

NOTICE OF MEETING

CABINET MEMBER SIGNING

Friday, 15th July, 2016, 12.00 pm - Civic Centre, High Road, Wood Green, N22 8LE

Members: Councillor Eugene Ayisi (Chair)

Quorum: 1

1. **FILMING AT MEETINGS**

Please note that this meeting may be filmed or recorded by the Council for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site or by anyone attending the meeting using any communication method. Although we ask members of the public recording, filming or reporting on the meeting not to include the public seating areas, members of the public attending the meeting should be aware that we cannot guarantee that they will not be filmed or recorded by others attending the meeting. Members of the public participating in the meeting (e.g. making deputations, asking questions, making oral protests) should be aware that they are likely to be filmed, recorded or reported on.

By entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings.

The chair of the meeting has the discretion to terminate or suspend filming or recording, if in his or her opinion continuation of the filming, recording or reporting would disrupt or prejudice the proceedings, infringe the rights of any individual or may lead to the breach of a legal obligation by the Council.

2. **URGENT BUSINESS**

The Cabinet Member will advise of any items they have decided to take as urgent business.

3. **ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR, CRIME AND POLICING ACT 2014 - REQUEST TO APPROVE PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER - ST ANN'S AND TOTTENHAM GREEN WARDS (PAGES 1 - 100)**

The report will seek Cabinet Member approval for the introduction and implementation of a Public Spaces Protection Order in the surrounding area of the Wickes store on Seven Sisters Road in South Tottenham, following an eight week public consultation period.

4. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any items of Urgent Business admitted under Item 2 above.

Philip Slawther
Principal Committee Coordinator
Tel – 020 8489 2957
Fax – 020 8881 5218
Email: philip.slawther2@haringey.gov.uk

Bernie Ryan
Assistant Director – Corporate Governance and Monitoring Officer
River Park House, 225 High Road, Wood Green, N22 8HQ

Thursday, 07 July 2016

Report for: Cabinet Member Signing – 15th July 2016

Item number: 3

Title: Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 – Request to approve Public Spaces Protection Order – St Ann's and Tottenham Green wards

Report authorised by : Tracie Evans, Chief Operating Officer

Lead Officer: Eubert Malcom Head of Community Safety & Regulatory Services.

Ward(s) affected: St Ann's and Tottenham Green

**Report for Key/
Non Key Decision:** Key

1. Describe the issue under consideration

This report provides the Cabinet member for Communities with the findings of the statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) for St Ann's and Tottenham Green wards and seeks approval for the introduction of the PSPO.

2. Cabinet Member Introduction

The issue of men gathering outside Wickes on Seven Sisters Road has been a problem for a number of years. Regular complaints are made to the police and Council Officers with regard to this activity and the resulting ASB afflicting the local area.

The results of the consultation carried out earlier this year clearly demonstrated that residents and businesses within the locality are frustrated with this situation and overwhelmingly supportive of the use of the PSPO to try and tackle this historical problem. As Cabinet member for Communities I am therefore supportive of the proposals contained within this report and agree that it is the only option going forward to address the ASB issues and improve the quality of life for people living and working in the affected area.

3. Recommendations

3.1 That the Cabinet member for Communities:

- I. Approves the introduction and implementation of a PSPO in the draft attached at Appendix 3, having taken into account the EQIA at Appendix 5, for a period of 12 months effective from 1st August 2016.

II. Notes the Enforcement Plan at Appendix 6.

4. Reasons for decision

- 4.1 Over a long period of time the Council and its partners have undertaken various measures and activities to tackle the Anti Social Behaviour (ASB) issues that blight residents' lives; these issues are all associated with the men who gather at Wickes. Due to the limited success of various measures and activities undertaken, it is considered by officers, that an effective deterrent will be the use of the new tools and powers available under the Antisocial Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.

5. Alternative options considered

Not to follow through with the PSPO, after a period of community feedback regarding the ASB being caused, and in light of the results of the Consultation this option is not considered appropriate. It is considered that the proposed PSPO provides the flexibility to address the dynamics of the problems being encountered. A PSPO allows council's to tailor prohibitions and requirements to deal with the specific behaviour causing negative effects on the community.

6. Background information

- 6.1 A report was presented to Cabinet on 9 January 2016, which made members aware of the new legislation available to local authorities in relation to PSPO, namely the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. Cabinet authorised entering into a period of statutory consultation with regards to the introduction of the PSPO. The Consultation ran for 8 weeks from 22nd February to 18th April 2016
- 6.2 Please refer to the Cabinet report from 9 January 2016 (Appendix 2) for background information in regards to the original proposal.
- 6.3 The purpose of the consultation was to ask the public to consider whether they would support the introduction of a PSPO within the proposed boundaries and in accordance with the proposed prohibitions and requirements.

The consultation sought to reach key audiences namely:

- Residents living in the proposed designated area. Approximately 1000 residential premises were contacted in writing, with a door knocking exercise. Officers also attended residents' meetings and a Ward Panel meeting, as well as facilitated public consultation meetings.
- Eastern Europeans - In recognition of the impact that the PSPO is likely to have on the Eastern European men who hang around outside Wickes, coupled with their unlikely access to the internet where the PSPO was publicised, direct engagement was undertaken with this group assisted by interpreters.

- Businesses and people working or visiting the affected area - Public consultation was also carried out with businesses and people working or visiting the affected area.

6.4 The summary findings from the consultation are attached at Appendix 4

6.5 The Public consultation involved a questionnaire with 4 key questions and an additional comments section after each question (see Appendix 1 for an original copy of the questionnaire). The questionnaire was available both as an on line and paper questionnaire. Questions were formulated to ascertain the extent to which the local community agree or disagree with the following:-

- i. That the terms of the PSPO are clear
- ii. The behaviours prohibited in the PSPO
- iii. The boundary area of the PSPO
- iv. The gating of the alleyway between Roslyn and Southey Road

The questionnaire also sought to ascertain the impact of restricting access to the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road.

6.6 The outcome presented an overwhelming support for the implementation of the PSPO, which now together with previously circulated evidence forms the basis to approving the PSPO, namely;

- 94% (446) Agreed that the terms of the proposed public spaces protection order are clear. 6% either said no or didn't know.
- 91% (432) Agreed with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities. 6% said no and 3% didn't know.
- 82% (389) Agreed with the proposed PSPO boundary area. 10% said no and 5% didn't know.
- 77% (365) Agreed with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road. 8% said no 13% didn't know.

6.7 The feedback through the consultation process highlighted a demand that the PSPO be extended to include the Stonebridge Estate; which was identified as having similar ASB issues. In discussion with partners it was also agreed that the PSPO boundary be amended to follow natural boundaries. This would make it easier for members of the public to understand the boundary of PSPO area and provide clarity for enforcement. The map showing the amended PSPO boundary can be found at Appendix 3.

6.8 The council has consulted with the police from the onset of considering the use of a PSPO to tackle to ASB in the area. This consultation has continued at each stage of the process and there is complete support from the Police in respect of the proposed restrictions, boundary and implementation of PSPO.

- 6.9 Should the Cabinet member decide to proceed with the implementation of the PSPO an Enforcement Plan has been drafted in consultation with partners. The Cabinet member is asked to note the draft Enforcement Plan at Appendix 6, which outlines a partnership approach to monitoring the area with input from the Tottenham Green SNT, St Ann's & Harringay SNT, Tactical Enforcement, Wickes, Kingdom Litter Enforcement Team and ASBAT, with additional targeted support from Immigration, Thamesreach and other relevant intervention & support services as and when required.

7 Implications for local people/service users

- 7.1 The introduction of a PSPO following the period of consultation would aim to improve the quality of life and experience for all residents, businesses and visitors to the area.
- 7.2 The proposed term of the order would prohibit certain activities locally, therefore some local people may feel negatively impacted by the introduction of such an order. The intention of the consultation period was to gauge the public mood pertaining to a PSPO and the behaviour it would prohibit in order to demonstrate that the impact would be broadly positive for local people and service users.
- 7.3 The findings of the consultation would appear to show an overwhelming support for the introduction of measures to address these behaviours.
- 7.4 It is recommended to the Cabinet member that a PSPO should be put in place to tackle this problem and the resulting ASB, with the following prohibitions, boundaries and restrictions:-

A. Prohibitions

- Congregating in a group of two or more persons in such a manner as to cause obstruction or give reasonable grounds for annoyance to any person in the street or public place or the car park of Wickes Store
- Persistently loitering in a street or public place or the car park of Wickes Store
- For a person in the street, public place or Wickes Car park, including a person in a motor vehicle to solicit another for the purpose of obtaining casual labour
- Urinating, defecating or exposing genitals in a public place or in an area belonging to a private resident, business or the council (excluding a toilet designated for use by members of the public).
- Consuming alcohol or having an open container of alcohol in your possession in the street or public place or the Wickes Car Park.
- Consuming alcohol or having an open container of alcohol in your possession in the street or public place or the Wickes Car Park.

B. Boundaries

The land in relation to which this Order should apply is that land in the area of the London Borough of Haringey, namely which

- a. Is delineated and shown in red on **Map 1** (in Appendix 3)
- b. Includes the roads: Kerswell Close, Victoria Crescent, Culvert Road, Russell Road, Elizabeth Road, Southey Road, Greenfield Road, Birstall Road, Brunswick Road, Brunswick Road Park, Suffield Road, Westerfield Road, Braemar Road, Kirkton Road, Lomond Close, Watts Close, part of Seaford Road, West Green Road (between Kirkton Road and High Road), Parts of Seven Sisters Road, Wickes Store and Wickes Store Car Park.

C. Restrictions

The PSPO restrict by erecting gates, the use of the public right of way between Roslyn Road and Southey Road; an area which is blighted with drug taking, people urinating and defecating

8. Contribution to strategic outcomes

- 8.1 The PSPO will support/link to the priority outcomes of the Corporate Plan 2015/18 in a number of ways as outlined in the report to Cabinet on 9th January 2016. The results of the consultation demonstrate that the local community and partners overwhelmingly agree with the PSPO as a means for improving our environment, reducing crime enabling residents and traders to feel safe and proud of where they live and work.
- 8.2. Implementation of the PSPO will involve a collaboration between various services within the Council, the police, Homes for Haringey, Thamesreach, Immigration and Custom Enforcement (ICE), support services such as HAGA and other agencies as appropriate. Working together to tackle existing ASB and prevent escalation to more serious crime and violence.
- 8.3. An improvement to the area both in terms of cleaner and safer environment will contribute to the sustainability and growth of housing and business; through the quality of homes, inclusivity of neighbourhoods and improved quality of life in the area.
- 8.4. Please refer to the cabinet report from 9 January 2016 (Appendix 2) for details of the Corporate Plan 2015/18 priorities supported

Statutory Officers comments (Chief Finance Officer (including procurement), Assistant Director of Corporate Governance, Equalities)

9 Finance and Procurement

- 9.1 The costs of the consultation exercise were met from within existing budgets. The costs for the implementation of the PSPO will also be funded from existing budget provisions of Community Safety & Regulatory Services (any income

arising (expected to be less than £5K pa) would be used to support enforcement activity.

- 9.2 The gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road are to be met through Highways budget.

10 Legal

- 10.1 A PSPO may be made if the Council is satisfied on reasonable grounds that;

Activities carried on in a public place within the Borough either have had or it is likely that they will have, a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality;

It is likely that the detrimental effect will be persistent, and such as to make the activities unreasonable;

The effect or likely effect is such as to justify the restrictions imposed by the proposed PSPO.

- 10.2 Section 72 (1) of the 2014 Act requires that in deciding whether to make a PSPO and, if so, what it should include, the Council must have particular regard to the rights of freedom of expression and freedom of assembly and association set out in articles 10 and 11 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms ("the Convention"). Whilst acknowledging that the proposed Order potentially entails an infringement of individuals' human rights, including the right to respect for private life and potentially the right to freedom of assembly and association, it is considered that these qualified rights may in this instance be legitimately interfered with in the interests of public safety, the prevention of crime and disorder and in accordance with the law.

- 10.3 Once it has been made the council must also publish the PSPO on its website; and erect notices on or adjacent to the public place to which the order relates to draw the attention of any member of the public using that place to (i) the fact that the order has been made and (ii) the effect of that order being made,

- 10.5 PSPOs can be enforced by a police officer, police community support officer, and council officers, and a breach of a PSPO is a criminal offence that can be dealt with through the issuing of a fixed penalty notice or a fine.

- 10.7. The implementation of the PSPO can be challenged by any interested person within 6 weeks of the making of the Order, the challenge is made at the High Court. Anyone who is directly affected by the making of the PSPO can challenge the order. A challenge can be made on the basis that the Council does not have the power to make the order, or that the particular prohibitions or requirements are unnecessary or that procedurally the order is defective.

11 Equality

11.1 The Council has a public sector equality duty under the Equalities Act (2010) to have due regard to;

- i. Tackle discrimination and victimisation of persons that share the characteristics protected under S4 of the Act (age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation);
- ii. Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not;
- iii. foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.

11.2 The PSPO will place restrictions on activities that can be undertaken within the designated area. Consultation on the PSPO was therefore undertaken with as many of the people living and working in the area as possible. An Equalities Impact Assessment has also been completed and is attached to this report at Appendix 5.

11.2 The introduction of a PSPO in the locality of Wickes Store, Seven Sisters Road N15 has the potential to have a positive impact on the Council's duty under the Equality Act 2010 to foster good relations between communities. It will tackle antisocial behaviour which has the potential to create tensions between different communities. The outcome presented an overwhelming support for the implementation of the PSPO.

11.3 The PSPO will apply to all individuals committing antisocial behaviour within the designated area, without discrimination. However, the nature of current ASB issues within the area indicates that this will impact predominantly on Eastern European men who currently loiter in the area waiting for work. There was direct engagement with this group to obtain their views and concerns, and to explain the PSPO and their rights. It has been agreed that further engagement will be undertaken with this group prior to implementation of the PSPO, in particular to communicate the terms of the PSPO and repercussions of breaching the order.

12 Use of Appendices

- Appendix 1 Copy of the Consultation Questionnaire
- Appendix 2 Copy of the report to Cabinet on 9 January 2016
- Appendix 3 Copy of the draft PSPO
- Appendix 4 Findings of the Public Consultation
- Appendix 5 Equalities Impact Assessment
- Appendix 6 Enforcement Plan

13 Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Anti-social behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014

This page is intentionally left blank

Enviromental Services & Community Safety

Eubert Malcolm Head of Community Safety & Regulatory Services



Date: **February 2016**

Public Spaces Protection Order Consultation

Dear Local Resident or Business

We want your views on whether we should introduce a new order to tackle anti-social behaviour in your area.

We are aware of concerns from residents about anti-social behaviour, particularly outside Wickes Superstore and in the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road.

A Public Spaces Protection Order would give the police and council more powers to take action against those responsible for this activity. It would also involve restricting access to the alleyway by installing a lockable gate.

We want your views on whether you agree with the proposal, if you would like any alterations to the proposed PSPO and what impact the order may have on you, the local area or local people.

Have a look at the information sheet overleaf and help let us know your views by filling in the questionnaire which is available on-line at **www.haringey.gov.uk/pspo-consultation**

We will also be visiting properties in the area over the next couple of weeks to hand-deliver the questionnaire and answer any questions you may have. Alternatively come along to one of our public consultation meetings as detailed on the attached information sheet to discuss your concerns with council officers and the police or complete the questionnaire.

You can also contact Joan Appavoo on 0208 489 3980 or Allison Pibworth on 0208 489 4620 for more information. Or email us at **asbat@haringey.gov.uk**

Yours sincerely

Eubert Malcolm
Head of Service
Community Safety & Regulatory Services

**Community Safety &
Regulatory Services**

Level 5, Alexandra House
10 Station Road
London
N22 7TR

T 020 8489 5520

F 020 8489 2288

www.haringey.gov.uk

What is a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO)?

A PSPO is a new provision created by the 2014 Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act.

It means restrictions and requirements can be placed on an area where activities have or are likely to have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of local people.

In this case, the PSPO would restrict:

- Congregating in a group of two or more persons in such a manner as to cause obstruction or give reasonable grounds for annoyance to any person in the street or public place or the car park of Wickes store
- Persistently loitering in a street or public place or the car park of Wickes store
- For a person in the street, public place or Wickes car park, including a person in a motor vehicle, to solicit another for the purpose of obtaining casual labour
- Consuming alcohol or having an open container of alcohol in your possession in the street or public place or the Wickes car park
- Anti-social behaviour, such as urinating in a public place or private property, or other unacceptable or offensive behaviour
- Public access to the footpath that runs between Roslyn Road and Southey Road

Anyone who breaches the order could face being arrested.

The council and police have already tried a number of things to try and tackle this issue, including enforcement and engagement with those responsible, and we believe we have now exhausted all other options.

Proposed Area

The PSPO would cover Kerswell Close, Victoria Crescent, Culvert Road, Russell Road, Elizabeth Road, Southey Road, Greenfield Road, Birstall Road, Brunswick Road, Brunswick Road Park, Suffield Road, Westerfield Road, Parts of Seven Sisters Road, Wickes Store Car Park.

For a map of the proposed area, more details on a PSPO and why we are consulting visit:

www.haringey.gov.uk/pspo-consultation

Public Consultation Meetings

The Activity Room, St Ann's Library, Cissbury Road N15:

- Wednesday 2nd March at 4.30pm – 6.30pm
- Friday 4th March at 4pm – 6pm
- Tuesday 8th March at 4pm – 6pm

College of Haringey, Enfield and North East London, High Road N15:

- Thursday 3rd March at 7pm – 9pm

Public Spaces Protection Order Consultation Questionnaire

We want your views on whether we should introduce a new order to tackle anti-social behaviour in your area. Please take a few minutes to complete this short survey.

Please return no later than **Monday 18th April 2016**

The Public Spaces Protection Order will restrict the following activities:

- Congregating in a group of 2 or more persons in such a manner as to cause obstruction or give reasonable grounds for annoyance to any person in the street or public place or the car park of Wickes Store
- Persistently loitering in a street or public place or the car park of Wickes Store, for the purposes of offering services e.g. as a prostitute, casual labour
- For a person in the street, public place or Wickes Car park, including a person in a motor vehicle to solicit another for the purpose of obtaining casual labour
- Urinating, Defecating or exposing genitals in a public place or in a area belonging to a private resident, business or the council (excluding a toilet designated for use by members of the public)
- Consuming alcohol or having an open container of alcohol in your possession in the street or public place or the Wickes Car Park
- Public access to the footpath that runs between Roslyn Road and Southey Road

Q1a. Do you agree that the terms of the proposed public spaces protection order are clear?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ I don't know

Q1b. If you answered no, how could the terms be made clearer?


Q2a. Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ I don't know

Q2b. If you answered No, please tell us the reason for your answer:

The areas covered by the Order

The following map shows the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary: (as outlined in red)



Q3a. Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ I don't know

Q3b. Are there any changes you would make to the proposed boundary?

Q4a. Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ I don't know

Q4b. Do you live in a property that joins or is next to the footpath

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ I don't know

Q4c. If access to the alleyway was restricted, what impact would this have on you?

Q4d. Would you be able to use an alternative route?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ I don't know

Q5. If you have any general comments around the proposals please tell us below:

About you

Are you a:

- ☐ Resident
☐ Local Business
☐ Work in the area

Please specify any other:

.....

.....

.....

.....

Please write in your full postcode

.....

1. Age Please tick one box

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 0-4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5-7 | <input type="checkbox"/> 8-9 | <input type="checkbox"/> 10-11 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 12-15 | <input type="checkbox"/> 16-17 | <input type="checkbox"/> 18-20 | <input type="checkbox"/> 21-24 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 25-29 | <input type="checkbox"/> 30-44 | <input type="checkbox"/> 45-59 | <input type="checkbox"/> 60-64 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 65-74 | <input type="checkbox"/> 75-84 | <input type="checkbox"/> 85-89 | <input type="checkbox"/> 90 and over |

2. Disability

Under the Equality Act 2010, a person is considered to have a disability if she/he has a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on her/his ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities. Haringey Council accepts the social model of disability. However, in order to be able to identify and respond to your specific needs, it is important that we know what kind of disability you have.

Do you have any of the following conditions which have lasted or expected to last for at least 12 months?

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Deafness or partial loss of hearing | <input type="checkbox"/> Blindness or partial loss of sight | <input type="checkbox"/> Learning disability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Developmental disorder | <input type="checkbox"/> Mental ill health | <input type="checkbox"/> Long term illness or condition |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Physical disability | <input type="checkbox"/> Other disabilities | <input type="checkbox"/> No disabilities |

3. Ethnicity Please tick the box that best describes your ethnic group

- | White | Black or Black British |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> British | <input type="checkbox"/> African |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Irish | <input type="checkbox"/> Caribbean |

White Other <input type="checkbox"/> Turkish <input type="checkbox"/> Turkish/Cypriot <input type="checkbox"/> Kurdish <input type="checkbox"/> Gypsy/Roma <input type="checkbox"/> Irish Traveller <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify below):		Asian or Asian British <input type="checkbox"/> Indian <input type="checkbox"/> Pakistani <input type="checkbox"/> Bangladeshi <input type="checkbox"/> East African Asian <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify below):	
Mixed <input type="checkbox"/> White and Black African <input type="checkbox"/> White and Black Caribbean <input type="checkbox"/> White and Asian		Chinese or Other Ethnic Group <input type="checkbox"/> Chinese <input type="checkbox"/> Any other ethnic background (please specify):	
4. Sex Please tick the box that best describes you			
<input type="checkbox"/> Male		<input type="checkbox"/> Female	
5. Gender reassignment			
Does your gender differ from your birth sex?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say	
6. Religion Please tick as appropriate			
<input type="checkbox"/> Christian <input type="checkbox"/> Muslim <input type="checkbox"/> Jewish <input type="checkbox"/> Buddhist		<input type="checkbox"/> Hindu <input type="checkbox"/> Sikh <input type="checkbox"/> Rastafarian <input type="checkbox"/> No Religion <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say	
7. Sexual orientation Please tick the box that best describes your sexual orientation			
<input type="checkbox"/> Heterosexual	<input type="checkbox"/> Bisexual	<input type="checkbox"/> Gay	<input type="checkbox"/> Lesbian
<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say			
8. Pregnancy and maternity Please tick one box			
Are you pregnant?		Have you had a baby in the last 12 months?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

9. Marriage and Civil Partnership Please tick one box

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Single | <input type="checkbox"/> Married | <input type="checkbox"/> Co-habiting |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Separated | <input type="checkbox"/> Divorced | <input type="checkbox"/> Widowed |

10. Refugees and Asylum Seekers Are you?

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> A Refugee | <input type="checkbox"/> An Asylum Seeker |
|------------------------------------|---|

What country or region are you a refugee/asylum seeker from?

11. Language Please tick the box that best describes your language

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Albanian | <input type="checkbox"/> Arabic | <input type="checkbox"/> English |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lingala | <input type="checkbox"/> Somali | <input type="checkbox"/> Turkish |

Other (please specify):

.....

Closing date: 18th April 2016

Thank you for completing this questionnaire

Report for: Cabinet
Item number: 12

Title: Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 – Request to commence Public Space Protection Order Consultation - St Anns and Tottenham Green wards

Report authorised by : Stephen McDonnell AD Environmental Services & Community Safety



Lead Officer: Eubert Malcolm Head of Community Safety & Regulatory services – 020 8489 5520.

Ward(s) affected: St Anns and Tottenham Green

**Report for Key/
Non Key Decision:** Key

1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1 Since 2004, the Council, Police and other agencies have targeted resources, and used a variety of legislative measures, in an attempt to disperse and discourage groups of men from gathering and seeking illegal and unregulated work outside Wickes Store, Seven Sisters Road, N15. The gathering of these individuals has resulted in anti-social behaviour being perpetrated in the area, and in local streets and parks. The type of anti-social behaviour ranges from empty beer cans and rubbish being left in residents front gardens, to using the local area to take drugs, and to urinate and defecate in.
- 1.2 Cabinet is being asked to approve for consultation a Public Space Protection Order to tackle this anti-social behaviour.

2. Cabinet Member Introduction

- 2.1 The issue of men gathering outside Wickes on Seven Sisters Road has been a problem for quite a few years. As Cabinet Member for Communities I have received many complaints from residents about how intimidated they feel as they go about their business, as well as the antisocial behaviour associated with this issue. I am therefore fully supportive of the proposals contained in this report to control antisocial behaviour which has blighted residents for such a long time.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 That Cabinet, approves for consultation the draft Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) as contained in Appendix 2. The consultation will commence in accordance with section 72 of the Antisocial Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, with consultation to run, for a period of eight weeks.

4. Reasons for decision

- 4.1 As detailed further in this report, the Council and its partners have undertaken various measures and activities to tackle the Anti Social Behaviour (ASB) issues that blight residents' lives. These issues are all associated with the men who gather at Wickes. Due to the limited success of various measures and activities undertaken, it is considered by officers, that an effective deterrent will be the use of the new tools and powers available under the Antisocial Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.
- 4.2 The legislation allows for the use of penalties such as Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) and prosecution. It is proposed that, in order to support the legislation, targeted and sustained enforcement will be used from partners including: Haringey police, Police Partnership Team officers, immigration, British Transport police, Tactical Enforcement, Neighbourhood Action Team officers and ASBAT. It must be noted that there will be a financial cost should the authority wish to gate off an area blighted by ASB, and should the authority prosecute any of the perpetrators.

5. Alternative options considered

- 5.1 Not to pursue any PSPO. Given community feedback over many years, and the ASB being caused, this option is not considered appropriate.

6 Background

- 6.1 Since 2004, the Council, Police and other agencies have unsuccessfully targeted resources and used a variety of legislative measures in an attempt to disperse and discourage groups of men gathering and seeking illegal and unregulated work, which in turn, has resulted in anti-social behaviour being perpetrated in the area. A summary of activity is set out in appendix 1.

7 Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPOs)

- 7.1 A PSPO is a new provision, created by the 2014 Anti-Social behaviour, Crime and Policing Act, which is intended to deal with a particular nuisance or problem in a defined area that is detrimental to the local community's quality of life, by imposing conditions on the use of that area which will apply to everyone.
- 7.2 The aim of this power is to stop individuals or groups committing anti-social behaviour in public spaces. Restrictions and requirements can be placed on an area where activities have or are likely to have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of local people, is persistent or continuing in nature and is unreasonable. These can be blanket restrictions or requirements or can be targeted against

named behaviours by certain groups at particular times. The guidance is not specific about what can be included in a PSPO.

- 7.3 The potential use of a PSPO appears to be very broad and flexible to allow a Council to cover individual circumstances in its area. A PSPO can cover multiple restrictions so one order could prohibit such activities as the drinking of alcohol and keeping dogs on a lead. The PSPO can cover any publicly accessible space with the Council's area, including an area in private ownership to which the public have access.
- 7.4 Enforcement will be shared between the Council and the police. Breach of a requirement to desist in a particular activity is a criminal offence which can result in an FPN or a fine of up to £1,000 on conviction. Enforcement can be undertaken by Council officers, and other groups the Council may designate, but principally police officers and PCSOs. The police will additionally have the power of detention.
- 7.5 A PSPO will in time replace existing provision such as designated Public Place Orders (DPPOs), which give powers to stop the drinking of alcohol in public spaces, and Dog Control Orders. Under the new 2014 Act these will continue to be valid for a period of three years from the commencement of the new provision; so until about October 2017.
- 7.6 This is likely to be the Council's first PSPO and would provide good experience of operating a PSPO in good time before all the Council's existing DPPOs and its Borough-wide Dog Control Orders expire in 2017, there are no such orders in the area proposed for the PSPO.
- 7.7 By effectively using the new tools and powers available under the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 alongside enforcement from partners, it is envisaged that a long term enforcement approach, combined with a national communications plan, will tackle the attraction for migrant workers to Wickes and the surrounding area. Partners include Haringey police, Police Partnership officers, immigration, British Transport police, Tactical Enforcement, Neighbourhood Action Team officers and ASBAT, through the use of penalties such as FPN and prosecution,

8 Proposed coverage of the PSPO

- 8.1 It is proposed to consult on the introduction of a PSPO which will cover a number of activities including (See attached);
- Congregating in a group of two or more persons in such a manner as to cause obstruction or give reasonable grounds for annoyance to any person in the street or public place or the car park of Wickes Store.
 - Persistently loitering in a street or public place or the car park of Wickes Store, for the purposes of offering services e.g. as a prostitute, casual labour.

- For a person in the street, public place or Wickes Car park, including a person in a motor vehicle to solicit another for the purpose of obtaining casual labour.
- Urinating, defecating or exposing genitals in a public place or in an area belonging to a private resident, business or the council (excluding a toilet designated for use by members of the public).
- Consuming alcohol or having an open container of alcohol in your possession in the street or public place or the Wickes Car Park.
- Gating an area that is blighted with drug taking resulting in defecation of alleyways.

8.2 The land in relation to which this Order applies is that land in the area of the London Borough of Haringey, namely which

- a. Is delineated and shown in red on Map 1 forming part of the Order: and
- b. Includes the roads: Kerswell Close, Victoria Crescent, Culvert Road, Russell Road, Elizabeth Road, Southey Road, Greenfield Road, Birstall Road, Brunswick Road, Brunswick Road Park, Suffield Road, Westerfield Road, Parts of Seven Sisters Road, Wickes Store and Wickes Store Car Park.

8.3 A breach the prohibition can result in a maximum penalty not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale (currently £1000).

8.4 In addition the proposed PSPO will restrict the use of the public footpath between Roslyn Road and Southey Road as shown in 'blue' on Map 2 forming part of the Order by erecting gating. Residents will subsequently be required to seek an alternative route along Greenfield Road, Elizabeth Road and Braemar Road (as identified by dashed blue line on Map 2)

8.5 This final order once approved by cabinet is likely to come into force on 1st July 2016 and shall remain in place until 30th June 2017

8.6 At any point before the expiry of this 12 month period the Council can extend the order by up to three years if they are satisfied on reasonable grounds that this is necessary to prevent the activities identified in the order from occurring or recurring or to prevent an increase in the frequency or seriousness of those activities after that time.

8.7 Any challenge to this Order must be made in the High Court by an interested person within six weeks of it being made. An interested person is someone who lives in, regularly works in, or visits the restricted area. This means that only those who are in the locality are directly affected by the restrictions and have the power to challenge. The right to challenge also exists where an Order is varied by the Council.

9 Consultation process

9.1 ASBAT will carry out extensive consultation, namely:

- Consultation for a period of eight weeks
- An online consultation survey will be made available
- ASBAT will design a partnership letter/leaflet again outlining the reasons for the PSPO and its proposed prohibitions.
- The letter/leaflet will direct residents/workers/shoppers to the online survey and the ASBAT mailbox
- We will distribute the letters through door- knocking in the affected locality and a hard copy of the survey will be included
- ASBAT will supply the letter/leaflet to local businesses for their information and to display for customers
- Wickes have agreed to give out the letters/ leaflet to their customers as well as display the same in store
- ASBAT will make contact with local schools and other services in the locality that can be asked to display and distribute the leaflet. ASBAT will attend relevant ward panel and resident meetings to inform participants of the proposed PSPO and to disseminate the leaflet and survey.

10 Contribution to strategic outcomes

10.1 Corporate Plan 2015/18

Our vision for all residents and businesses in Haringey is summarised in Priority 3 of the Corporate Plan: ***A clean, well maintained and safe borough where people are proud to live and work.*** Underpinning this overarching priority are two specific objectives to address crime and ASB:

- Objective 1 – ***Strengthening Communities and partnerships to improve our environment and reduce crime, enabling residents and traders to feel safe and proud of where they live.***
- Objective 5 – ***To work with partners to prevent and reduce more serious crime, in particular youth crime and gang activity.***

Create homes and communities where people choose to live and are able to thrive is a key driver for Priority 5. Sustainable housing growth in mixed and inclusive neighbourhoods where residents can lead happy and fulfilling lives is key, as is improving the quality of all homes in Haringey, with a particular focus on the private rented sector.

The PSPO is intended to deal with a particular nuisance or problem in a defined area, which is detrimental to the local community's quality of life, by imposing conditions on the use of that area which will apply to everyone, contributing to objective one and five.

10.2 Statutory Officers comments (Chief Finance Officer (including procurement), Assistant Director of Corporate Governance, Equalities)

- 10.3 The costs of undertaking the consultation exercise recommended in this report can be contained within existing budgets. If the consultation subsequently leads to a PSPO being implemented then the costs of doing so will also be funded from existing budget provisions, any income arising would be used to support enforcement activity.

11 Legal

- 11.1 A PSPO may be made if the Council is satisfied on reasonable grounds that;

Activities carried on in a public place within the Borough either have had or it is likely that they will have, a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality;

It is likely that the detrimental effect will be persistent, and such as to make the activities unreasonable;

The effect or likely effect is such as to justify the restrictions imposed by the proposed PSPO.

- 11.2 Before making a PSPO the council must publicise its draft text and consult with the local police (formally with the chief officer of police and MOPAC), with such local community groups as the council sees fit, and with the owners of any land covered by the PSPO.

- 11.3 Section 72 (1) of the 2014 Act requires that in deciding whether to make a PSPO and, if so, what it should include, the Council must have particular regard to the rights of freedom of expression and freedom of assembly and association set out in articles 10 and 11 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms ("the Convention"). Whilst acknowledging that the proposed Order potentially entails an infringement of individuals' human rights, including the right to respect for private life and potentially the right to freedom of assembly and association, it is considered that these qualified rights may in this instance be legitimately interfered with in the interests of public safety, the prevention of crime and disorder and in accordance with the law.

- 11.4 Regarding consultation, this has to be at a time when proposals are still at a formative stage. Second, the proposer has to give sufficient reasons for any proposal to permit an intelligent consideration and response. Third, adequate time has to be given for consideration and response, and finally, the product of consultation had to be conscientiously taken into account in finalising any statutory proposal or reaching a decision. The process of consultation has to be effective and looked at as a whole it has to be fair. The Council is obliged to take account of any representations made during the consultation period and all objections received must be properly considered by the decision maker in the light of administrative law principles, Human Rights law and the relevant statutory powers.

- 11.5 Once it has been made the council must also publish the PSPO in accordance with regulations published by the Secretary of State.
- 11.6 PSPOs will impose Restrictions and requirements that are set by the local authority. These can be blanket restrictions or requirements or can be targeted at against certain behaviours by certain groups at certain times.
- 11.7 PSPOs can be enforced by a police officer, police community support officer, and council officers, and a breach of a PSPO is a criminal offence that can be dealt with through the issuing of a fixed penalty notice or a fine.
- 11.8 As this PSPO will affect two or more wards it will be a key decision and following consultation it will need Cabinet approval.
- 11.9 The implementation of the PSPO can be challenged by any interested person within 6 weeks of the making of the Order, the challenge is made at the High Court. Anyone who is directly affected by the making of the PSPO can challenge the order. A challenge can be made on the basis that the Council does not have the power to make the order, or that the particular prohibitions or requirements are unnecessary or that procedurally the order is defective.

12. Equality

- 12.1 The Council has a public sector equality duty under the Equalities Act (2010) to have due regard to; tackle discrimination and victimisation of persons that share the characteristics protected under S4 of the Act (age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation); advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not; and foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.
- 12.2 The government guidance on PSPO states that the restrictions of a PSPO can be blanket restrictions or requirements or can be targeted against certain behaviours by certain groups at certain times. It should be noted that this particular PSPO is likely to have a more significant impact upon the activities of the Eastern European men regularly loitering around the Wickes Store waiting for or having been unsuccessful in securing any paid labour. These are the individuals largely identified as but not solely responsible for the anti-social behaviour that is detrimental to the local community's quality of life – with instances of men urinating or defecating into people's gardens, litter from consumed cans and bottles of alcohol, intimidation felt by the large numbers blocking the public highway, the noise nuisance through the men gathering together and drinking
- 12.3 No particular group should be disadvantaged through the consultation, publicity and enforcement of the PSPO. The law requires that we ensure that we improve the Borough's understanding of the community and cultivate better understanding between communities thereby "fostering good relations" as

required by law at 1 (c) above. Targeting specific groups may cause friction so careful consideration will be given when carrying out consultation in both the wording of the consultation document/survey and the PSPO, so that no one group is targeted by the Order. We will also ensure that when carrying out consultation we give due regard to those who might not otherwise get involved helping them understand how they can get involved so their voices are heard, for example where there are known language barriers documentation will be translated into other relevant languages and face-to-face consultation will involve interpreters and officers with other relevant languages. We will undertake letterdrops and door knocking exercises to all affected residents and business in the locality. We have agreed with the police and will involve other services (e.g. StreetLink) in carrying out pre-consultation operations targeting, in particular the Eastern European men congregating outside Wickes and immediate areas, to ensure they are aware of the consultation process and have an opportunity to make their views known. A similar operation will be delivered explaining the PSPO should the order be sanctioned.

12.4 The introduction of a PSPO in the locality of Wickes Store, Seven Sisters Road N15 has the potential to have a positive impact on the Council's duty under the Equality Act 2010 to foster good relations between communities. It will tackle antisocial behaviour which has the potential to create tensions between different communities.

12.5 The PSPO will apply to all individuals committing antisocial behaviour within the designated area, without discrimination. The Consultation process will seek to gather the views of all local communities and ensure that the characteristics of respondents are recorded. Equalities analysis of the consultation response and results, and an outline of any proposed mitigating actions, will then be recorded in an Equalities Impact Assessment which will be carried out once the consultation is complete.

13. Use of Appendices

13.1 Appendix 1 – A summary of activities carried out in the area

13.2 Appendix 2 - Draft Public Spaces Protection Order Consultation & area map

14 Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

14.1 ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR, CRIME AND POLICING ACT 2014

Appendix 1

Previous use of legislation and partnership operations

- **Dispersal Orders** - This allows police officers to ask groups (of two or more) who may be engaging in ASB to leave the area, and should they return within 24 hours they can be arrested. Dispersal Orders have run from July 2007 and have been extended on five occasions to July 2010. A further Dispersal Order was implemented in May 2014 to November 2014. This initiative had limited success as it became apparent that as soon as the Police left the area, the men immediately returned.
- **High Court Injunction** – In 2013 an application was made to the High Court for a blanket injunction restricting men gathering and causing ASB in the area. The High Court, however, indicated that it would not be minded to grant the injunction, as it was considered 'too far reaching and disproportionate'. As a result, the Council's application was withdrawn in July 2013.
- **Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs)** - In July 2012, the Council and the Police initiated a month long operation to identify some of the men gathering. 11 ASBOs excluding those subject to the proceedings from the area. However, although those subject to the ASBO did not return, they were replaced by other individuals not subject to the ASBO.
- **Partnership Operations**
 - **Operation Tailgate** – In an attempt to remove the attraction to the area, police and Council officers targeted those employing men to undertake work. Vehicles were stopped and checked for tax and insurance documents and whether they were unlawfully carrying waste. Vehicles unable to provide the relevant documents were towed away and crushed. Those vehicles unlawfully carrying waste were issued FPNs but this did not deter the men from congregating.
 - **Department of Work and Pensions** - In an attempt to prosecute those who were approaching men for unregulated work, police and Council officers worked alongside the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP). However, for the DWP to instigate legal proceedings, they are required to witness employment actually taking place, due to the distances being travelled to various places of work, this soon became unsustainable due to the resources involved.
 - **Outreach work** – In an attempt to educate the men gathering, interpreters and translated literature was used to encourage them to seek legitimate work, or to claim appropriate benefits. This also had limited impact as the men continued to gather.

- **Operation Ajutor** – Between April 2014 and October 2014, the police dedicated two full time Police Constables to monitor the Wickes area. Concurrent to this, police colleagues also put in place a ‘Dispersal Order’ in conjunction with LBH. Once this was in place, the police (Neighbourhood Policing Teams) started to enforce the dispersal zone. In the first two months of the operation, numbers reduced from a peak of approximately 40 to 12-15 each morning, however a core of workers who appeared to live in the area remained. After the operation had finished the numbers returned.
- **ASB associated with footpaths**
 - In 2012 a public footpath running between Roslyn Road and Southey Road N15 was found to be particularly affected by anti-social behaviour; discarded beer cans, drugs paraphernalia, urine and faeces. The footpath is around the corner from Wickes and residents and services are of the view that the men loitering outside Wickes may be major contributors to the ASB occurring along the footpath. The men outside Wickes are often seen drinking for most of the day, they have subsequently been witnessed urinating and defecating in the locality. This ASB has attracted drug taking and dealing.
 - To tackle this issue, the Council considered the use of a Gating Order (and undertook a consultation in respect of this in February 2014). However the introduction of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 gating orders were replaced by PSPOs. This footpath does provide a route to residents, however, there alternative suitable routes in close proximity. Its closure would also bring long awaited relief to the immediate residents unable to use their gardens.

APPENDIX 2

**Draft PSPO - Restricting activities within the defined
area surrounding the Wickes Store in South Tottenham,
Seven Sisters Road N15**

ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR, CRIME AND POLICING ACT 2014

PART 4, SECTION 59

PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER

Haringey Council makes this Order, being satisfied on reasonable grounds that activities in the location described in paragraph 1 of this Order have had or are likely to have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality, and that these activities involved various anti-social behaviours. Further, Haringey Council believes that the effect, or likely effect, of the activity described in paragraph 1 of this Order is (or is likely to be) persistent in nature, such as to make the activity unreasonable and justifies the restriction imposed by this notice.

Haringey Council hereby requires by way of this Order that:-

1. The activity described below is hereby prohibited as from the date of the Order:
 - ***Congregating in a group of 2 or more persons in such a manner as to cause obstruction or give reasonable grounds for annoyance to any person in the street or public place or the car park of Wickes Store***
 - ***Persistently loitering in a street or public place or the car park of Wickes Store, for the purposes of offering services e.g. as a prostitute, casual labour.***
 - ***For a person in the street, public place or Wickes Car park, including a person in a motor vehicle to solicit another for the purpose of obtaining casual labour***
 - ***Urinating, Defecating or exposing genitals in a public place or in a area belonging to a private resident, business or the council (excluding a toilet designated for use by members of the public)***
 - ***consuming alcohol or having an open container of alcohol in your possession in the street or public place or the Wickes Car Park***
2. The land in relation to which this Order applies is that land in the area of the London Borough of Haringey, namely which
 - a. Is delineated and shown in red on **Map 1** forming part of the Order, and
 - b. Includes the roads: Kerswell Close, Victoria Crescent, Culvert Road, Russell Road, Elizabeth Road, Southey Road, Greenfield Road, Birstall Road, Brunswick Road, Brunswick Road Park, Suffield Road, Westerfield Road, Parts of Seven Sisters Road, Wickes Store and Wickes Store Car Park.
3. If without reasonable excuse you breach the prohibition in paragraph 1 you may be issued with a Fixed Penalty Notice, or prosecuted and convicted. The

maximum penalty is a fine not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale (currently £1000).

4. In addition the PSPO will restrict by erecting gates, the use of the public right of way between Roslyn Road and Southey Road as depicted in 'Blue' on **Map 2** forming part of this Order. The alternative route for residents will be along Breamar Road, Greenfield Road and Elizabeth Road
5. The responsibility for the maintenance of the gates in the defined alleyway will lie with the Public Highways.
6. This Order will come into force on 1st July 2016 and shall remain in place until 30th June 2017
7. At any point before the expiry of this 12 month period the Council can extend the order by up to three years if they are satisfied on reasonable grounds that this is necessary to prevent the activities identified in the order from occurring or recurring or to prevent an increase in the frequency or seriousness of those activities after that time
8. Any challenge to this Order must be made in the High Court by an interested person within six weeks of it being made. An interested person is someone who lives in, regularly work in, or visits the restricted area. This means that only those who are directly affected by the restrictions have the power to challenge. The right to challenge also exists where an Order is varied by the Council.

Interested persons can challenge the validity of this order on two grounds:

- 1) that the Council did not have power to make the order, or to include particular prohibitions or requirements;
- 2) or that one of the requirements of the legislation, for instance consultation, has not been complied with.

When an application is made the High Court can decide to suspend the operation of the order pending the Court's decision, in part or in totality. The High Court has the ability to uphold the order, quash it or vary it.

Date: _____ 2016

Section 67 Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014

- 1) *It is an offence for a person without reasonable excuse*
 - a. *To do anything that the person is prohibited from doing by a PSPO, or*

b. To fail to comply with a requirement to which a person is subject under a PSPO

- 2) A person guilty of an offence under this section is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale*
- 3) A person does not commit an offence under this section by failing to comply with a prohibition or requirement that the local authority did not have the power to include in the public spaces protection order*
- 4) Consuming alcohol in breach of a PSPO is not an offence under this section (but see section 63)*

Section 63 Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014

This section applies where a constable or an authorised person reasonably believes that a person (P)—

- (a) is or has been consuming alcohol in breach of a prohibition in a public spaces protection order, or
- (b) intends to consume alcohol in circumstances in which doing so would be a breach of such a prohibition.

In this section “authorised person” means a person authorised for the purposes of this section by the local authority that made the public spaces protection order (or authorised by virtue of section 69(1)).

(2) The constable or authorised person may require P—

- (a) not to consume, in breach of the order, alcohol or anything which the constable or authorised person reasonably believes to be alcohol;
- (b) to surrender anything in P’s possession which is, or which the constable or authorised person reasonably believes to be, alcohol or a container for alcohol.

(3) A constable or an authorised person who imposes a requirement under subsection (2) must tell P that failing without reasonable excuse to comply with the requirement is an offence.

(4) A requirement imposed by an authorised person under subsection (2) is not valid if the person—


- (a) is asked by P to show evidence of his or her authorisation, and
- (b) fails to do so.

(5) A constable or an authorised person may dispose of anything surrendered under subsection (2)(b) in whatever way he or she thinks appropriate.

(6) A person who fails without reasonable excuse to comply with a requirement imposed on him or her under subsection (2) commits an offence and is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 2 (currently £500) on the standard scale.


Section 68- Anti- Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014

A constable or an authorised person may issue a fixed penalty notice to anyone he or she has reason to believe has committed an offence under section 63 or 67 in relation to a public spaces protection order.





Public Footpath to be gated



Alternative Routes for residents of Roslyn and Southey Road

Starting Point	Destination	Alternative routes
Roslyn Road	Seven Sisters	Greenfield Road
Roslyn Road	West Green Road	Not affected by footpath Closure
Roslyn Road	Southey Road	Braemar Road
Southey Road	Seven Sisters	Not affected by footpath Closure
Southey Road	West Green Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elizabeth Road to Greenfield Road to Roslyn Road Braemar Road to Roslyn Road

Residents of other roads in the locality and visitors to the area may also be using the Footpath as a short cut. They too will need to use Braemar Road and Greenfield Road ; these alternative routes do add just a few minutes to any walking journey.

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 3

**Draft PSPO - Restricting activities within the defined
area surrounding the Wickes Store in South Tottenham,
Seven Sisters Road N15**

With amended boundaries

ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR, CRIME AND POLICING ACT 2014

PART 4, SECTION 59

PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER

Haringey Council makes this Order, being satisfied on reasonable grounds that activities in the location described in paragraph 1 of this Order have had or are likely to have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality, and that these activities involved various anti-social behaviours. Further, Haringey Council believes that the effect, or likely effect, of the activity described in paragraph 1 of this Order is (or is likely to be) persistent in nature, such as to make the activity unreasonable and justifies the restriction imposed by this notice.

Haringey Council hereby requires by way of this Order that:-

1. The activity described below is hereby prohibited as from the date of the Order:
 - ***Congregating in a group of 2 or more persons in such a manner as to cause obstruction or give reasonable grounds for annoyance to any person in the street or public place or the car park of Wickes Store***
 - ***Persistently loitering in a street or public place or the car park of Wickes Store, for the purposes of offering services e.g. as a prostitute, casual labour.***
 - ***For a person in the street, public place or Wickes Car park, including a person in a motor vehicle to solicit another for the purpose of obtaining casual labour***
 - ***Urinating, Defecating or exposing genitals in a public place or in a area belonging to a private resident, business or the council (excluding a toilet designated for use by members of the public)***
 - ***consuming alcohol or having an open container of alcohol in your possession in the street or public place or the Wickes Car Park***
2. The land in relation to which this Order applies is that land in the area of the London Borough of Haringey, namely which
 - a. Is delineated and shown in red on **Map 1** forming part of the Order, and
 - b. Includes the roads: Kerswell Close, Victoria Crescent, Culvert Road, Russell Road, Elizabeth Road, Southey Road, Greenfield Road, Birstall Road, Brunswick Road, Brunswick Road Park, Suffield Road, Westerfield Road, Braemar Road, Kirkton Road, Lomond Close, Watts Close, part of Seaford Road, West green Road (between Kirkton Road and High Road), Parts of Seven Sisters Road, Wickes Store and Wickes Store Car Park.

3. If without reasonable excuse you breach the prohibition in paragraph 1 you may be prosecuted and convicted the maximum penalty is a fine not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale (currently £1000).
4. In addition the PSPO will restrict by erecting gates, the use of the public right of way between Roslyn Road and Southey Road as depicted in 'Blue' on **Map 2** forming part of this Order. The alternative route for residents will be along Breamar Road, Greenfield Road and Elizabeth Road
5. The responsibility for the maintenance of the gates in the defined alleyway will lie with the Public Highways.
6. This Order will come into force on 1st August 2016 and shall remain in place until 31st July 2017
7. At any point before the expiry of this 12 month period the Council can extend the order by up to three years if they are satisfied on reasonable grounds that this is necessary to prevent the activities identified in the order from occurring or recurring or to prevent an increase in the frequency or seriousness of those activities after that time
8. Any challenge to this Order must be made in the High Court by an interested person within six weeks of it being made. An interested person is someone who lives in, regularly work in, or visits the restricted area. This means that only those who are directly affected by the restrictions have the power to challenge. The right to challenge also exists where an Order is varied by the Council.

Interested persons can challenge the validity of this order on two grounds:

- 1) that the Council did not have power to make the order, or to include particular prohibitions or requirements;
- 2) or that one of the requirements of the legislation, for instance consultation, has not been complied with.

When an application is made the High Court can decide to suspend the operation of the order pending the Court's decision, in part or in totality. The High Court has the ability to uphold the order, quash it or vary it.

Date: _____ 2016

Section 67 Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014

- 1) *It is an offence for a person without reasonable excuse*
 - a. *To do anything that the person is prohibited from doing by a PSPO, or*
 - b. *To fail to comply with a requirement to which a person is subject under a PSPO*
- 2) *A person guilty of an offence under this section is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale*
- 3) *A person does not commit an offence under this section by failing to comply with a prohibition or requirement that the local authority did not have the power to include in the public spaces protection order*
- 4) *Consuming alcohol in breach of a PSPO is not an offence under this section (but see section 63)*

Section 63 Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014

- (1) *This section applies where a constable or an authorised person reasonably believes that a person (P)—*
- (a) *is or has been consuming alcohol in breach of a prohibition in a public spaces protection order, or*
 - (b) *intends to consume alcohol in circumstances in which doing so would be a breach of such a prohibition.*

In this section “authorised person” means a person authorised for the purposes of this section by the local authority that made the public spaces protection order (or authorised by virtue of section 69(1)).

- (2) *The constable or authorised person may require P—*
- (a) *not to consume, in breach of the order, alcohol or anything which the constable or authorised person reasonably believes to be alcohol;*
 - (b) *to surrender anything in P’s possession which is, or which the constable or authorised person reasonably believes to be, alcohol or a container for alcohol.*
- (3) *A constable or an authorised person who imposes a requirement under subsection (2) must tell P that failing without reasonable excuse to comply with the requirement is an offence.*
- (4) *A requirement imposed by an authorised person under subsection (2) is not valid if the person—*
- (a) *is asked by P to show evidence of his or her authorisation, and*

(b) fails to do so.


(5) A constable or an authorised person may dispose of anything surrendered under subsection (2)(b) in whatever way he or she thinks appropriate.

(6) A person who fails without reasonable excuse to comply with a requirement imposed on him or her under subsection (2) commits an offence and is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 2 (currently £500) on the standard scale.


Section 68- Anti- Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014

A constable or an authorised person may issue a fixed penalty notice to anyone he or she has reason to believe has committed an offence under section 63 or 67 in relation to a public spaces protection order.





Public Footpath to be gated



Alternative Routes for residents of Roslyn and Southey Road

Starting Point	Destination	Alternative routes
Roslyn Road	Seven Sisters	Greenfield Road
Roslyn Road	West Green Road	Not affected by footpath Closure
Roslyn Road	Southey Road	Braemar Road
Southey Road	Seven Sisters	Not affected by footpath Closure
Southey Road	West Green Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elizabeth Road to Greenfield Road to Roslyn Road • Braemar Road to Roslyn Road

Residents of other roads in the locality and visitors to the area may also be using the Footpath as a short cut. They too will need to use Braemar Road and Greenfield Road ; these alternative routes do add just a few minutes to any walking journey.

Purpose

The public consultation was undertaken following approval from a full Cabinet meeting of 9th January 2016, in accordance with section 72 of the Antisocial Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. The consultation sought to obtain public views, particularly of the locally affected community on:-

- the restricted activities specified within the proposed order;
- the boundary of the Order
- the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road N15
- The Impact of gating the above alleyway

Methodology

- 1.0. Consultation process began on 22nd February 2016. Details of the consultation were available on line and online questionnaire was activated. Printed Consultation packs were received late afternoon on 24th February 2016.
- 1.1 ASBAT undertook a door knocking exercise, making contact with residents and businesses, at almost every property in the affected locality. Officers undertook direct engagement, explaining the consultation and PSPO; this took place during the day, evening and also weekends to maximise contact with the community. Where direct engagement was not possible a copy of the Consultation questionnaire was left for the occupant(s) to complete. Officer also attended residents' meetings and a Ward Panel meeting, as well as facilitated public consultation meetings, disseminating information about the PSPO consultation and questionnaires. An outline of the engagement undertaken by ASBAT is detailed in the attached table at appendix A
- 1.2. In recognition of the impact that the PSPO is likely to have on the Eastern European men who hang around outside Wickes, coupled with their unlikely access to the internet where the PSPO was publicised we undertook direct engagement with this group on 17th March 2016. To maximise engagement the area was attended early morning and we were assisted by:-

Benjamin Sebok	TRIO – Thames Reach	Polish speaker
Izzet Bicmen	ASBAT	Turkish speaker

With assistance from above we were able to speak to about 40 males to explain PSPO and ascertain their views. They were mostly of Romanian and Bulgarian origin with a couple of them from Hungary. All of those spoken to stated that they understood why the Council wanted to put this order in place. They agreed there were issues with litter, people urinating in the street and residents' gardens, men blocking the pavements and harassing women. They generally agreed that there was fighting and the behaviour was at times aggressive and intimidating. The pattern was for any Bulgarian spoken to, to

put the blame for the anti-social behaviour upon the Romanians, and vice versa. The Romanians accused the Bulgarians of being drinkers, rough sleepers and urinating. The Bulgarians accused the Romanians of doing drugs, intimidating women and fighting all the time. Both parties accuse the other of causing a nuisance. However the impression gained from the men spoken to, it would appear that the Bulgarians are rough sleeping on the street. The Romanians spoken to indicated to Benjamin that they were renting accommodation. Some of the men spoken to, though not able to speak English, indicated that they had been in the UK for some time, had National Insurance numbers but were struggling to gain employment. A Bulgarian male when asked his name, took out his ID and stated, 'this is the name they gave me'. We have since been advised that purchasing fake IDs to enter the UK is common place. One young Romanian spoke fluent English, but was still struggling to obtain long term employment owing to lack of CV, qualifications and the ability to obtain qualifications, although he had experience in his native country. A Hungarian man who appeared to be 50-60 years old stated that men gathering outside Wickes had been going on for years and that no order would stop this – the men do not fear being arrested; they will go to jail (get a shower and food) and when they come out will return to outside Wickes – because this is the only way to get employment.

- 1.3 ASBAT was also assisted by Kenny Wilkes (Street Enforcement Officer) who was able to engage with several businesses in West Green Road, enhancing response from local business. 21 completed Questionnaires
- 1.4. It is estimated that between 1100 questionnaires were distributed by ASBAT. In addition to the above about 400 blank questionnaires were left at Wickes for distribution to customers. Also about 200 blank questionnaires were given to Tottenham Green Safer Neighbourhood Team for distribution to the public in their ward in the borderline streets and areas. Both Wickes and SNT were advised that no further direction was permitted after 18th March 2016 and the closure of the consultation on 18 April 2016. They were advised to destroy any remaining blank questionnaires.

Data Analysis

- 2.0. The responses to the 5 key questions of the Consultation Questionnaire reaped an overwhelming support for the proposed PSPO and the gating order for the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road

Q1A. Do you agree that the terms of the proposed public spaces protection order are clear?

Yes	No	I don't know	Total	No reply
446	15	14	475	-
94%	3%	3%	100%	-

Q2A. Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?

Yes	No	I don't know	Total	No reply
432	27	16	475	-
91%	6%	3%	100%	-

Q3a. Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?

Yes	No	I don't know	Total	No reply
389	48	26	475	12
82%	10%	5%	100%	3%

Q4a. Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?

Yes	No	I don't know	Total	No reply
365	40	64	475	6
77%	8%	13%	100%	1%

Q4b. Do you live in a property that joins or is next to the footpath

Yes	No	I don't know	Total	No reply
64	385	11	475	15
13%	81%	2%	100%	3%

Q5A Would you be able to use an alternative route?

Yes	No	I don't know	Total	No reply
335	22	64	475	54
71%	5%	13%	100%	11%

- 2.1. The consultation process targeted people living and working within the affected area of the proposed PSPO, as they would be expected to be most affected by the Order. To ensure their views were fully represented respondents to the questionnaire were asked to identify their post code and specify whether or not they were a resident, local business or work in the area.

Resident	Local Business	Work in the area	Total	No reply
335	66	56	475	18
71%	14%	12%	100%	4%

354 respondents specified a N15 post code. From this we were able to ascertain that 91% of those who stated they lived or worked in the N15 area were in favour of the restricted activities of the PSPO; 82% agreed with the specified boundary of the proposed PSPO. 77% agreed with the closure of the alleyway between Roslyn and Southey Road. Only 32 of the respondents living or working in the N15 area disagreed with the gating order (representing 9%)

- 2.2. The characteristics of all respondents to the PSPO can be viewed in the tables attached in Appendix B. Additional comments made by Respondents to the key questions and within the general comments box are recorded in Appendix C

APPENDIX A

DATE	AREA
25 th February	Door knocking at all properties on the following roads: Suffield Road Kerswell Close Regency Terrace Initial contact with Seven Sisters Market
26 th February	Seven Sisters Market – engagement with businesses within the Market Hall Door knocking at all properties Victoria Crescent
27 th February	Door knocking at all properties on the following roads: Roslyn Road Greenfield Road Birstall Road
29 th March	Attended Victoria Road Residents Association Meeting. All residents in attendance welcomed the PSPO and supported the provisions. Resident's representative from Pagin House would like the boundary extended as Pagin House currently excluded – 15 copies of Questionnaire given to Rep to circulate to tenants of Pagin House
1 st March	Tottenham Green Ward Panel - 15 in attendance Again all attendees supported the PSPO. Again would like the boundary extended to include a little more of Tottenham Green Ward, namely: Other side of West Green Road; further up West Green Road to Lawrence Road; Braemar Road, Kirkton Road through to West Green Road. This extension would include the main shopping parade and areas prioritised for police patrols for ongoing ASB
2 nd March	St Ann's Library – Public meeting 4.30 – 6.30 7 Questionnaire completed on-line, 12 Questionnaire forms completed, 6 Questionnaire distributed for return

Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

3 rd March	<p>Door knocking at all properties on the following roads: West Green Road Elizabeth Road Southey Road Culvert Road Russell Court</p> <p>CHANEL Public Meeting 7pm- 9pm. It was not practical to use the meeting room given its location in the canteen which was not in use. Therefore Joan and Zaffar interacted with the public in the reception area. This was primarily users of the college: students, staff and governing body members.</p>
4 th March	<p>Joan, Zaffar and Scholar – attended Apex House to engage with staff and users. Details of the consultation had been circulated to all Apex staff via email and ASBAT attended Apex House to explain the consultation further and collect any completed forms. ASBAT took the opportunity to engage with residents/users attending Apex House for advice and assistance with Housing, to ascertain their views</p> <p>St Ann's Library – public meeting 4pm – 6.30pm</p>
8 th March	<p>St Ann's Library – public meeting – 4pm -6pm</p>
9 th March	<p>Roslyn Road & others – residents meeting, about 20 attendees. Included residents from Roslyn Road, Seaford Road, Elmar Road, Brunel Walk, and Lomond Close.</p> <p>Key concerns for these residents were the litter/fly-tipping and street drinking. They felt that collections and litter patrols not effective. Often rubbish is left around litter bins. Park was very badly affected</p>
15 th March	<p>Carried out additional door knocking on properties of Stonebridge Estate and questionnaires left with the Sheltered Scheme</p>
17 th March	<p>Interaction with men outside Wickes 6.30am – 9am, to explain PSPO and ascertain their views</p>

APPENDIX B

AGE

	Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?					Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?					Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?				
	Yes	No	don't know	Total	No reply	Yes	No	don't know	Total	No reply	Yes	No	don't know	Total	No reply
Under 16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16-24	17	1	-	18	-	17	1	-	18	-	12	1	4	18	1
	4%	4%	-	4%	-	4%	2%	-	4%	-	3%	3%	6%	4%	17%
25-44	174	15	8	197	-	152	24	16	197	5	148	18	29	197	2
	40%	56%	50%	41%	-	39%	50%	62%	41%	42%	41%	45%	45%	41%	33%
45-64	182	7	6	195	-	168	14	9	195	4	154	14	24	195	3
	42%	26%	38%	41%	-	43%	29%	35%	41%	33%	42%	35%	38%	41%	50%
65+	47	4	1	52	-	42	7	1	52	2	39	6	7	52	-
	11%	15%	6%	11%	-	11%	15%	4%	11%	17%	11%	15%	11%	11%	-
Prefer not to say	3	-	-	3	-	2	-	-	3	1	3	-	-	3	-
	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%	8%	1%	-	-	1%	-
No reply	9	-	1	10	-	8	2	-	10	-	9	1	-	10	-
	2%	-	6%	2%	-	2%	4%	-	2%	-	2%	3%	-	2%	-
Total	432	27	16	475	-	389	48	26	475	12	365	40	64	475	6

GENDER

	Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?					Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?					Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?				
	Yes	No	don't know	Total	No reply	Yes	No	don't know	Total	No reply	Yes	No	don't know	Total	No reply
Female	212	12	9	233	-	191	22	16	233	4	179	17	34	233	3
	49%	44%	56%	49%	-	49%	46%	62%	49%	33%	49%	43%	53%	49%	50%
Male	193	14	6	213	-	173	25	8	213	7	164	21	25	213	3
	45%	52%	38%	45%	-	44%	52%	31%	45%	58%	45%	53%	39%	45%	50%
Prefer not to say	4	1	-	5	-	4	-	1	5	-	5	-	-	5	-
	1%	4%	-	1%	-	1%	-	4%	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%	-
No reply	23	-	1	24	-	21	1	1	24	1	17	2	5	24	-
	5%	-	6%	5%	-	5%	2%	4%	5%	8%	5%	5%	8%	5%	-
Total	432	27	16	475	-	389	48	26	475	12	365	40	64	475	6

SEXUAL ORIENTATION

	Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?					Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?					Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?				
	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	Total	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	Total	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	Total
Heterosexual	254	23	40	4	321	273	23	16	9	321	254	23	40	4	321
Bi sexual	3	1	2	0	6	1	2	2	1	6	1	2	2	1	6
Gay	10	1	0	0	11	6	5	0	0	11	8	1	2	0	11
Lesbian	5	0	1	0	6	2	3	1	0	6	4	0	2	0	6
Prefer not to say	53	11	3	0	67	50	12	5	0	67	44	10	12	1	67
No Reply/ blank	61	1	2	0	64	57	3	2	2	64	54	4	6	0	64
Total	386	37	48	4	475	389	48	26	12	475	365	40	64	6	475

GENDER REASSIGNMENT

	Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?					Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?					Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?				
	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	Total	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	Total	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	Total
Yes changed	3	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	0	3
No change	330	23	15	0	368	297	41	21	9	368	281	30	53	4	368
Prefer not to say	32	3	0	0	35	29	2	3	1	35	27	6	2	0	35
No Reply/ Blank	67	1	1	0	69	60	5	2	2	0	56	3	8	2	69
Total	432	27	16	0	475	389	48	26	12	475	365	40	64	6	475

RELIGION OR BELIEF

	Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?					Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?					Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?				
	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL
Christian	174	4	6	0	184	162	10	7	5	184	148	14	20	2	184
Hindu	12	0	0	0	12	11	0	1	0	12	11	0	1	0	12
Muslim	59	2	1	0	62	51	5	3	3	62	50	3	9		62
Sikh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jewish	3	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	3
Rastafarian	3	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	3	2	0	1	0	3
Buddhist	4	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	4	3	0	1	0	4
No Religion	105	15	5	0	125	89	23	9	4	125	86	17	19	3	125
Prefer not to say	47	5	2	0	54	43	7	4	0	54	41	5	7	1	54
Other/blank	25	1	2	0	28	23	3	2	0	28	22	1	5	0	28
TOTAL	432	27	16	0	475	389	48	26	12	475	366	40	63	6	475

MENTAL OR PHYSICAL DISABILITY

	Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?					Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?					Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?				
	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL
Yes	55	3	1	0	59	50	4	2	3	59	47	4	7	1	59
No	309	21	14		344	280	36	21	7	344	261	31	48	4	344
Prefer not to say	9	1	0	0	10	7	1	2	0	10	7	1	2		10
blank	59	2	1	0	62	51	6	3	2	62	50	4	7	1	62
Total	432	27	16	0	475	388	47	28	12	475	365	40	64	6	475

MARRIAGE and CIVIL PARTNERSHIP

	Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?					Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?					Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?				
	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL
Single	141	9	5	0	155	124	17	10	4	155	115	15	23	2	155
Married	145	8	3	0	156	131	14	8	3	156	130	7	18	1	156
Co-Habiting	49	4	5	0	58	41	8	7	2	58	40	9	8	1	58
Separated	8	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	8	7	0	1	0	8
Divorced	33	3	3	0	39	31	4	1	3	39	30	4	3	2	39
Widowed	10	0	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	10	8	0	2	0	10
Same Sex Civil Partnership	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
No Response	45	3	0	0	48	43	5	0	0	48	34	5	9	0	48
Total	432	27	16	0	475	389	48	26	12	475	365	40	64	6	475

PREGNANCY and MATERNITY

	Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?					Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?					Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?				
	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL
Pregnant	4	1	0	0	5	4	0	1	0	5	4	0	1	0	5
Not Pregnant	336	23	14	0	373	297	44	23	9	373	282	30	55	6	373
No Response	92	3	2	0	97	88	4	2	3	97	79	10	8	0	97
Total	432	27	16	0	475	389	48	26	12	475	365	40	64	6	475
Had a baby in the last 12 months	6	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	6	5	0	1	0	6
Have not had a baby in the last 12 months	323	25	15	0	363	289	42	22	10	363	270	36	53	4	363
No Response	103	2	1	0	106	94	6	4	2	106	90	4	10	2	106
Total	432				475					475					475

Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

ETHNIC GROUP

	Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?					Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?					Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?				
ETHNIC GROUP	Yes	No	I don't know	Total	No reply	Yes	No	I don't know	Total	No reply	Yes	No	I don't know	Total	No reply
White British	128	13	5	146	-	110	21	11	146	4	106	16	20	146	4
	30%	48%	31%	31%	-	28%	44%	42%	31%	33%	29%	40%	31%	31%	67%
White Irish	11	1	-	12	-	9	1	1	12	1	9	-	3	12	-
	3%	4%	-	3%	-	2%	2%	4%	3%	8%	2%	-	5%	3%	-
White Other Greek / Greek Cypriot	3	-	1	4	-	3	-	1	4	-	3	-	1	4	-
	1%	-	6%	1%	-	1%	-	4%	1%	-	1%	-	2%	1%	-
White Other - Turkish	22	2	-	24	-	21	1	-	24	2	19	-	5	24	-
	5%	7%	-	5%	-	5%	2%	-	5%	17%	5%	-	8%	5%	-
White Other - Turkish Cypriot	3	1	-	4	-	2	2	-	4	-	3	1	-	4	-
	1%	4%	-	1%	-	1%	4%	-	1%	-	1%	3%	-	1%	-
White Other - Kurdish	7	-	1	8	-	7	1	-	8	-	7	1	-	8	-
	2%	-	6%	2%	-	2%	2%	-	2%	-	2%	3%	-	2%	-
White Other - Gypsy / Roma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White Other - Irish Traveller	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-
	0%	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
Black or Black British: African	49	-	2	51	-	49	2	-	51	-	39	4	7	51	1
	11%	-	13%	11%	-	13%	4%	-	11%	-	11%	10%	11%	11%	17%
Black or Black British: Caribbean	74	1	-	75	-	63	5	3	75	4	60	5	9	75	1
	17%	4%	-	16%	-	16%	10%	12%	16%	33%	16%	13%	14%	16%	17%
Asian or Asian British: Indian	9	-	-	9	-	9	-	-	9	-	9	-	-	9	-
	2%	-	-	2%	-	2%	-	-	2%	-	2%	-	-	2%	-
Asian or Asian British: Pakistani	6	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	6	-
	1%	-	-	1%	-	2%	-	-	1%	-	2%	-	-	1%	-
Asian or Asian British: Bangladeshi	5	-	-	5	-	4	-	-	5	1	5	-	-	5	-
	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%	8%	1%	-	-	1%	-
Asian or Asian British: East African Asian	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-
	-	4%	-	0%	-	-	2%	-	0%	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
Mixed: White and Black African	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-
	-	-	6%	0%	-	-	-	4%	0%	-	-	-	2%	0%	-
Mixed: White and Black Caribbean	4	-	-	4	-	4	-	-	4	-	4	-	-	4	-
	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%	-
Mixed: White and Asian	4	-	-	4	-	2	2	-	4	-	4	-	-	4	-
	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%	4%	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%	-
Chinese	2	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	2	-
	0%	-	-	0%	-	1%	-	-	0%	-	1%	-	-	0%	-
Any other ethnic background	52	7	6	65	-	49	7	9	65	-	43	11	11	65	-
	12%	26%	38%	14%	-	13%	15%	35%	14%	-	12%	28%	17%	14%	-
Prefer not to say	11	1	-	12	-	9	3	-	12	-	7	1	4	12	-
	3%	4%	-	3%	-	2%	6%	-	3%	-	2%	3%	6%	3%	-
No reply	41	-	-	41	-	39	2	-	41	-	37	1	3	41	-
	9%	-	-	9%	-	10%	4%	-	9%	-	10%	3%	5%	9%	-
Total	432	27	16	475	-	389	48	26	475	12	365	40	64	475	6

APPENDIX C – Other comments**Q1A Do you agree that the terms of the proposed public spaces protection order are clear?****Q1B If you answered No, how could the terms be made clearer?**

Q1b is a biased and undemocratic question. It assumes by disagreeing with the proposed public spaces protection order, I am saying that the terms are not clear. The terms are clear but I think they are unfair, undemocratic and discriminatory. The men at the entrance to Wickes are just poor working men who are trying to make a living; they are not hurting anybody and, although I use Wickes all the time, they have never hassled me; they just ask politely if I would like some help. All that is needed is a mobile toilet or at least a sign to the toilet on the corner of Seven Sisters Road and the High Road. Come on Haringey, you can do better than this!

However worried about where people will go

Concerns re: ASB. Have not seen myself but worry about putting people into unsafe situations i.e. homelessness, deportation etc Human rights, welfare of people. Difficulty finding work

They could be made clearer with an explanation as to why it is felt necessary to take these measures. vague terms such as 'obstruction', 'annoyance', 'other unacceptable or offensive behaviour' are all too loosely defined. how is one to know if one is breaching these terms.

I do not know what 'more powers' with regard to the Police and Council means. I can guess, but it is not clear.

It is not clear how much of a problem this is as this part of the justification relies on anecdotal, unsubstantiated and unquantified reports. To justify this you need to make clear that the community as a whole thinks this is a problem; has a real survey been done? Nobody has asked me.

Points 1-5 are clear, although these appear totally different to Point 6. There is no connection between Points 1-5 and Point 6 at all. The Footpath should remain open and policed as any other Footpath would be.

DON'T KNOW HAVEN'T HAD ANY PROBLEMS

AS LONG AS ACTION IS CONSISTENT. BIGGER POLICE PRESENCE. MAYBE FINE CONTRACTORS

Congregating on stairwell and bin areas on estates. Allowing dogs to run loose intimidating residents and fouling grass areas

Seems inhumane. people have the right to get together. how do we know people won't abuse this. Police will abuse young people and workers

Breach of civil liberties. The terms are unclear - especially the "two or more persons". The police will abuse their powers. This is illegal! The police already failed, so why should our area change?

Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

I would also like Haringey to follow in Enfield's footsteps and ban spitting. It is rife in this area & totally disgusting. Also dumping, major issue but all I see are a few signs here & there & the dumping continues. These issues are both anti-social behaviours & linked to PSPO

There does NOT need to be a PSPO. Any concerning behaviour (i.e. public urination, harassment) are illegal and police already have powers to deal with these

The first five points are clear. Although there is NO connection made with these and point six - closure of the footpath. The footpath should remain open and policed as any other footpath

Q2A. Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?**Q2b. If you answered No, please tell us the reason for your answer**

I agree with most parts of it but I'm unsure about the part concerning people outside Wickes seeking casual labour. I'm aware of the illegality....my main concerns are for their health and safety. I have never had a problem with this group of men,

They are looking for work, however I am not sure if arresting them is necessarily the best form of action. Maybe if there were more public toilets available to them.

Same reasons as above. They should put toilet facilities in place.

I don't mind them

These people are workers looking for jobs; they may have a beer early in the morning, which seems to me more an illness, alcoholism, than antisocial behaviour. They have never annoyed me. They are polite.

Criminalising the listed behaviours has historically always been ineffective. I recognise you're being squeezed by Tory budgets which makes it hard to look for genuine solutions, but this is not the answer to antisocial behaviour; it's criminalising a symptom, not solving a problem.

People forced to literally beg for work which is very low paid and have no employee rights shouldn't then also be attacked by the rest of us which is what this PSPO does

I live 5 mins from Wickes and pass the car park nearly every day. I have never once had any grounds for annoyance from anyone 'loitering' outside. In my opinion, it is not a crime to 'congregate', 'loiter' or drink alcohol. Anything that might constitute criminal behaviour is already adequately covered by the existing laws. You do not need to criminalise these people who are trying to get some work. The fact that the people targeted are mainly Roma men, suggests to me that the object of this PSPO is racist. Roma people were enslaved in Europe for hundreds of years. Trying to find casual labour is a sign of joblessness, not of criminality.

It is unacceptable to prevent people from gathering meaning people can no longer meet at all, to chat, or walk together, or to meet up, or take part in a lawful demonstration, to meet prior to going on to another activity such as a trip via the train station or shopping etc. Preventing a group of 'two or more' means even two people cannot stand together at all. How far apart must they stand to be within the suggested restriction? It is unacceptable to

Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

prevent people from meeting each other in order to offer, or seek, work, hardly evoking an environment that would help people into work. It is also unacceptable to prevent people from 'having an open container of alcohol' in this area.

Excess criminalisation is unlikely to work, and can instead lead to net widening and uptariffing. The idea, it seems, is to target people looking for casual work. Clearly these guys are desperate, and must have ended up in their unenviable position due to being vulnerable. How many have been trafficked? The best way to address this is through proper engagement and outreach work. Have council officials thought about this creatively? There are apparently going to be 5,000 new jobs being created in Haringey, and a lot of construction going on. Why not work with the developers and find positive, helpful ways to link some of these guys with jobs, and actually do something which will be of benefit to everyone, including the community? Police and civil enforcement resources are scarce enough. It'd be much better to focus them on serious issues such as gangs and dangerous drivers.

It's not clear how this would actually solve the core of the problem here. It would just push people elsewhere. It also appears to be exclusively targeted at migrant labourers, who are definitely not the only people engaging in "anti-social behaviour" in the area (groups on Culvert Road gathering with dogs is far more of a concern to me).

But I would prefer it be replaced by bringing these men into the regular workforce. Bit of a bigger project.

Clearly those people queuing every day for work outside Wickes are in a much harder material position than me and than many other residents of the area. I have never seen any antisocial activity beyond a couple of people (who may or may not be seeking work, how can you tell?) who have had a bit too much to drink. This targeting of almost exclusively migrant workers fits into a nasty and dangerous culture of blame which I do not want to endorse. I don't think it's appropriate that police are there moving people along. If you are worried about public urination, how about pointing the finger at the utter lack of public toilets in the area, which is down to the council.

Point 6 is NOT an activity. Closure of the Footpath is NOT necessary - it has been utilised since the surrounding area was built upon in the early 1900's and this should remain the case.

YES THIS IS BAD IN THE AREA IN OUR ESTATE

THIS IS A PROBLEM ON THE ESTATE

I think, someone getting arrested for urinating in public is a bit overboard as it depends heavily on circumstances

People in the borough should be contributing more to raise funds to help the people causing problems

I think it is unfair to prevent people from trying to find work, which is what the people who gather round Wickes are doing. Preventing the drinking & public urination & mess are okay, but not people asking/seeking casual work

Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

Tackle the problem itself. People will always come but having orders won't make it go away. It will move elsewhere

Our area should not change to accommodate the failure of appropriate police action. This is a disgusting proposal that only serves bullies !! Urinating and consuming alcohol in public spaces is a problem. WE DO NOT HAVE POLICE SERVICE. ONLY BULLIES

It seems as though the genuinely antisocial behaviour is already covered by other laws/acts. I have no problem with 'loitering' if it is non-threatening. I don't want to make lives harder

The order seems mean spirited. These are poor people trying to earn money - the vast majority I'm sure are orderly

I live in the area and have not witnessed any more illegal activity than elsewhere in the Borough

NEED MORE SECURE

About time !

I agree with points 1-5 but not with point 6 closure of the footpath is not necessary and is not an activity

Q3a. Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?

Q3b. Are there any changes you would make to the proposed boundary?

Think it could go further but agree if it is a hot spot

This needs to be further extended to the area off Broad Lane, opposite 8-22 Victoria Road. Where there are groups of males that gather on a regular basis. This is where all the cafes are. Sleeping in cars, drinking and leaving a mess.

Should be extended to include the Apex House Car Park. As this is an area where drinkers congregate in the evening.

It needs to be wider because people will just be moved elsewhere

Broaden the area to cover stone bridge and the whole of West Green Road. These areas have been historic as hot spot over the years

It should also include areas around the station exits and parades of shops along seven sisters road. Aggressive begging really unacceptable.

Office car park

It could be wider to cover more areas

My concern is that this scheme is going to force those committing ASB in to other parts of the area and I feel that the exclusion zone should be extended as soon as similar incidents

Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

start occurring in nearby areas, this should be a hard line approach to all those committing ASB in all parts of Tottenham at every instance

As Chair of the Tottenham Green Ward Safer Neighbourhood Panel, and also a resident of Roslyn Road, I feel it is vital that for effective policing and reduction of antisocial behaving including public consumption of alcohol, urinating in gardens and streets, littering etc, that the western boundary be extended a short distance to include Braemar Road, Kirkton Road and the 'Ramp' (at the junction of Brunel walk and Lomond Close). Also I feel that the 'zone' include the north side of West Green Road from the High Road westwards to the end of the shopping parade at Lawrence Road. These suggestions were also minuted at the last Ward SNT Panel Meeting. I understand that the Safer Neighbourhood Police Team would be favourable to this suggestion understanding it would be beneficial in reducing antisocial behaviour. Thank you for your consideration.

It could be wider to cover more areas

I am in favour of extending the PSPO westwards to include Braemar Road, Kirkton Road and the Ramp between Brunel Walk and Lomond Close. Also to include the Northern side of West Green Shopping Parade from the High Road to Lawrence Road.

I'm in favour of extending the PSPO westwards to include Braemar Road, Kirkton Road and the Ramp between Brunel Walk and Lomond Close. Also to include the Northern side of West Green Shopping Parade from the High Road to Lawrence Road

Yes, extend to include Braemar Road, Kirkton Road, and the car park/ community garden where these two roads meet.

Problems will just move on

Not nice they are messy

They are only round here when police are looking for them

I believe the boundary should stretch as far as Lawrence road along west green road and should include Braemar & Kirk ton roads. There is a significant amount of anti-social behaviour on these roads, especially on Kirkton and that stretch of West Green Road.

Expand the area to include Kirkton Road, and ramp that connects Kirkton Road/Braemar Road/Seaford Road

Toilets, publicado toilets, for them and others to urinate

Get rid of it entirely.

Get rid of it altogether

I would not have any PSPO whatsoever. The police are making an issue out of something that isn't an issue because it looks untidy and involves an ethnic minority whom they are prejudiced against.

I have been informed that this is increasing and would support the extension.

Extend westward to include Braemar and Kirkton Roads

To close a public footpath, that is marked on maps etc, is totally unacceptable. As an example the footpath is a means for people living to the east of Greenfield road, and in Greenfield road, to reach seven sisters school. There will be many other people inconvenienced by not being able to use the footpaths. People walking to and from the station would also be inconvenienced considerable, including visitors to the area. If such an area were to be imposed, people who currently meet within it would simply find somewhere else nearby. There should be no restrictive PSPO anywhere in the boundary area.

Scrap it.

If the people using the street to urinate just move into an area outside the red border can the border be widened?

Include Stonebridge Road as people could congregate there.

Include Page Green Terrace. The hedge along the High Road edge is just perfect for men to piss against.

A boundary is NOT required - if people are committing crimes etc then they should be dealt with accordingly. This Order could result in a situation where neighbours talking in the street are classed as criminals or anti social. There is no logic to this at all.

It is too large related to the area causing the problem and the route cause. It should only be 100-200m around Wickes, and does not need to extend and engulf seven sisters station and the Latin market where totally different groups of people congregate, and could be unreasonably affected by the additional rights of this order.

But needs to include the car parking areas at Apex House - groups congregate there to drink, smoke and sleep on grassed area

ENLARGE AREA TO COVER HIGH ROAD N15

ENLARGE BOUNDARY AREA TO COVER WHOLE OF HARINGEY

SHOULD BE WIDER TO INCLUDE STONEBRIDGE ESTATE - THEY ALL COME HERE, DRINKERS, DRUG USERS

WHAT ABOUT STONEBRIDGE ESTATE

BUT PLEASE EXTEND TO INCLUDE STONEBRIDGE ESTATE

YES MAKE BIGGER INCLUDE STONEBRIDGE ESTATE AREA

THIS WILL PUSH ALL THE PROBLEMS INTO STONEBRIDGE ESTATE - MAKE BOUNDARY BIGGER

EXTEND TO INCLUDE STONEBRIDGE ESTATE

INCLUDE STONEBRIDGE ESTATE

Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

CAN YOU STOP PEOPLE COMING ONTO THIS ESTATE (STONEBRIDGE), DRINKING, SLEEPING
DRUG ISSUES ON MY ESTATE, LOTS OF NOISE / LITTER. COVER STONEBRIDGE ESTATE

COVER MORE AREA

NEED TO ENLARGE THE BOUNDARY AREA

WHERE PROBLEM IS CONTAINING IT

It should include Pagin House which is on Braemar Road. This block suffers from people from Wickes sleeping in the garden at the back and breaking into sheds and outhouses

Include service road to Seven Sisters market hall

Putting fencing around the grass area, like it is in St Ann's Road

This proposal order only serves to downgrade our area and fails to identify the failure of the police. This should of already come out of the police budget not the residents. The police already bully the residents - this proposal is a license to abuse residents. There is already 'Public Order' and 'Stop & Search' powers !?! USE THEM! URINATING BY MEN IS A REGULAR OCCURANCE

This should be extended as Stone bridge Road there are groups too

Please look carefully at some of these council estates where these people hanging out. Pushing drugs, drinking and loitering within these boundaries. Main area Helston Court. It is serious

No I am happy with your proposals

Maybe block off the patch of ground outside the block of flats number 21-23 flats. This never gets cleaned up and it is just used as a rubbish bin, dumping ground & gets overflowed with rubbish & nothing gets done about it. It's called a community garden

The public Spaces protection Order should also please include Stonebridge Road which is already suffering from some anti-social behaviour

Stonebridge Estate should be in the boundary because of people (boys mainly) gathering at the entrance of near the Council Apex House

If you wish to go ahead with the order, all Stonebridge road should be included. There are often gangs of youths playing loud music often late at night

There does not need to be a PSPO in this area - the behaviour of people around here is not offensive or intimidating

I would like my boundary to be include Ashmount Road. I will have to think about it. I don't think gates should be included. These are loitering at night and dumping of rubbish to front of the building

Please include Stonebridge Road too. They already have started to group on the road just by the communal bins. This causes the same concern to the residents there

I would like to include Ashmount and Earlsmead

Question: Why is Stonebridge Road excluded? I'd be concerned that the current proposed would push offenders onto our estate

Perhaps if successful expand the PSPO Boundary
Adding Stonebridge Road because of anti-social drinking in the evenings
Boundary extended to include Stonebridge Road

Can you please include Pagin House in the proposal boundary. It is a small building and might have been forgotten. Could you include all of Culvert Road as it is unclear on map if you do.

If people are committing crimes/obstructions etc- then this should be dealt with via law enforcement. Surely there is no boundary to this. Such an order could result in neighbours speaking in the streets being classified as criminals

YES, add Apex House area as well

I am confused and a little concerned as to how this order would be used to those using the small park at the end of Roslyn Road. At present the park is both filthy and unsafe at night. However the order should not be used to stop people hanging out or using the park

Yes please include Stonebridge road. All of the activities listed in the PSPO are also happening here. Specifically on the corner closest to Wickes where the estate bins are. Fly tipping, urinating, consuming alcohol and loitering. This area needs to be included or the behaviour will just be pushed towards my house

No I think it's an area in which there are a lot of current problems

YES, the boundary should include Stonebridge Road. As there are issues with drug dealing, gangs of youth, defecating, drinking, dumping of rubbish, urinating, dog fouling, so called residents without parking permits colluding with parking enforcement officers who block park and escape fines. Robbery of cars with SAT NAV, & prostitution in alleyways & flats where they break in and have sex in doorways whilst residents are at home.

Boundaries not clear Cover West Green Road and Stonebridge Road & Seven Sisters Tube stations

Need clearer boundaries
What about displacement?

Q4a. Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?

Q4b. Do you live in a property that joins or is next to the footpath

Q4c. If access to the alleyway was restricted, what impact would this have on you?

61 Residents responded saying 'no', 'n/a', 'none' or 'no impact'

- Do not live near the alleyway
- Protect the area from anti social behaviour
- I don't know the area. I just work for the Council.
- Not much but it does provide a much shorter route from Roslyn Rd to Southey Rd for those who need it. Having said that, maybe very few people actually do need it.
- I do use the alleyway for access relatively frequently, but the impact of it being gated isn't clear
- Already I reroute along Greenfields Road
- No. Police should patrol this area. But it is a dangerous area.
- Leave it open
- Very convenient to get to West Green Road
- Alternative route but convenient short cut
- It is a nice short cut
- Should only be last resort. Not good lighting in alley way
- Walled off would be better
- It would increase journey time for pedestrians to West Green Road
- Can't residents have a key to access the alley.
- Would rather to leave alley open, use it to get to West Green Road. Just need more lighting and to be kept clean.
- Occasionally I would need to take a longer route.
- It would feel safer, and would remove an area where people could hide or be unseen.
- I've hardly used the alleyway for a couple of years now in any case. I used to use it regularly as a cut through to get to West Green Road. There's often needles and broken glass on the pathway and judging by the stench of urine, it's often used as a toilet. In places, it's so narrow there's barely space for 2 people to pass and when you're a woman of a little over 5 ft and the person or persons coming the other way are big young men with hoods up believe me it's hard not to feel scared. Pretty much the only people I see using it these days are those who are just looking for a quick way to get out of sight.
- It would mean that I would have to walk two streets around to get to my usual walkway
- I will feel fenced, no gates, leave spaces open to residents
- None it would benefit
- It would restrict my access. I would not like this. I live a few streets away.
- Not any as I do not use it
- This alley should have been closed a long time ago. I know of many incidents which have affected my family and friends over many years.
- I do use seven sisters station; this would make journeys to and from it longer if I were visiting, as an example, the east end of Roslyn Road
- It'd inconvenience pedestrians.
- Little
- I wouldn't have to occasionally hold my breath walking past...
- (If it's locked, can immediately nearby residents have keys?)
- It would mean travelling in the opposite direction to reach the retail facilities on West Green Road

Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

- We are very far from that place so can't make any comment or statement
- MY DAUGHTER AND I USE IT, WOULD CAUSE DELAYS, WALK AROUND THE LONG WAY. I HAVE SEEN MEN IN THERE DRINKING, SMOKING
- NONE, APART FROM MAKING THE AREA SAFER
- NONE DON'T LIVE NEAR THE ALLEYWAY OR USING IT
- Inconvenient might have to try others
- No impact whatsoever, I never use it
- If the alleyway were gated it is important that it is still cleared regularly to prevent build up of rubbish
- I would have to take a different route
- It's on my morning route, but I'll just have to run a bit further. I run up the alleyway to avoid having to go out to Seven Sisters Road and run past all the groups of men hanging around in Wickes
- A lot could open back gate more instead of treading in human poop
- Hopefully there'll be less fly tipping & loitering
- I live in Southey Road - It would mean longer walk to (and especially from) many shops.
- Walking home from, in particular Tesco and Sainsbury when laden with shopping would be inconvenient & I am not aware that there is all that much anti-social behaviour in the alleyway (not during daylight hours at least)
- Walking a longer distance than usual. It is a cut-through that saves walking. This proposal will affect the residents, more than the loitering
- It doesn't affect me as I don't use the alleyway day or night as not safe to do so. Also if you are going to install a gate that's lockable it might be a waste of time as people who go through the gate don't close it so they will get in that way
- Would add extra time to my journey to the supermarket
- No impact, but sometimes I use it to take a short cut
- one would have to walk all the way round on seven sisters road to get to West Green Road
- Impact on footpath as it is a short cut to do shopping
- getting to the PO & Doctors quickly on foot
- None. We do not use the alleyway. If restricted, resident should have access key
- DO NOT KNOW
- We'd be very happy because there is so much problems from these people always going to the toilet. selling drugs and fighting. I am scared to go down there. it is dangerous
- I will be safe from fear, I will have peace of mind and help us from noise which always wakes me up at night. Will protect gangs from enter our area
- I would have to use the high road or the bus
- I would need to walk further but agree that the path should be closed
- It's a long way to Tesco!! "Lockable gate" yes !! but is there a key!
- An extra couple of minutes walk around but to be hones I do that anyway because I don't want to face a group of men!
- None as I can walk up Elizabeth Road then onto Southey Road or Culvert Road, Russell Road the Southey Road
- Would we have keys for access?
- Lives nearby to alleyway. It would improve my safety and freedom of movement, also my peace of mind
- LIMITED IMPACT
- It would mean going in the opposite direction to where I wanted to go - making it less easy to access retail facilities on West Green Road

- None it will make life better
- no much
- Very little
- Sometimes use it as a short cut in the day time
- it would mean it would take me longer to get to West Green Road
- It would make my property more secure, as well as removing the problem of rubbish being dumped there and people gathering there late at night
- None at all

Q6. If you have any general comments around the proposals please tell us

- Please close alleyway behind 152 to 16 Victoria crescent also
- I have a general comment about the notion of a 'group of two or more' being obstructive or intimidating. Two people are not a group; they are just two people e.g. me and my son or me and my partner. Would we be split up if we were hanging around the proposed restricted area? Not only does this seem a bit over the top but it would be very hard to enforce. I don't live in the area but I think this is a point of general principle.
- Really good ideas to prevent existing anti-social behaviour.
- The Council needs additional powers to tackle the level and type of anti social behaviour in the area.
- I am a woman and I avoid walking past Wickes- I choose to go to the Tottenham Hale Retail Park which is further away from me for hardware supplies. It is intimidating walking past and being cat called, especially if you walk into the car park of the store. I also find that if they are moved on, many other members of the group regularly move towards other streets such as Earlsmead Road where they continue to drink and urinate in resident's gardens or along the wall of the brick building by the Earlsmead Road entrance to Seven Sisters tube station. I have also seen them congregate and urinate in the public park, opposite the nursing home on Rangemoor Road- and where children from Earlsmead Primary School use the basketball courts. There has also been a spike in anti-social behaviour along Wakefield Road and Pembroke Road with young men racing or revving their motorbikes at all hours, kicked in fences, and graffiti. I welcome any measures to tackle anti social behaviour in the Seven Sisters area.
- The people who stand around on the street are very intimidating. I leave the house at 7am and they are standing there staring and making comments. It's awful and very scary. They need to be moved along, the place looks messy. The litter and urinate in my garden and I have witness someone doing a poo. It's disgusting
- likelihood is that the groups causing the issue surrounding Wickes will just move location to an area not covered by the proposal and the cycle will start again
- Large groups of men gather for the chance of work, they are in such numbers you have to walk into the street or vehicle entrance/exit for Wickes. Female colleagues do suggest they find the leering of groups of men quite intimidating but don't see it as something they would report,

Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

- I agree with it because a lot of people try and come into the cafe and steal things. Recently someone came in and stole a phone from a customer. By Paddy POWER THERE are lots of trouble and empty beer cans and bottles
- This is a problem at all the wicks. Corners about how the police use this order. They may use it to move on law abiding people
- There is a lot of problems with drunk men some come from the bookies and cause problems. They try and steal from the shop. You try and stop them and they want to fight with you.
- There is a lot of problems with drunk men some come from the bookies and cause problems. They try and steal from the shop. You try and stop them and they want to fight with you.
- I totally agree. I feel very uncomfortable when I walk past Wickes.
- No impact for me so no objection.
- It would be great to be able to walk along Seven Sisters to the station without having to feel like you are being looked at. Also the amount that sit on the wall by Elizabeth Road. Some times are worse. Makes you want bad weather as less people.
- No
- I think restriction or gating the alleyway may result in inconveniences to may legitimate users who access through for good reasons. Right of way may no longer be a right way if it is restricted or a gate installed.
- I have lived in the area for nearly 5 years. I walk past Wickes on the way to the tube station every day. I was initially surprised by the men who wait for casual labour outside Wickes, but in that time I have never felt threatened or unsafe as a result. I think that this order tackles two separate issues indiscriminately. I do feel that the alley is sometimes used for drug dealing and other illegal activity. But since that is already illegal I feel like police should already have the powers to deal with this. I think the issue around Wickes is separate, and is about supply and demand. If there were no demand round there, it seems casual labourers wouldn't congregate. It's not clear from the information supplied why tackling supply is the answer to this issue.
- I can't see how a lockable gate would be the answer as people with keys may be tempted to leave the gate open. I do not know the alleyway, but in my experience designing out ASB is the most effective way of tackling problems so I can see how the gate is a good idea, and in this instance some council funding to make the Alley Way look bright, colourful, clean & tidy, maybe with some plants dotted about & better lighting could go a long way in tackling the problems
- Antisocial behaviour is in part due to the presence of Wickes. There should be an onus on the store to tackle the problem of on-street urination through provision of in-store toilet facilities by this business. In addition, the council should ensure that the public toilets on Tottenham High Road, adjacent to Apex House should be replaced in any proposed redevelopment of that site, to ensure some public toilet facilities exist in the area.
- Please restrict the use of mopeds and cycles on the pavement and pathways

Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

- I have to pass the men outside Wickes every single morning; they leer at me and whistle. It is very disrespectful.
- RESPONDENT IS POLISH LABOURER WORKING IN PROPERTY ON THE ESTATE
- Gets hassled when on her walking passed Wickes feels vulnerable
- I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW THE REGENERATION WILL AFFECT THEM FINDING JOBS
- Don't want to use alternative route
- Gating alley way will mean journey will take longer from SOUTHEY road
- Alley needs more lighting and to be kept clean
- Please gate this alley as it's a dumping ground for rubbish and other mess, it is dark and creepy and the area would feel a lot safer without this.
- I know this is a problem that both the council and the police have tried to tackle for a few years and I'm very much hoping that something more can be done. Every single morning I have to walk through the hoards of men hanging around Elizabeth Road. Some of them aren't so bad, but some are not so good. Some will purposely stand in your way; some will spit at your feet as you go by. Years ago they weren't such a rough lot and I used to think that at least they were making an effort to get work. Now as some of them are already drinking at 8 in the morning, I'm guessing work isn't the reason they're there. I hate that walk from Elizabeth Road to the station. I hate it 5 days a week, 52 weeks a year. I can always tell if the police have turned up near the station to question these men because as I leave home loads of them are running down Elizabeth Road, straight down the alleyway in Southey Road. They know once they get to the end they can disperse in about 5 directions.
- It would be useful if the gated was accessible by people in the neighbourhood, but I do not know how possible this is.
- Proper jobs and health professionals to help alcoholic to come out of their addiction
- I do not agree with these proposals and will be opposing them throughout the process.
- We don't want gated alleyways and we don't want laws targeted against particular minorities, criminalising non-criminal activities. Standing around looking for work is not a crime and should not be made so. This law looks racist. Likely enough, these people had few opportunities in their home countries and are now trying to gain some meaningful, paid employment here. So what? People want their homes done up cheaply, this is the free market in action. If there is some exploitative racket behind this, then tackle that, not the victims. If you don't want people urinating in the streets, put up some public toilets. I appreciate the services the council provide but please don't make a mountain out of a molehill. It looks untidy - cities are untidy and that is the joy of them - don't criminalise untidiness. It's false morality, penalising jobless people for not looking 'civilised'. p.s. in your ethnic monitoring form you put 'gypsy/Roma' under 'white other'. Eastern European Roma would certainly not describe themselves as white. Perhaps British Roma would.
- This is severely restricting people use of these public spaces, possibly leading to criminalisation.
- Criminalisation is unhelpful and unlikely to work. Engage with those guys and incentivise the developers who are receiving so much public money as it is to employ these guys on their sites.

- This Company owns Seven Sisters Market Hall at 231- 243 High Road, Tottenham N15 5BT. We also control the service road off Suffield Road which serves the rear of the building and adjacent retail premises. We welcome the introduction of powers to prevent anti-social behaviour in this area as we suffer from same in the service road so are constantly forced to take management action to deter same. The service road is private property and the Traders in the Market Hall are harassed by persons loitering to seek casual labour, the consumption of alcohol in public, overnight sleeping in cars, occasional drug-dealing and fouling by drug-users and persons urinating in the roadway. We are stepping-up measures to control this and have evicted illegal squatters and persons running unauthorised vehicle repair businesses in the service road and removed large amounts of refuse. We have introduced overnight gate security and will soon install CCTV coverage of the area. Contrary to the suggestion of a local complainant (who we understand lives on Suffield Road) these problems are NOT caused by Traders from the Market who are very keen to see them resolved. We have served banning notices on several individuals who frequented the Market and will soon be reintroducing a properly-policed Pay & Display car park and overnight security patrols. We remain concerned that displacing antisocial activity from Wickes car park etc will transfer it to our site and that public consumption of alcohol is encouraged by large off-licences on West Green Road and Seven Sisters Road. We continue to co-ordinate with the Met Police Safer Neighbourhoods Team and would welcome the service road being included within the area covered by a legislation. For more details please contact Jonathan Owen on 01296 712233 - jonathan.owen@marketassetmanagement.com.
- Well done - about time too - and thank you!
- Please implement this ASAP to move the people on. The recent parking consultation in the area should also help with this problem if the St Ann's CPZ is increased.
- Do you know that there are now groups of men hanging around outside Screwfix on Rangemoor Road (i.e. other side of the High Rd from 7Sis Rd, across Page Green)? Not many yet, but if Wickes is out of bounds it will shift to there. And then they will be pissing in my garden instead. I understand that B&Q in Tottnm Hale is closing so that won't be a new pick-up location. This is going to need lots and lots of very visible enforcement. The High Road has been a no-alcohol area for years now but I have never seen that being enforced. If it succeeds it will displace this lump-labour collection point away from this area, I am intrigued to know where it will pop up instead. Going for the employers is the only way to 'cure' it. Minimum wage enforcement would be a start. As your report says that attempts to follow the vans have not worked, you need to infiltrate the men, there's no mention of attempts to do this in your reports. As they are rumoured to work for £30 a day, a bit more than that could bring in useful information.
- See above. I think it is a massively overblown issue which could be mitigated better by the provision of public toilets and (if you are worried about drugs and alcohol) attention to addiction services in the borough instead of this appalling idea of sweeping people off the streets because you don't like what they look like, smell like or sound like.
- Closure of the Footpath would result in a longer trip to the shops & render it pretty difficult when carrying heavy shopping etc.
- If you're going to prohibit people for soliciting for labour from vehicles, why not extend this to soliciting for sex. I have been kerb crawled on Roslyn Road and it was very unpleasant.

Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

- The proposal given makes neighbourhood safe and better and to make this area better living place is a good idea. because we are struggling with such kind of behaviour and activity around out business
- Trades people picking up casual workers should be held accountable too. No tax on wages, no checks workers eligible to work etc.
- DON'T BE IT
- I am in support of this proposal. I have visited Wickes for DIY materials on a number of occasions and it is not a pleasant experience. Lots of men hanging around, approaching you when you get out of your car. This has been a problem for years and really does need to be tackled. I know, a number of things have been tried already but they have had very little impact. I hope that this proposal is put in place and it has the desired effect.
- I WOULD LIKE PEOPLE TO STOP COMING ONTO THE ESTATE (STONEBRIDGE) AND DRINKING AND CAUSING ASB
- IT IS A GOOD IDEA. IT IS GOOD FOR THE LOCAL AREA. I HAVE GONE PAST AND HAVE SEEN THEM AND THEY ARE INTIMIDATING
- IT WILL BE GOOD FOR COMMUNITY
- In the vicinity of the business, sit in the paved area drinking smoking & urinating at any time of the day. This is very unpleasant as the smell is very bad. people blocking the pavement as they stand around in large groups
- I think it is a very good idea. I use Wickes from time to time and I see the men standing around. I was there last Sunday and we were scared to leave the car. There is also a problem near the paved area of men drinking smoking weed and pissing there it is disgusting. There should be more public toilets
- My observation is drug dealing near these shops once Sainsburys close up
- I think the best thing is to put CCTV in the area for evidence. The atmosphere is not good here especially the park area. Since Paddy Power has been there it has changed the area the types of people who go there deal drugs. You don't want to go in there. It was a bad decision by the Council to put that park area there (West Green Road Pocket park). It does not improve the area.
- The paved area near the shops was very bad idea. "The creeps come out at night". The drinking and the littering is unacceptable. It is intimidating for a woman walking through that area at night. We objected to Paddy Power coming into West Green Road, but now they are here they should do something about what goes on in there. We have seen their customers weeing in the park area.
- TRY TO GIVE A GOOD SOLUTION TO US
- I'm not sure what's been happening in front of Wickes Store, but it's usually people willing to do cheap labour there. Let them.
- NOTHING
- I'd suggest to build more public toilets
- Please see accompanying letter dated 21.3.2016 to Eubert Malcolm supporting the proposal and suggesting restrictions on off-sales of alcohol and further patrols by Met police to service yard at rear Seven Sisters Market Team, 231-243 High Road N15 5BT.

Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

Letter from Seven Sisters Market Hall - referred to above held by Joan Appavoo -ASBAT. Keys points: We welcome the introduction of powers to prevent anti-social behaviour in the proposed area as we suffer from the same in our service yard road. We are constantly forced to take management action to deter same on this private property and Traders in the Market Hall are harassed by persons loitering to seek casual labour, the consumption of alcohol in public, over night sleeping in cars, occasional drug-dealing and fouling by drug users and persons urinating in the roadway. We have served banning notices on several individuals who frequented the Market and will soon be reintroducing a properly-policed Pay & Display car park and overnight security patrols. We are however concerned that displacing anti-social activity from Wickes car park etc will transfer it to our site and that the public consumption of alcohol on the service road and Suffield Road is encouraged by off-licences on West Green Road and Seven Sisters Road. We suggest restricting such uses would go a long way to resolving that problem. We would welcome the service road being included within the area covered by such legislation

- This should have been done a long time, although we have had dispersal order in the past, but that was a waste of time
- Special attention must be made to Victoria Crescent, Kerswell Close and Culvert Road stairwells and bin areas. Drug dealing and using is extremely high in these areas especially during spring to summer daily
- Please deal with the problem when moving people on
- People will move more towards Victoria Crescent and Kerswell Close. How will the problem go away. it will move elsewhere
- Who are the people that employ these gangs of men? They should be punished too. I feel very sorry for the people who live like in the houses where the gangs loiter
- I don't believe this to be an appropriate consultation and fear that the residents views do not really matter - wasted exercise. The council have failed to put pressure on the police to do their job and provide an appropriate service. The police are too busy abusing their powers, wasting public money and failing to deliver a service to our area that is effective. The police ruined our area.
- This should have been done years ago !
- Please make this happen. We dont not feel safe having the alley behind our garden and also smells of urine. In general, I have to walk on the road to pass the groups of men at Wickes and the end of Greenfield Road. My female friends are scared of them.
- it would be nice for members of the community to be able to walk down the road without being harassed by those people
- Could access to the alleyway be given to residents who wanted it either through paying a fee to obtain a key for access or some other option that could be provided to residents?
- I'll be happy if these work at as soon as possible. It's a nuisance with these people. messing up the community, need addressing urgently
- I think it is a very good idea all this project, cause I've been victim of all those men standing in front of Wickes, they are in the way all the time, stalking me and other women and even once, one of them started to tell me things very close to me and

Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

followed me a few steps on my way, he looked drunk. I can't go to work and come back home in peace of mind with all those men (big groups) in front of my house (flat)

- If used an alternative route it'll increase the amount taken to walk
- This problem will be passed onto another area Prostitution at the end of Elizabeth Road N15 & Drug dealing in my front garden - Southey Road, have gone (hopefully) - which does make me feel safer Please prosecute gang leaders & those picking up men for work at Wickes. these men are upholding the problem Please work with community groups, mental health/alcohol services - some of the men at Wickes are very unwell, Repatriation?/Detox Services
- The proposals are fine far as stopping any public nuisance but will not address the main cause/issue, which is people wanting/looking for work. If the Council could provide some formal platform for people to provide & access short term (or long term) labour this may well help the situation & save all the problems these orders are designed to address
- Hugely improve our quality of life. We live next to the alleyway and regularly witness the following:- drug dealing, human excrement, fights, motorbike & bikes speeding down, sexual activity, alcohol consumption - loitering in the entrance of the alleyway, sitting on our wall drinking, urinating, constant rubbish in our garden, we were burgled & the burglars accessed our property from the alleyway unseen flytipping, vile smell, especially in the summer, broken glass, poo & wee pose a health hazard to my 2 years old son and baby daughter I feel threatened by the presence of groups of men drinking at the entrance to my house
- It is not quite clear to me what problem is being 'solved' here. Do people feel menaced? or object to casual labour? I think there might be better, more positive solutions available, e.g. if public urination is an issue, is this order going to change anything? would a public toilet be better? okay, not necessarily a practical/affordable solution, but a better one in theory. Yes?
- Please see previous page, to include spitting & dumping, littering! Littering is another anti-social behaviour surrounding these loitering people. Where are the fines? Where are the enforcement officers pulling people up on this unacceptable behaviour
- I would find an alternative route
- If Stonebridge Road is not included it will suffer increased anti-social behaviour
- Please close this alley
- There is too much noise in our area such loud music throughout till late at night, riding motor-cycle with very loud engine, shouting, throwing cans of beer in front of the doors. this is Stonebridge Road area which needs to be taken into account
- Stonebridge estate where the basket ball court is used as football court. There are always groups gather at the alleyway. As a tenant I am very worried
- I live in Ashmount Road. We have people trying to get into our building at night. I found a man sleeping in side my building at 7am. I woke him up and asked him to leave

Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

- I would like to see cameras installed on Ashmount Road n/r Seven Sisters Station
- Please, do go ahead with this proposal. It's a shame not to do anything about these problems, Tottenham residents deserve better. Thank you!#
- Please put a stop to men urinating and messing in the alleys at the bottom of Russell Road leading through to Elizabeth Road. It is disgusting & smelly and children come through on the way to school not nice at all drink cans and food waste gets thrown everywhere.
- I have no issues thus far. Since the West Green pub has been closed. The anti-social behaviour and noise has reduced greatly. (I live in Brunswick Road)
- I have friends & family live in those areas whom I visit sometimes, but because of what's going on especially on evenings I don't anymore.
- PS. A gating of the footpath between Elizabeth Road and Culvert Road would be much appreciated (ps back of 607, 609, 66, 613, 615, 617 etc)
- When police the police
- It would be much longer and more difficult to carry heavy shopping
- I don't use the alleyway
- yes, the alleyway between Elizabeth Road and the fence is used for the purposes of offering prostitution , selling things on the bike and using as toilet and poos, urinate, and old mattresses all over this alleyway, the most popular hidden place to be so anti-social.
- If the proposals kept the park cleaner and safer then I would agree. Otherwise the men hanging outside Wickes looking for work don't really bother me. I would like to take this opportunity to ask the council to do something about the park. I fear taking my niece or dog there, as there is so much rubbish, broken glass, chicken bones and sometimes needles
- I have lived the area for over twenty years, and these consultation have be never ending! Plus who are picking up the cost !!! How long will it take Haringey Council for a final decision make!
- I recently found people drinking alcohol in the locked stairwell of the building. They were jamming the doors so they wouldn't lock when slammed, in order to gain access. I am concerned that more of this will happen if my road is not included in the PSPO boundary. Stonebridge Road n15 5PF
- I think it would be helpful to install CCTV to cover the area on Elizabeth Road just along from the café before the houses. This spot is frequently used both for fly tipping and by men urinating (in daylight as well as at night) - it is very unpleasant to have to walk past this and a visible camera should be some deterrent.
- I am very much in favour of the proposal and think it should be implemented as soon as possible

- Why was Stonebridge excluded from the proposals? If you don't include Stonebridge Road in the boundary, the individuals that are currently doing this anti-social behaviour will spill over into Stonebridge and it already has loads of anti-social behaviour that is spiralling out of control. This has been reported to no avail. Police should have records of this for you to check
- THIS IS NEEDED

Equality Impact Assessment

Name of Project	PSPO – St Ann’s & Tottenham Green Wards	Cabinet meeting date <i>If applicable</i>	Cabinet Member Signing – 15 th July 2016
Service area responsible	Community Safety & Regulatory Services		
Name of completing officer	Joan Appavoo	Date EqIA created	2 June 2016
Approved by Director / Assistant Director	Eubert Malcolm on behalf of Stephen McDonnell	Date of approval	7 th July 2016

The Equality Act 2010 places a ‘**General Duty**’ on all public bodies to have ‘**due regard**’ to:

- Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act
- Advancing equality of opportunity between those with ‘protected characteristics’ and those without them
- Fostering good relations between those with ‘protected characteristics’ and those without them.

In addition the Council complies with the Marriage (same sex couples) Act 2013.

Haringey Council also has a ‘**Specific Duty**’ to publish information about people affected by our policies and practices.

All assessments must be published on the Haringey equalities web pages. All Cabinet papers MUST include a link to the web page where this assessment will be published.

This Equality Impact Assessment provides evidence for meeting the Council’s commitment to equality and the responsibilities outlined above, for more information about the Councils commitment to equality; please visit the Council’s website.

Stage 1 – Names of those involved in preparing the EqlA	
1. Project Lead	5. Joan Appavoo
2. Equalities / HR	6. William Shanks
3. Legal Advisor (where necessary)	7.
4. Trade union	8. n/a

Stage 2 - Description of proposal including the relevance of the proposal to the general equality duties and protected groups. Also carry out your preliminary screening (Use the questions in the Step by Step Guide (The screening process) and document your reasoning for deciding whether or not a full EqlA is required. If a full EqlA is required move on to Stage 3.

The Council is looking to introduce a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) in a defined area of South Tottenham straddling St Ann's Ward and Tottenham Green Ward, which will restrict the activities listed:

- Congregating in a group of two or more persons in such a manner as to cause obstruction or give reasonable grounds for annoyance to any person in the street or public place or the car park of Wickes Store
- Persistently loitering in a street or public place or the car park of Wickes Store
- For a person in the street, public place or Wickes Car park, including a person in a motor vehicle to solicit another for the purpose of obtaining casual labour
- Urinating, defecating or exposing genitals in a public place or in an area belonging to a private resident, business or the council (excluding a toilet designated for use by members of the public).
- Consuming alcohol or having an open container of alcohol in your possession in the street or public place or the Wickes Car Park.
- Consuming alcohol or having an open container of alcohol in your possession in the street or public place or the Wickes Car Park.
- Gating an area that is blighted with drug taking resulting in defecation of alleyways.

The government guidance on PSPO states that the restrictions of a PSPO can be blanket restrictions or requirements or can be targeted against certain behaviours by certain groups at certain times. At the onset of our consideration of the PSPO it was noted that such an order is likely to have a more significant impact upon the activities of the Eastern European men regularly loitering around the Wickes Store, in Seven Sisters Road, waiting for or having been unsuccessful in securing any paid labour. These are the individuals largely identified as but not solely responsible for the anti-social behaviour that is detrimental to the local community's quality of life – with instances of men urinating or defecating into people's gardens, litter from consumed cans and bottles of alcohol, intimidation felt by the large numbers blocking the public highway, the noise nuisance through the men gathering together and drinking.

The introduction of a PSPO in the locality of Wickes Store, Seven Sisters Road N15 has the potential to have a positive impact on the Council's duty under the Equality Act 2010 to foster good relations between communities. It will tackle antisocial behaviour which has the potential to

create tensions between different communities. The PSPO will apply to all individuals committing antisocial behaviour within the designated area, without discrimination.

A Consultation was carried out seeking the views of all local communities and ensured that the characteristics of respondents were recorded. An EIA can hence be completed utilising the data obtained

Stage 3 – Scoping Exercise - Employee data used in this Equality Impact Assessment

Identify the main sources of the evidence, both quantitative and qualitative, that supports your analysis. This could include for example, data on the Council's workforce, equalities profile of service users, recent surveys, research, results of recent relevant consultations, Haringey Borough Profile, Haringey Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and any other sources of relevant information, local, regional or national.


Data Source (include link where published)	What does this data include?
The PSPO is likely to have a positive impact on any staff working in the locality. Staff based at Apex House (Seven Sisters Road) and other housing staff were advised of the Consultation and several staff did complete the questionnaire. The verbal feedback indicated a 100% support for the PSPO with additional requests that the PSPO be extended to actually include Apex House (Seven Sisters Road) and Stonebridge estate.	The consultation data did ask respondents to specify if they are a resident, local business or work in the area. 12% of respondents selected the 'work in the area' category, but this did not differentiate between general public and council staff. There was again an overwhelming support for the PSPO, the only significant disagreement was with regard to the boundaries where Respondents advocated extending the existing boundary to cover a larger area.

Stage 4 – Scoping Exercise - Service data used in this Equality Impact Assessment


This section to be completed where there is a change to the service provided

Data Source (include link where published)	What does this data include?
Results of PSPO Consultation carried out between 22 nd February 2016 to 18 th April 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Public view of the PSPO proposals 91% of respondents agreed with the PSPO restricting defined activities; 82% of respondents agreed with the PSPO boundary; 77% of respondents agreed with the gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road.Differentiates between those living, working or studying in the affected area and those that do not;Characteristics of the Respondents: Gender, age, disability, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, religion & belief, race, marriage & civil partnership, pregnancy & maternity. A breakdown of the characteristics is outlined in Final Consultation Report and through the charts below


Q2a. Do you agree with the PSPO restricting these activities? - by Age




Q3a. Do you agree with the PSPO boundary area? - by Age




Q4a. Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway? - by Age




Q2a. Do you agree with the PSPO restricting these activities? - by Gender




Q3a. Do you agree with the proposed PSPO boundary area? - by Gender




Q4a. Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road? by Gender




Q2a. Do you agree with the PSPO restricting these activities? - By Ethnicity




Q3a. Do you agree with the proposed PSPO boundary area? - by Ethnicity



**Q4a. Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway? -
by Ethnicity**






Other White European Breakdown








Individuals of 'other white european' ethnic origin like other ethnic groups overwhelmingly supported all aspects of the PSPO. Within this group no one disagreed with the proposed restricted activities. 1 person of Polish origin disagreed with the proposed boundary. 3 people (Italian, Polish and a Romanian disagreed with the proposed gating of the alleyway.


Stage 5a – Considering the above information, what impact will this proposal have on the following groups in terms of impact on residents and service delivery:

Positive and negative impacts identified will need to form part of your action plan.

	Positive	Negative	Details	None – why?
Sex			Of the men and women who responded to the questionnaire 91% were in favour of the PSPO criteria, 81% were in favour of the boundary and 76% were in favour of the gating order. Both men and women spoke of the intimidation felt and supported this action as a means to increase safety in the area	
Gender Reassignment			Of the 475 respondents 373 ticked no change in gender from birth and 97 made no reply. Only 3 indicated a change in their gender. Of these 3 all were in favour of the PSPO restricting activities and the boundary; 1 was in favour of the gating order, 1 against and 1 ticked don't know	
Age			The vast majority of all age groups were in favour of the PSPO restricting activities, its boundary and the gating order. Increased journey with shopping was an issue raised by some residents and of course this may present problems for the elderly and frail	

Disability			Only 12.5% of Respondents to the Consultation indicated that they had a physical or mental disability. 72.5% indicated that they did not and 15% either selecting 'prefer not to say' or leaving section blank. Of those specifying a mental or physical disability, 93% agreed with the restricted activities of the proposed PSPO, 85% agreed with the proposed boundary area and 80% agreed with the gating of the alleyway.	
Race & Ethnicity			The vast majority of all ethnic groups were in favour of the PSPO restricting activities, its boundary and the gating order. The PSPO would have a significant impact on the Eastern European Men loitering outside Wicks; they declined to complete any questionnaires but gave verbal acknowledgement of why such action was needed to address ASB. It is also noted that of 156 respondents who ticked 'any other background' 14 were of Eastern European origin and again very much in favour of the proposals	

Sexual Orientation			The vast majority of those identifying their sexual orientation in the questionnaire were in favour of the PSPO restricting activities, its boundary and the gating order. 6 respondents identified themselves as bi-sexual and in their case there was no majority vote for the PSPO boundary and gating order.	
Religion or Belief (or No Belief)			The vast majority of of all religious groups or beliefs were in favour of the PSPO. The restricting activities, its boundary and the gating order. There were no identified impacts on any particular religious group, faith or belief	
Pregnancy & Maternity			Only 4 respondents stated they were pregnant; 4 were in favour of the whole proposal and 1 did not agree with the restricted activities and answered don't know in relation to the boundary and gating. Only 6 respondents indicated that they had had a baby within the last 12 months, none of whom opposed any part of the proposed PSPO. A high proportion of respondents often left the questions relating to pregnancy blank.	

Marriage and Civil Partnership (note this only applies in relation to eliminating unlawful discrimination (limb 1))			There were no distinct patterns between responses and marital status. The vast majority of all groups favoured the PSPO proposals.	
--	---	--	--	--

Stage 5b – For your employees and considering the above information, what impact will this proposal have on the following groups: Positive and negative impacts identified will need to form part of your action plan.

	Positive	Negative	Details	None – why?
Sex				The PSPO is only likely to have a positive impact on staff – by using the PSPO to prevent ASB and tackle any persistent ASB the area will be improved and made a safer and cleaner working environment
Gender Reassignment				
Age				
Disability				
Race & Ethnicity				
Sexual Orientation				
Religion or Belief (or No Belief)				
Pregnancy & Maternity				
Marriage and Civil Partnership (note this only applies in relation to eliminating unlawful discrimination (limb 1))				

Stage 6 - Initial Impact analysis	Actions to mitigate, advance equality or fill gaps in information
<p>It is likely that the PSPO will have a significant positive impact for all people living and working in the affected area. The increased power to the Council and Police to tackle ASB in the locality is likely to improve the areas in terms of improving the environment, reduce fear of crime and increase safety of residents and workers, thus improving their quality of life and community as a whole.</p> <p>There is likely to be a negative impact upon the Eastern European men who tend to loiter outside Wickes waiting for work, as a group. In so far as the PSPO will restrict them from loitering in the area, which will then in turn impact on them seeking employment in this informal manner in the area.</p>	<p>The consultation engaged with as many of the people living and working in the area as possible; this incorporated reaching a wide range of people. The consultation questionnaire was available on-line in other languages.</p> <p>The consultation undertook direct consultation with this group to obtain their views and concerns. Romanian/Hungarian and Turkish speaking officers were on site outside Wickes from the early hours of the morning to maximise contact. The Romanian/Hungarian speaker was a worker from Thamesreach who was familiar with needs and culture of the men seeking work. He was able to engage with them, explain the PSPO and their rights. All men spoken to stated an understanding as to why the Council were taking this action. About 40 men were spoken to, of Bulgarian, Romanian and Hungarian origin. All acknowledged that there were ASB issues linked to the men hanging about outside Wickes (albeit each group blaming the other for causing the ASB). Prior to the implementation of the PSPO the Council and its partners have agreed that further engagement will be undertaken with this group: translated leaflets and interpreters will be used to fully relay the terms of the PSPO and repercussions of breaching the order; utilising the Thames Reach TRIO (Targetted Rapid Intervention Outreach) to again engage with advice on rights, appropriate & legal employment paths and options available.</p> <p>As can be seen in the Consultation Report a wide range of additional comments were made. Some comments were made stating that the Proposed PSPO and its provisions were racist, seeking to criminalise a particular group. Though such comments were repeated in the various addition comment boxes of the questionnaire the source was from a handful of people; they were not from the same ethnic group and there were no patterns in respect of other characteristics. The</p>

	<p>PSPO will be implemented without discrimination and proportionately, the concerns of all respondents will be taken on board and hopefully be addressed through the monitoring of the implementation and reviews. At the end of the first year of the PSPO, the actions and effectiveness will be evaluated to inform any proposal to extend the PSPO for a further period of time.</p>
--	---

Stage 7 - Consultation and follow up data from actions set above	
Data Source (include link where published)	What does this data include?
Results of the Public Consultation undertaken between 22 February 2016 and 18 th April 2016	See copy of Consultation Report (Appendix 4)

Stage 8 - Final impact analysis

There were 475 questionnaires completed in response to the Public consultation. We are advised by the Communications team that this was a great response from the East of the Borough as it is usually hard to engage with. The respondents were diverse, reflecting all ethnic groups and other protected characteristics. Additional efforts were made to ensure engagement with the group which is most likely to be adversely affected by the introduction of the PSPO in the locality, namely the Eastern European Men loitering outside Wickes and the immediate streets.

The introduction of the PSPO will impact on the lives of people who live, work and visit the area of the PSPO. The proposed restrictions will impact positively on people whose protective characteristics are impacted upon by the anti-social behaviour the order is designed to address. For example, women feeling intimidated and harassed by the groups loitering on the streets, blocking pavements. The aim is for the PSPO to deter people from engaging in the restricted activities. Whilst the PSPO is designed to prohibit certain activities it is also designed to enable people to feel that the place where they live, work or visit, is a safe and welcoming place. The PSPO tackling ASB in the area could therefore have a positive impact for the area.

Upon implementation, the PSPO will be applied to everyone within the designated area without discrimination of any kind. The authorised officers who will be monitoring the area and enforcing the PSPO will consider the needs of the individual and their personal circumstances in order to make an informed decision as to the appropriate action to take, they will also ensure that any action taken is proportionate to and balanced against the risks posed, either to an individual or the wider community. e.g. seriousness of offence, any past history, repeated non-compliance.

The net outcome of the consultation was an overwhelming support for the PSPO – During the consultation process many people spoke of the intimidation and feeling unsafe, generally commenting that ‘it was about time’ something was done. Women in particular felt apprehensive when walking passed Wickes, having been subject to sexual harassment. Others commented on the drinking in the street and the debris left behind – cans of beer and puddles of urine in their front yards. However it is noted that upon completing the Consultation questionnaire it tended to be the very few people opposing the PSPO who would make additional comments. The only variance which received a high proportion of support was that the boundary of the designated area should be extended to include the Stonebridge Estate and follow natural boundaries; the PSPO has subsequently been amended to reflect this. Generally most people felt that the proposed action should have been taken a long time ago and/or that many other areas could benefit from similar enforcement measures.

Stage 9 - Equality Impact Assessment Review Log

Review approved by Director / Assistant Director

Eubert Malcolm on behalf of
Stephen McDonnell

Date of review

7th July 2016

Review approved by Director / Assistant Director

Date of review

Stage 10 – Publication

Ensure the completed EqIA is published in accordance with the Council's policy.

APPENDIX 6: PSPO – DRAFT ENFORCEMENT ACTION PLAN

Action	Outcome	Frequency	Lead
Targeted distribution of leaflet outlining PSPO and repercussions of breaches to EU Nationals outside Wickes in planned operations involving ASBAT, Police and Thames Reach; to include translated leaflets and Polish & Bulgarian/Turkish speakers	Group that is likely to be adversely affected by the PSPO, will have further notice of the Order and advice on avoiding legal action or fines	One-off operation just prior to commencement of PSPO (late July)	ASBAT In partnership with Police Thames Reach
CCTV coverage of area outside Wickes	To monitor activity and make timely reports to police and other enforcement services of any PSPO breaches	Daily – review after 2 months	Izzet Bicmen (ASBAT)
	To capture & collate evidence to support enforcement action	Daily	Izzet Bicmen (ASBAT)
Carry out reconnaissance of the area	<p>To communicate with anyone breaching PSPO and seek compliance, issue FPN if offender fails to comply or indentified as a persistent offender</p> <p>To uncover evidence of any linked ASB, record & collate, share new information with</p>	Bi-weekly	ASBAT

APPENDIX 6: PSPO – DRAFT ENFORCEMENT ACTION PLAN

Action	Outcome	Frequency	Lead
	partners		
Carry out targeted patrols of area	<p>To communicate with anyone breaching PSPO and seek compliance, issue FPN if offender fails to comply or indentified as a persistent offender</p> <p>To uncover evidence of any linked ASB, record & collate, share new information with ASBAT</p>	Weekly or Bi-Weekly depending on resources	Chris Georgiou
Carry out targeted Patrols of PSPO area	<p>To communicate with anyone breaching PSPO and seek compliance, issue FPN if offender fails to comply or indentified as a persistent offender</p> <p>To uncover evidence of any linked ASB, record & collate, share new information with ASBAT</p>	Weekly	Kingdom Litter Enforcement Team Eubert Malcolm
CCTV monitoring of Wickes Car Park	To continue to monitor usage of Wickes car park – customers only and issues	Daily	Wickes

APPENDIX 6: PSPO – DRAFT ENFORCEMENT ACTION PLAN

Action	Outcome	Frequency	Lead
	penalties to any unauthorised vehicles		
Security Guard presence at Wickes Car park gate	<p>To continue to stop any individuals pursuing customers/traders into the Wickes Car park</p> <p>To alert ASBAT and police of any Intel with regard to descriptions of persistent offenders and vehicles, and any other information which may assist ASBAT and police in targeting resources affectively</p>	Daily	Wickes
Include PSPO area in regular patrols of area	<p>To communicate with anyone breaching PSPO and seek compliance or issue FPN</p> <p>To advise ASBAT of any linked environment crime & waste management issues and address as per usual protocols e.g. referral to Veolia</p>	To be confirmed by Tom Hemmings	Neighbourhood Action Team

APPENDIX 6: PSPO – DRAFT ENFORCEMENT ACTION PLAN

Action	Outcome	Frequency	Lead
Targeted Police resource Police Teams to attend PSPO area 7.30am- 9.30am	To enforce PSPO – communicate with offenders, seek compliance with PSPO, issues FPNs or arrest as appropriate for non-compliance or identified persistent offender	Daily	Matt Cox – East Cluster Policing team Karl Rogers – West Cluster Policing Team
Use Dispersal powers	To tackle problem areas which may arise outside of the PSPO area through displacement	As and when required	Insp Matt Cox – West Cluster Policing team Insp Karl Rogers – East Cluster Policing Team
To incorporate the PSPO area into regular SNT Patrols where possible	To utilise the PSPO power whilst on patrols on West Green Ward – diverting resources when possible to reported incidents amounting to breach of the PSPO	As per SNT Shifts	Insp Karl Rogers – East Cluster Sgt Tom Hassan - Tottenham Green SNT
To incorporate the PSPO area into regular SNT Patrols where possible	To utilise the PSPO power whilst on patrols on St Ann's Ward – diverting resources when possible to reported incidents amounting to breach of the PSPO	As per SNT Shifts	Insp Matt Cox – West Cluster Sgt Bruce Howells – St Ann's SNT
Tackle illegal EU Nationals through the rough sleeping	To work with ASBAT & Police to determine targeted	As and when required	ASBAT Immigration Enforcement

APPENDIX 6: PSPO – DRAFT ENFORCEMENT ACTION PLAN

Action	Outcome	Frequency	Lead
angle	operations and carryout such operations as and when required		

This page is intentionally left blank