

<b>Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 Register and Summary of Responses to initial partner consultation on potential introduction of a Public Spaces Protection Order ('PSPO') (Consultation Period between 4th and 18th March 2016)</b>		
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Rodney Duggua  Town Clerk Chichester City Council</b>	<p><b>At officer level the potential control of issues associated with groups of peddlers, non-licensed buskers and dog fouling was welcomed.</b></p> <p><b>No real issues were highlighted in relation to street drinking during the “working day” however it was suggested that during evening “the character of the City Centre does change” with a number of highlighted drinking “incidents”.</b></p> <p><b>Again, at officer level, support to control ‘chuggers’ (charitable muggers) was welcomed.</b></p> <p><b>There was no desire to limit the area to be covered to that of the city centre. Particular emphasis was given to not limiting the area in connection with drinking but to include areas such as Henty Field (at the back of the West Sussex County Council Records Office) and school playing fields, public parks and open spaces.</b></p>
<b>2</b>	<b>Anne Scicluna City Councillor</b>	<p><b>Whilst fully endorsing the Town Clerk’s comment, especially about the pedlars, it was also suggested to include the Roman Amphitheatre in Whyke Lane/Velyn Avenue in the “no drinking rule”.</b></p>
<b>3</b>	<b>Martyn Bell City Councillor</b>	<p><b>The comments of the Town Clerk were endorsed with reference to ‘Public Parks and Open Spaces’ being included in a potential Order. Priory Park and Oaklands Park were specifically mentioned along with other locations (unspecified) not far ‘outside the walls’ and within the City boundary including the many ‘Twittens’”.</b></p>
<b>4</b>	<b>Nigel</b>	<p><b>Agreed with the Town Clerk's comments and would also endorse Anne Scicluna’s comment in</b></p>

	<b>Galloway City Councillor</b>	<b>terms of including the Roman Amphitheatre site in view of Mr Galloway having allegedly “been told by residents there is a problem in this area”. It is assumed this relates to ‘street drinking’ in the specific location.</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Trevor Tupper City Councillor</b>	<b>No specific comment offered other than agreeing with those previously made by the Town Clerk and Anne Scicluna.</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Richard Plowman City Councillor</b>	<b>No specific comment offered other than agreeing with those previously made by the Town Clerk and Anne Scicluna but considered “ some reassurance” was needed about how enforcement would be carried out.</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Sarah Sharp City Councillor</b>	<p><b>A comprehensive and thorough reply.</b></p> <p><b>The respondent expressed concern about the “alacrity” with using Anti-Social Behaviour legislation via a possible Public Spaces Protection Order to apply to both street trading and drinking although was appreciative that Chichester District Council was intending to consult on this issue - unlike other councils.</b></p> <p><b>The respondent was uncertain how either drinking in public or peddling/hawking in Chichester city centre is causing a "misery" to any residents linking it to the broad definitions contained in the Home Office guidance.</b></p> <p><b>Peddling</b></p> <p><b>Could understand that restaurant and cafe owners would be upset that there are other food outlets without the overheads that they have to pay but at the same time emphasised that we are a free market, defending the right of these on street outlets to offer possibly cheaper alternatives.</b></p>

**Sarah Sharp went on to say “choice and different offer can be precisely what makes the city centre more “lively” and less “dull” and encourage the odd impulse purchase” and “street trading and street food in most countries is seen as something lovely to enjoy”.**

**Balanced against the above comments was a note in reference to whether Councillors/officers are concerned about the image of these stalls suggesting dialogue with the operators may help to “raise standards”.**

**Under a section title ‘Community Protection Notices’ the respondent offered the following in relation to street traders/pedlars.**

**“Although our sensibilities might be offended with the quality of the goods on sale, or the smell of the fried food, I think it would be excessive use of this notice to ban these stallholders by saying the community’s quality of life has been spoilt. These peddlers are doing their best to earn a living - another reason not to ban them without thoroughly thinking through the reasons why. They would either have to go elsewhere or would be out of a job if banned everywhere in the district.”**

#### **Public Drinking**

**In relation to the amphitheatre the respondent confirmed there have been a few incidents over the years but did not feel that groups of people who drink in the summer have caused her “harassment, alarm or distress”. There was reference to occasional noise, but this again doesn’t cause the respondent “misery” resulting in her not wanting to ban people from coming onto the amphitheatre with a drink. The main concern was litter and the need for greater focus on supporting people with drinking problems rather than banning them from more and more of the city.**

**The respondent was clear in terms of the cases of drinking on the bench or on the amphitheatre near Whyke Lane had not caused, in her opinion, “harassment, alarm or distress” however acknowledged that others may be caused more concern.**

		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Chuggers</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>References were made by the respondent to occasionally having been approached by representatives acting on-behalf of a variety of charities including Greenpeace/Cancer charities/Barnados etc – but not every day. The respondent highlighted charities dependency on donations and felt their presence in Chichester was not “a huge problem”.</b></p>
--	--	---

8	<b>Chief Inspector Justin Burtenshaw</b> Chichester and Arun District Police Commander	<p>Chief Inspector Burtenshaw confirmed he was <i>“fully supportive of the implementation of a PSPO within Chichester”</i> however suggested it would be good to meet as <i>“for what is covered”</i>.</p> <p>He was keen that there should be some alignment with any PSPO powers in Arun District Council to prevent enforcement in one area displacing people to the other.</p> <p>Issues as to who enforces the PSPO powers were raised and that any introduction will need to come with accreditation of people from the Council to enforce as it was highlighted that local PCSO’s will not have all the required powers.</p>
9	<b>Emily King</b> Principal Manager Community Safety & Wellbeing Communities & Public Protection Directorate, WSCC	<p>Broadly in favour of the proposal for the PSPO however it was made clear that an opportunity to discuss the matter in more detail would be welcomed, particularly in regard to the behaviours to be included and the area covered. As with the previous DPPO a strong evidence base illustrating the impact of street drinking and illegal street trading is extremely useful in informing discussions with partners.</p>
10	<b>CDC internal officer comments</b>  <b>Communities &amp; Wellbeing</b>	<p>Broadly confirmed there was support for the introduction of a PSPO for the City. However, it was suggested that while the peddling and street trading are perceived to be a nuisance it was felt that there was some value to the wares they provide and contribution they make to the city centre. Further comments were offered in relation to an Order potentially proving an effective means of enforcement but also felt there was a need for clear guidance as to what street trading would be permissible (including buskers).</p> <p>Using the PSPO to curtail street drinking was also supported. From a Wellbeing perspective, the discouragement of street drinking is consistent with other messages regarding the harmful health impacts of alcohol consumption – however it might be useful to consider what activity it might</p>

	<p><b>Economic Development</b></p>	<p>inadvertently curtail and whether certain ideas were incompatible? i.e. the introduction of ‘piazza’ style areas and alcohol consumption.</p> <p>It was agreed that the CSP would be an appropriate forum for further discussion.</p> <p>Reference was also made to busking providing a positive contribution to the Chichester street scene. However, it was suggested that it might be appropriate to develop designated sites and slots (as per London Underground) which may assist with both compliance and enforcement with a caveat that landowners or parties pushing for a wider extension should not look to the PSPO as an alternative to their own land/estate management responsibilities and liabilities.</p> <p>1. <b>Peddlers</b> – Yes. Generally supportive of the Council introducing a PSPO to control peddling/illegal street trading in the city centre</p> <p>The main streets attract a range of peddlers and hawkers. Businesses note that there does not appear to be any cohesive management or control of these. Opinions will vary, but generally there is frustration and resentment from business owners that, while they pay considerable rent and rates for their premises, and operate under stringent H&amp;S rules, peddlers do not.</p> <p>Peddlers sometimes obscure shop-fronts and entrances, and when they locate around the Market Cross thoroughfares become squeezed. There can be some associated litter and food smells, and some businesses question how this benefits the ‘ambience’ of the City. Some, however, feel that, well-controlled, some peddlers and street-food sellers can add to the vibrancy of the City – the key word is ‘control’ so there may need to be some separate licencing arrangement for times when we do wish to encourage such traders and, particularly, street food sellers.</p> <p>A BSO undertook a little ‘snap-shot’ survey in December 2014. A week before Christmas, 16 peddlers were counted inter-mingled with the Christmas market. On 23rd December 13 peddlers had established their own ‘mini-market’ around the Cross.</p>
--	------------------------------------	--

		<p>This is very relevant to the success of the City Centre, as doing business in Chichester is not always easy. Rents are high and sometimes just small changes in market conditions will mean a retailer moves from profit to loss.</p> <p>2. <b>Street Drinking</b> – No. Not supportive of the Council introducing a PSPO to control street drinking in the city centre</p> <p>Not perceived as a problem in the main streets. There may be the odd anecdote of some minor drunkenness, but there does not appear to be any regular, significant or sustained problem or issue to control. In a city such as Chichester, which needs to expand its events calendar, its night-time economy and its visitor economy, any ‘excessive’ controls under a PSPO may be detrimental to these objectives if the city gets tagged as ‘boring’ and the authorities as ‘kill-joys’.</p> <p>Occasionally there are people drinking perhaps excessively in parks and around the walls, but again not a major problem other than occurrences of litter.</p> <p>3. <b>Buskers</b> – Not seen as a problem and seen more as an opportunity.</p> <p>The main streets attract a range of buskers. Some are licenced and some are not and, again, opinions will vary, but generally buskers (if controlled) are considered to add to the street-scene and vibrancy of the City.</p> <p>The key word is ‘control’. Furthermore, from a visitor economy perspective, there may be a desire to encourage and manage busking to attract more visitors and shoppers to the City and retain them in the city for longer.</p> <p>Chuggers – Seen as a nuisance, but probably don’t need to come under a PSPO unless other councils ban them which might mean they all target towns and cities which do not ban them!</p> <p>4. <b>The area to be covered</b> - It would probably make sense if the area defined within any PSPO covers the area residents primarily use to serve their day-to-day needs – i.e. the retail, hospitality,</p>
--	--	--

	<p><b>Environmental protection</b></p>	<p>transport, entertainment, social, heritage and cultural focal points of the City Centre. This is broadly how we are defining the area under consideration for the Chi Vision project.</p> <p>General comment offered in terms of additional consultees when the full public consultation exercise is undertaken. The following groups were highlighted: Chichester Visitors Group as their members include all of the cultural and visitor attractions in the City (Chichester Festival Theatre, Pallant House Gallery, Novium, Cathedral, Canal, etc.).</p> <p>The respondent also suggested they thought it would be useful to include Chichester University as <i>“they are keen to integrate further into the city and might give a perspective from a student’s viewpoint”</i>.</p> <p>It is difficult to say how many complaints are received about City Centre activity such as buskers or illegal traders. Generally we get a handful of complaints (3-4) a year about buskers but these are generally not deemed to be a nuisance.</p> <p>Dog fouling is currently covered by our Dog Control Order and will be transferred to a PSPO next year when we transfer all DCOs to PSPOs.</p>
--	--	---