

MINUTES OF THE CABINET MEMBER SIGNING HELD ON MONDAY 18TH MARCH 2024, 9:00AM – 9:05AM

PRESENT:

COUNCILLORS: Adam Jogee

ALSO ATTENDING: Brian Elik, Eubert Malcolm, Bhavya Nair

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred to the notice of filming at meetings and this information was noted.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

3. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

5. DEPUTATION / PETITIONS / QUESTIONS

There were no deputation / petitions / questions.

6. PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER - HARINGEY BOROUGH-WIDE

That Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Cohesion considered the report that sought approval of the consultation for this proposed Public Space Protection Order.

RESOLVED

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Cohesion to approve a 12 weeks consultation in respect of a proposed borough wide PSPO for alcohol control and other detrimental activities as detailed in the proposed PSPO at Appendix 1 and supported through the co-design process.

Reasons for decision

The Council's commitment to creating a safer environment for all residents and visitors was clear in its vision for the borough [The Corporate Delivery Plan | Haringey Council](#).

To achieve this vision, the Council was proposing the introduction of a borough-wide Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) to address the ongoing issues of anti-social behaviour (ASB) and criminal activity that were currently blighting the lives of residents and businesses in the borough, making residents and visitors feel unsafe and creating an environment that was unwelcoming and unpleasant.

A Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) sets clear conditions for the use of specified public areas and enables authorised Council officers and Police Officers to engage individuals and educate them about their behaviour and responsibilities.

Haringey's current PSPO provisions relating to alcohol were limited to certain areas. Noel Park Ward was the only ward which had an alcohol control PSPO in place covering the whole ward. Of the other remaining 10 Alcohol control PSPOs, these only apply to parts of the following wards: Bounds Green, Bruce Castle, Harringay, Hermitage & Gardens, Northumberland Park, St Ann's, Seven Sisters, South Tottenham, Tottenham Central, Tottenham Hale and West Green. With ward boundary changes in 2023, some of the alcohol control PSPOs had to be renamed as area PSPOs and no longer relate to a single ward; this may confuse residents and visitors to the borough and availability of resources to monitor and enforce the PSPOs can become muddled. There was no alcohol provision in the following wards: Alexandra, Crouch End, Fortis Green, Highgate, Hornsey, Muswell Hill and Stroud Green. Thus, leaving areas without a PSPO, vulnerable to displacement of this activity from areas which were covered by a PSPO.

In addition, Haringey's neighbouring boroughs, all have borough wide alcohol control provision, thus encouraging the displacement of such activity into Haringey, where our own provision was patchy. Enfield and Barnet have a complete prohibition on the consumption of alcohol in a public space. Islington, Hackney and Waltham Forest have a PSPO that gives the police and authorised Officers of the Council borough-wide powers to confiscate alcohol and request people to stop drinking where there was reason to believe that if they do not, alcohol-related nuisance and annoyance was likely to occur.

The initial co-design consultation with residents and other stakeholders took place during January 2024. Prior to this period the matter of a borough-wide PSPO was discussed with stakeholders at meetings such as Ward Panels, Ladder Community Partnership (LCSP), resident association meetings, and Neighbourhood Watch Association meetings. The overwhelming feedback from the co-design process was the support for a borough wide PSPO prohibiting alcohol related nuisance and a number of other detrimental, as listed in the draft proposed PSPO in Appendix 1

Cabinet/ Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Cohesion must consider the outcome of the co-design process in deciding on whether to approve the consultation on a borough wide PSPO.

Background Information Co-design Consultation Process

As part of the Haringey Deal, the Council undertook a co-design process with residents, workers and visitors to Haringey, seeking their views on the introduction of borough-wide public spaces Protection Orders (PSPOs). The process included an on-line survey that ran between 10th and 31st January 2024.

A flyer was produced publicising the co-design consultation, outlining what PSPOs were and included a QR code for the on-line survey. The council held two pop up event (Marcus Garvey Library and Wood Green Library) distributing the flyer and engaging with 66 residents. During the co-design period officers also attended various resident/stakeholder based meetings to advise on the co-design consultation process, distribute the flyer, encourage participation and answer any additional questions residents had with regard to PSPOs and the proposals. These meetings included Ward Panels for Seven Sisters, St Ann's Bounds Green and Woodside Wards: Ladder Community Safety Partnership, Noel Park Residents Association meeting, Love Finsbury Park (Clear Hold Build). Details of the co-design consultation were also emailed to over 200 services, community groups and organisations, individual stake holders, faith groups and residents' groups to distribute to their users and members.

Residents and other stake holder were asked whether they were in favour of a borough-wide alcohol control PSPO. In addition, residents and stakeholders were asked if they agreed or disagreed with a number of other detrimental activities also being prohibited through a PSPO.

The results of the co-design process

1. 175 people completed the on-line survey.
2. 79% of respondents were in favour of a borough wide alcohol control PSPO.
3. 83.2% of respondents strongly agreed/agreed that causing harassment, alarm, or distress to any individual(s) by committing anti-social behaviour (offensive language, acting in an aggressive manner) should be part of a PSPO. A further 7.5% of respondents were neutral on this issue.
4. 85.4% of respondents strongly agreed/agreed that urinating, defecating, spitting or littering in a public place should be part of a PSPO. A further 6.8% of respondents were neutral on this proposal. It was noted that Respondents commented that future consultations should seek to separate these issues as views may differ on each issue.
5. 80.7% of respondents strongly agreed/agreed that being in possession of or misuse fireworks in any public space unless individually licensed by the

council should be part of a PSPO. A further 10.6% of respondents were neutral on this proposal.

6. 79.5% of respondents strongly agreed/agreed that to ride moped/motorbikes and cause alarm harassment or distress, should be part of a PSPO. A further 10.3% of respondents were neutral on this proposal.
7. 75.7% of respondents strongly agreed/agreed that to smoke any tobacco or tobacco related product, smokeless tobacco product including electronic cigarettes, herbal cigarettes, within the boundary of the children's play areas should be part of a PSPO. A further 14.3% of respondents were neutral on this proposal.
8. 71.5% of respondents strongly agreed/agreed that to misuse or share with others any illegal substances (spice, and other substances known for legal highs) or marijuana/weed in a public space; nor be in possession in a public place of any drug paraphernalia for example cannabis grinders or crack cocaine pipes, should be part of a PSPO. A further 13.7% of respondents were neutral on this proposal.
9. 71.4% of respondents strongly agreed/agreed that starting or attempting to build any open fires or BBQs in Green Spaces (without prior written permission of the council), should be part of a PSPO. A further 15.5% of respondents were neutral on this proposal.
10. Although to a lesser extent, the majority of respondents also agreed with the inclusion of the following detrimental activities, indicating that these issues should be addressed through PSPOs targeting specific locations/areas.
 - Engage in or promote or encourage others to promote or deliver any unlicensed music events unless individually licensed in writing by the council – 62% agreed and 18.9% were neutral.
 - Buy and/or sell any merchandise on or within 7 metres of the Public Highway without the written consent from the council (illegal trading) – 56.1% agreed and 24.5% were neutral.
 - Not to buy and/or sell event tickets on or within 7 metres of the Public Highway without prior written consent of the council (ticket touting) – 57.1% agreed and 28.6% were neutral.
 - Congregate in a group of 3 or more people, where one or more person/s have been engaging in anti-social behaviour and at least one member of that group was within the designated area 66.2% agreed and 14.4% were neutral.

11. 44.4% of respondents strongly agreed/agreed that to engage in or encourage others to engage in any filming or making of music videos on council land or without prior written permission of the council should be part of a PSPO. A further 26.9% of respondents were neutral on this issue. It was noted that this was only likely to be perceived as anti-social behaviour by those residents living on council managed estates, where they have been affected by the disorder resulting from the production of gang-related videos. The result of the co-design confirms that this was not a borough wide issue and would be best suited for a PSPO for specific areas where this had been identified as a particular problem.

The co-design survey also asked respondents to identify any other detrimental activities which they felt should also be considered under the PSPO provision and the

- Drug dealing and drug use including cannabis, aerosols, gas cannisters, NOS, balloons.
- Dog Control: tackling dangerous dogs/aggressive dogs and their owners; training dogs for dog fighting; limiting number of dogs per dog walkers to 3 Allowing dogs; dogs off the lead within 400m of a children's playground; Not cleaning up dog foul if you were the owner. High fines for dog fouling
- Verbal abuse particularly to women
- prostitution
- Loitering in communal areas and stairwells in council blocks
- Aggressive begging, begging at traffic lights, outside shops, stations, around parks.
- Waste & Street enforcement: Bins blocking pavements; Fly tipping, landlord dumping white goods, furniture; graffiti; dumping of rubbish, Litter.
- Noise pollution: cars/motorbikes revving their engines unnecessarily; Busking without consent; Use of megaphone or microphone with speaker; amplified preaching and music.
- Vehicle related nuisance: Cyclists, e-bikes and e-scooters on pavements; Repairs of vehicles on the street/public highway/housing estate land; Residents blocking road to reserve parking spaces; engines idling; e-bikes left blocking pavements; hire bikes abandoned on pavements; congregation of Deliveroo, food delivery drivers.

Some key supportive comments from the Co-design process were highlighted below:

“Alcohol control PSPO will help make the streets safer for us and our children”

“Unfortunately as the nuisance caused by alcohol related behaviour seems to occur in disparate parts of the borough it will be easier to use a whole borough approach, which will enable authorities to deal quickly with issues arising in new places instead of having to apply for new orders when a problem arises”.

“Excessive drinking and drunken behaviour in public spaces is closely related to high levels of noise all of which disturb the peace and limit enjoyment of public spaces. Behaviour of those drinking excessively can also be very intimidating especially for a woman on her own.”

Respondents also raised other concerns:

- i. *“How will it be enforced – do the police and council have the resources and capacity.”*

It was not anticipated that the Council and the police will provide 24 hours monitoring of a Borough wide PSPO. It was hoped that restrictions will serve as a deterrent, to prevent the problem recurring. By having the Order in place it equips authorised officers, when encountering nuisance to use this power to stop the nuisance and/or give warnings/advice to those engaging in the unwanted behaviour, to prevent recurrence. Whilst the Council and the Police may not be able to directly respond to every individual report of breaches, enforcement services will utilise reports and community intelligence to inform planned activities and operations.

- ii. *“This power could be easily be misused against a harmless social gathering where people were enjoying some alcoholic drinks”*

The proposed order was not imposing a blanket restriction on alcohol in public spaces. It will not be an offence to drink alcohol in the restricted area. The PSPO will be used to tackle anti-social behaviour resulting from the consumption of alcohol. It was the desire to reduce the nuisance caused that an authorised officer may request that an individual stop drinking or surrender the alcohol in their possession. The offence which can result in enforcement (the issuing of a fine) was where an individual fails to comply with this request. Any required interventions would also be explored e.g. advice/signposting to support. However, any history of persistent engagement in this restricted behaviour without reasonable excuse would also be taken into consideration.

- iii. *The orders will impact on already vulnerable or marginalised groups*

The PSPO will not be used to target any particular group and there was no evidence of enforcement of PSPOs within the Borough being used to target any particular groups. Nor does the data available support that, ethnic minorities or particular age groups, were more likely to be engaging in the behaviours the proposed PSPO is seeking to restrict. The need to tackle anti-social behaviour, respond effectively to complaints from the public and take action against detrimental activities, to ensure the safety of the public, outweighs the negative impact this could have on any particular group, that was the issuing of a fine or

prosecution. The Council acknowledges the prominence of street drinking, alcohol and drug consumption amongst the street homeless population and other disadvantaged groups and we will continue to work in partnership with support and outreach services to engage with relevant groups and undertake preventative and supportive initiatives in the first instance. Authorised officers will give consideration to the needs of the individual and personal circumstances, in order to make an informed, balanced and equitable decision as to the appropriate action to take.

The Co-design consultation report can be found at Appendix 2

Alternative options considered

Not to consult and to maintain current PSPO provision within the borough until those current provisions expire in May 2025.

This option was not recommended as

- The co-design process and indications from stake holders and partners confirms support for widening the PSPO provisions within the borough in respect of alcohol control and other detrimental activities.
- Without the additional powers under a PSPO it was likely these detrimental behaviours were likely to recur and remain persistent, having a detrimental effect on the local community.

7. PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER - FINSBURY PARK SOUTH ENTRANCE

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Cohesion considered the report that sought approval of the consultation for this proposed Public Space Protection Order.

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Cohesion to approve the Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) – Gating order, as contained in Appendix 1.

Reasons for decision

The Council's commitment to creating a safer environment for all residents and visitors was clear in its vision for the borough. To achieve this vision, the Council was proposing the introduction of a Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) to address the ongoing issues of anti-social behaviour (ASB) and criminal activity that are negatively affecting the park's atmosphere and the safety of those who use it.

The specific area in question, was located adjacent to the south entrance of the park on Seven Sisters Road, which poses certain challenges due to its design and layout. The main issues which have influenced the decision for the gating PSPO are as follows:

- Layout of the area. The narrow line of sight and the transition from nearby amenities like Lidl into an open space have created an environment where unlawful activities can occur without being easily detected.
- There was a lack of clear ownership or defined rules in the space which contributes to issues, as there are no clear indications of proper usage, including, poor pavement markings, the absence of signage and no clear parking restrictions.
- The environment also allows individuals to conceal themselves around various corners, leading to decreased feelings of safety in the area. This contributes to the misuse of the space for criminal activities and anti-social behaviour.
- The issue was not limited to pedestrian traffic; mopeds parking on the pavement further compounds the problem. While some moped riders might have legitimate reasons for being there, the presence of both legal and illegal users creates an assumption that this practice was acceptable, essentially establishing a "desire line" for mopeds in the area. This becomes a challenge to rectify, even if it negatively impacts the general public. It's also noted that the majority of moped users are pretending to be delivery drivers but are, in fact, involved in facilitating the supply of drugs.

Closing off the area by erecting gates and implementing the PSPO will bring an end to or restrict the behaviours above and subsequently, bring about improvements to the area such as, an increase in feelings of safety for users of the park in particular women and in addition the area will be put to better, legitimate use.

Alternative options considered

Not to pursue a gating order under a PSPO.

Given the length of time that the behaviour had been ongoing and the detrimental effect the behaviour was having on our communities and businesses, this was not an option.

Also the outcome of the statutory consultation in respect of this proposal was support for the implementation of the Finsbury Park (South Side) PSPO

8. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no new items of urgent business.

CHAIR:

Signed by Chair

Date