 27.15 | 2.628% | 1.460% |
| Drug taking total | 296 | 243 | 79 | 19 | 40 | 8 |
| Drug taking % | 43.21% | 35.47% | 11.53% | 2.774% | 5.839% | 1.168% |
| Dog control & fouling total | 100 | 189 | 284 | 71 | 34 | 7 |
| Dog control & fouling % | 14.60% | 27.59% | 41.46% | 10.36% | 4.964% | 1.022% |
| Public urination & defecation total | 125 | 217 | 239 | 50 | 48 | 6 |
| Public urination & defecation % | 18.25% | 31.68% | 34.89% | 7.299% | 7.007% | 0.8759% |
| Street Drinking total | 188 | 256 | 166 | 43 | 24 | 8 |
| Street Drinking % | 27.45% | 37.37% | 24.23% | 6.277% | 3.504% | 1.168% |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Litter relating to personal belongings total | 263 | 232 | 128 | 30 | 25 | 7 |
| Litter relating to personal belongings % | 38.39% | 33.87% | 18.69% | 4.380% | 3.650% | 1.022% |
| Motorbike nuisance total | 101 | 163 | 242 | 94 | 77 | 8 |
| Motorbike nuisance % | 14.74% | 23.80% | 35.33% | 13.72% | 11.24% | 1.168% |
| Illegal mooring total | 36 | 62 | 156 | 128 | 294 | 8 |
| Illegal mooring % | 5.255% | 9.051% | 22.77% | 18.69% | 42.92% | 1.314& |

| | Do you agree with the proposed condition Total | | | Do you agree with the proposed condition % | | | Do you think the conditions cover the whole borough Total | | | Do you think the conditions cover the whole borough & | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | N/A | Yes | No | N/A | Yes | No | N/A | Yes | No | N/A |
| Begging | 542 | 140 | 3 | 79.12 | 20.44 | 0.4380 | 554 | 119 | 12 | 80.88 | 17.37 | 1.752 |
| Nuisance busking | 416 | 261 | 8 | 60.73 | 38.10 | 1.168 | 427 | 221 | 37 | 62.34 | 32.26 | 5.401 |
| Drug taking | 617 | 59 | 9 | 90.07 | 8.613 | 1.314 | 613 | 52 | 20 | 89.49 | 7.591 | 2.920 |
| Dog control & fouling | 620 | 58 | 7 | 90.51 | 8.467 | 1.022 | 606 | 62 | 17 | 88.47 | 0.051 | 2.482 |
| Public urination/defecation | 624 | 56 | 5 | 91.09 | 8.175 | 0.7299 | 604 | 56 | 25 | 88.18 | 8.175 | 3.560 |
| Litter relating to personal belongings | 593 | 83 | 9 | 86.57 | 12.12 | 1.314 | 568 | 87 | 30 | 82.92 | 12.70 | 4.380 |
| Motorbike nuisance | 612 | 61 | 12 | 89.34 | 8.905 | 1.752 | 596 | 59 | 30 | 87.01 | 8.613 | 4.380 |
| Illegal mooring | 495 | 132 | 58 | 72.26 | 19.27 | 8.467 | 484 | 115 | 86 | 70.66 | 16.79 | 12.55 |