

**Appendix 1:  
The Proposed Public Spaces Protection Orders and results from the Public Consultation**

**Contents:**

	<b>Page number</b>
Introduction	1
Glossary	2
The proposed Public Spaces Protection Orders:	2
Control of alcohol consumption	2
Vehicle Cruising	3
Holding of Fireworks to cause intimidation etc or throwing of Fireworks	4
Dog Controls	4
Persons loitering causing nuisance etc. in Council housing estate blocks	11
Intimidatory Begging	12
Possession, use, consumption and supply of psychoactive substances	13
Persons windscreen washing/selling goods	13
Prostitution	14
Smoking in playgrounds	15
Flying of Drones	16
Vehicles deposited on land	17
Parking around Schools	17
Riding of mopeds to cause alarm etc.	18
Loitering of persons in certain locations	19

**Glossary:**

The general definitions used to describe the locations involved are as follows:

Borough	All open public land owned, adopted or managed by the London Borough of Enfield including roads, footpaths, pavements, alley ways and towpaths, all grass verges, and parks and open spaces including wooded areas.
Highways	All roads, footpaths, pavements, alley ways, towpaths and grass verges maintained at public expense.
Parks	All parks and open spaces managed by the London Borough of Enfield. Details of the parks to which the dog controls apply can be found in Appendix 5 (schedules 1-3).
Council Housing estates	All Council housing estates owned by the London Borough of Enfield.
Authorised person	A Local Authority Employee, a person designated by the Local Authority, a Police Officer or a Police Community Support Officer

## The proposed Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPOs)

This section sets out the details of the proposed Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPOs) on which the public were consulted, the location each might apply and the legal wording.

Where changes to the proposals were made as a result of feedback from the public consultation, this is explained and the legal wording amended in red text if necessary.

### 1. Control of alcohol consumption

The following provisions are proposed to replace the existing Designated Public Place Orders by extending them to the whole borough.

The PSPO does not make it a criminal offence to consume alcohol in public places and is not designed to disrupt peaceful activities, for example having a glass of wine with friends in a park. The aim of the provision is only to enable challenge of alcohol consumption where individuals are causing a nuisance.

<b>Proposal 1</b>	<b>Prohibition of drinking alcohol after having been requested to stop by an authorised person, and hand over any alcohol when requested to do so by an authorised person.</b>
Where it will apply	Whole borough
Change from existing	The current Designated Public Place Orders apply to only some areas of the borough such as parks, main high streets and around transport hubs. The proposal is to extend this across the whole borough.
Recorded reports/complaints	Between March 2013 and March 2016, 103 calls to the Police (CAD Calls) were made, 45 Penalty Notices were issued by the Police and 350 warning given by the Police in the year March 2015 to March 2016.
Consultation results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 89% of respondents were in support of the prohibition of drinking after having been requested to stop, (82% in total agreement and 7% in agreement but with some changes) and</li> <li>▪ 82% of respondents were in support of the person being required to hand over the alcohol when requested to do so (75% in total agreement and 7% in agreement but with some changes)</li> </ul>
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The majority of comments on this prohibition were that it should only be invoked if the drinking is causing a problem/nuisance, and should not apply to social gatherings not causing annoyance. Discretion to be exercised.</li> <li>▪ Some comments suggested issuing a warning first</li> <li>▪ Concerns about resources to enforce these provisions and the confrontation that might occur</li> </ul>
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ It is currently the case, and would be under these proposals, that persons would only be requested to stop drinking and hand over alcohol if they were causing nuisance or disorder, or this was reasonably anticipated.</li> <li>▪ With regards to the comments about giving a warning first, persons causing a problem would be asked to stop drinking (and hand over the alcohol), and would only be issued with a FPN if they failed to stop drinking or hand over the alcohol.</li> <li>▪ Enforcement resources will be used as needed, and proactively</li> </ul>

	targeted to locations where intelligence suggests the problem is greatest.
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Proceed with the proposal</b>
Draft legal wording	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No person shall drink alcohol (other than in a premises licensed for the sale of alcohol or at a venue where a Temporary Event Notice is in force) after having been requested to stop by an authorised person</li> <li>2. A person is required to immediately surrender any alcohol, whether in an open or closed container, in his possession when requested to do so by an authorised person who reasonably believes that the person has consumed, is consuming, or intends to consume alcohol in breach of the prohibition above.</li> </ol>

## 2. Vehicle Cruising

<b>Proposal 2</b>	<b>Participating in vehicle cruising activity as a passenger or driver of a vehicle, and/or congregating in the area to spectate cruising activity to include cars, motorbikes, mopeds, vans, trucks, lorries or other vehicle</b>
Where it will apply	The A10 and A406 within the Borough boundaries, Ravenside Retail Park, Tesco Carpark in Glover Drive, <b>Enfield Retail Park, Millmarsh Lane, Riverwalk Road Business Park and The Green, N14</b>
Change from existing	No existing Order Concerns about excessive noise, verbal abuse and intimidation from 'boy racers' and spectators. There is also a major concern over the safety of other road users and pedestrians.
Recorded reports/complaints	Between March 2013 and March 2016, 98 calls to the Police (CAD Calls) were made. The calls tend to refer to cars doing "doughnuts" in car parks or racing on the roads.
Consultation results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>97% of respondents supported this proposal (93% in total support and 4% in support but with some changes)</li> </ul>
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several comments that car cruising/racing is a significant dangerous problem and causing severe noise disturbance (particularly on Saturday and Sunday evenings) and needs tackling</li> <li>One comment about a child that was killed due to car cruising on the A10</li> <li>One comment that Bounds Green Road is a problem area for racing</li> <li>A couple of comments that there should be organised events/meets for responsible enthusiasts</li> <li>Several comments calling for a ban on car cruising across the borough, including arrests, driving bans and vehicles confiscated</li> <li>One comment that it also happens in Sainsbury, Winchmore Hill car park</li> <li>One comment to include motorbikes also (due to wheelies)</li> <li>Comments received during a meeting with Cllrs and an MP requesting that Enfield Retail Park be included, and also complaints received about mopeds receiving instruction and doing wheelies and stunts on roads in the Brimsdown area</li> <li>The Police requested that Riverwalk Road Business Park be included due to cruising activity</li> <li>Southgate Green was also subsequently identified as a location for heavy vehicles revving engines etc.</li> </ul>
Amendments /	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PSPO powers do not extend to arrest, driving bans or confiscation of</li> </ul>

considerations after consultation	<p>vehicles but other legislation can be used for these aspects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Two further locations are mentioned by two respondents – but will be addressed separately as no evidence of a widespread problem</li> <li>▪ There are no plans to facilitate or organise meets/events for enthusiasts</li> <li>▪ Amend the proposal to also include motorbikes, mopeds, vans, trucks and lorries and other vehicles as some of the issues are not just caused by cars</li> <li>▪ Extend the scope of the PSPO to include the other affected areas of Enfield Retail Park, Millmarsh Lane, Riverwalk Road Business Park and Southgate Green</li> </ul>
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal - <b>but also incorporate motorbikes, mopeds, vans, trucks, lorries and other vehicles and extend it to Enfield Retail Park, Millmarsh Lane, Riverwalk Road Business Park and The Green, N14</b>
Draft legal wording	<p>No person shall participate in <b>vehicle</b> cruising activity as a passenger or driver of a vehicle and/or congregate to spectate <b>vehicle</b> cruising activity within the area designated in the Public Spaces Protection Order</p> <p><b>Vehicle</b> cruising is activity that a reasonable person would consider to be 'car cruising' such as speeding, driving in convoy, racing, performing stunts, sounding horns (as to cause public nuisance), revving engines, wheel spins etc) <b>using cars, motorbikes, mopeds, vans, trucks, lorries and other vehicles</b></p>

### 3. **Holding of fireworks to cause intimidation etc or throwing of fireworks**

<b>Proposal 2</b>	<b>Prohibit the holding of fireworks to cause intimidation etc or throwing of fireworks</b>
Where it will apply	Whole borough
Change from existing	No existing Order. Concerns are expressed that a dangerous minority deliberately uses fireworks to harass, intimidate and sometimes seriously harm those around them by throwing fireworks.
Recorded reports/complaints	Between March 2013 and March 2016, there were 564 calls to the Police (CAD calls) about fireworks, over 90% of them in the months of October and November.
Consultation results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 96% of respondents were in support of this proposal (95% in total support and 1% in support but with some changes)</li> </ul>
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There were several comments that fireworks should only be allowed in public displays, banned altogether (or from 8pm) or only sold to adults of at least 18 or 25 years old and one comment that they should not be sold at all to the public</li> <li>▪ One comment that fireworks continue for weeks either side of 5 November</li> <li>▪ One comment that fireworks in EN3 was a big issue last year for weeks, which was not well handled, and escalated</li> <li>▪ Feedback that the PSPO should also include holding fireworks to intimidate and harass etc other people</li> </ul>
Amendments / considerations after	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ It is already illegal to sell fireworks to persons under 18, and retailers have a responsibility to take appropriate steps to ensure this.</li> </ul>

consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that the responsible use of fireworks, especially in a public display are enjoyable, and the Council does not seek to ban the responsible use of fireworks.</li> </ul>
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal – and include holding of fireworks to intimidate etc
Draft legal wording	(1) Person(s) within this area shall not hold fireworks such as to intimidate others or cause nuisance, alarm or distress, or throw fireworks.

#### 4. Dog Controls

The following provisions are proposed to replace the existing Dog Control Orders, to update the list of parks to which the requirements apply to take account of new parks/park areas and extend dog controls to include a maximum number of dogs to be walked and the need for dog walkers to carry suitable receptacles to clean up dog mess.

<b>Proposal 3</b>	<b>Prohibition of dog fouling and having a receptacle to pick up dog faeces</b>
Where it will apply	Whole borough
Change from existing	There is a current Dog Control Order across the borough prohibiting dog fouling. This proposal is to include a requirement that persons in control of dogs have suitable receptacles (such as bags) immediately available for picking up their dog's faeces.
Recorded reports/complaints	Between March 2013 and March 2016, there were 63 FPNs issued for dog fouling, and between February 2015 and February 2016 the parks police issued 20 FPNs for dog fouling in parks. 519 complaints were received by the Envirocrime team about dog fouling between March 2013 and March 2016.
Consultation results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>96% in support of the prohibition of dog fouling, (92% in total support and 4% in support but with some changes), and</li> <li>97% in support of the requirement for persons in control of dogs to carry suitable receptacles to pick up dog mess (95% in total support and 2% in support but with some changes)</li> </ul>
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several comments where respondents had seen dog walkers not clean up their dog's mess and that it should be enforced with fines</li> <li>A couple of specific locations mentioned where dog fouling is a problem such as Westerham Ave, N9 and Broomfield Park</li> <li>One comment that bag debris is a problem for the environment and should 'stick and flick' dog mess in open parkland</li> <li>One comment that concerned about being fined if the owner forgets to take a bag with them</li> <li>Many comments were that the Council should provide free bags available at the park entrances or on park bins</li> <li>A few comments that there should be more bins to dispose of dog mess, and to be emptied regularly so that they do not overflow</li> <li>The Kennel club commented on the consultation regarding dog fouling as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports responsible dog ownership and cleaning up dog mess everywhere they are, including woods and countryside</li> <li>Concerned about responsible dog owners who have run out of bags being fined, and suggests that this is taken account of in the PSPO</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Suggests dog owners might chose to not pick up dog mess if they were down to their last bag or had run out, especially if they had given another dog owner their last bag to use</li> <li>○ Prefer that the focus is on catching persons not clearing up their dog's mess</li> <li>○ Ensure publicity and signage if PSPO introduced</li> <li>○ The provision needs to allow for persons registered blind or using an assistance dog</li> <li>○ Refers to the decision of Cornwall Council not to introduce a 'means to pick up' provision as they considered it not reasonable/proportionate and unenforceable</li> </ul>
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Council does not intend to provide bags for dog owners as it is their responsibility to make provision to clear up their dog's mess</li> <li>▪ Bags containing dog's mess can be disposed of in any litter bin provided by the Council. There is a schedule for emptying of all bins.</li> <li>▪ The purpose of this proposal is to both ensure that dog owners clear up dog's mess, and that they carry sufficient bags to pick up their dog's mess</li> <li>▪ The proposal includes a 'reasonable excuse' provision so if the dog walker were able to satisfactorily demonstrate that they could use a suitable receptacle to pick up dog mess, then they would not be issued with a FPN</li> <li>▪ Publicity and signage will be provided if the PSPOs are introduced</li> <li>▪ The proposal does not apply to persons registered blind or with limited mobility</li> <li>▪ With regards to the Cornwall Council decision not to implement the 'means to pick up' provision, Enfield Council does not share their views. The consultation and other feedback from residents provides sufficient concerns about dog mess not being cleaned up, and the carrying of a suitable receptacle would assist responsible dog ownership and can be enforced. This proposal is not considered unreasonable or disproportionate.</li> <li>▪ The proposal is amended to include appropriate disposal of dog mess due to a few comments received about bags of dog's faeces being left hanging on trees etc.</li> </ul>
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal – including appropriate disposal of the dog faeces
Draft legal wording	<p>(1) If a dog defecates at any time on any land detailed, a person who is in charge of the dog at that time must have with him an appropriate means to pick up dog faeces deposited by that dog <b>and</b> remove the faeces from the land forthwith <b>and appropriately dispose of it</b>, unless –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) he has a reasonable excuse for failing to do so; or</li> <li>(b) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his failing to do so.</li> </ul> <p>(2) The obligation to have appropriate means of picking up dog faeces is complied with if, after a request from an authorised officer, the person in charge of the dog produces an appropriate means to pick up dog faeces.</p>

	<p>(3) Being unaware of the defecation (whether by reason of not being in the vicinity or otherwise), or not having a device for or other suitable means of removing the faeces shall not be a reasonable excuse for failing to remove the faeces.</p> <p>(4) Nothing in this article applies to –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) a person who is registered as a blind person in a register compiled under section 29 of the National Assistance Act 1948; or</li> <li>(b) a person who has a disability which affects that person’s mobility, manual dexterity, physical coordination or ability to lift, carry or otherwise move everyday objects, in respect of a dog trained by a prescribed charity and upon which that person relies for assistance.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Proposal 4</b>	<b>Failure of the person in charge of a dog to have it on a lead at all times in the designated area</b>
Where it will apply	Areas in Schedule 2 (in Appendix 5) of the list of parks and open spaces and Council housing estates
Change from existing	It is essential that dogs are under control on a lead at all times in small parks and walled gardens to prevent attacks and causing nuisance to other park users. The proposal is that it would apply in areas covered by the existing Dog Control Orders and new parks/play areas since the existing Dog Control Orders were made (such as Angel Gardens, Arnos Community Growing Space, Broomfield Community Orchard, Pymmes Park (Wetlands) Woodcroft Wildspace and Whitewebbs Golf Course). In addition, it is considered appropriate that dogs be kept on leads on Council Housing estates.
Recorded reports/complaints	Very little recorded data about issues with this. Officers report that there appears to have been a high degree of compliance because of the Dog Control Order being in place.
Consultation results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 80% in support of this proposal (73% in total support and 7% in support but with some changes)</li> </ul>
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A few comments that dogs should be allowed to be off the lead as dogs need to exercise – unless they are dangerous and should be kept on a lead</li> <li>▪ 5 comments that dogs should not have to be on leads at all times in most/all parks</li> <li>▪ A few comments that dogs should be on leads at all times</li> <li>▪ A few comments suggested that there should be designated times or parks/areas of parks that dogs can be walked</li> <li>▪ One comment that people are scared by dogs off the lead</li> <li>▪ One comment about dogs on leads on council housing estates – that it depends on the circumstances</li> <li>▪ The Kennel club commented on the consultation regarding dogs on leads at all times in certain parks as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ They do not usually oppose Orders to exclude dogs from playgrounds or for them to be on leads in tennis courts etc. as</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>long as alternative provision is made for dog walking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The statutory guidance for PSPOs makes it clear that Councils must provide restriction-free spaces for dogs to be exercised</li> <li>○ Consider the Public Sector Equality Duty with regards to the accessibility of restriction-free spaces for those with mobility issues and the elderly in addition to persons with protected characteristics</li> </ul>
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Initial comments on the questionnaire suggested a misunderstanding about the need for dogs to be on leads – people thinking it applied to all parks and not the few on the schedule. This was clarified by an explanatory paragraph on the consultation website which was also sent to Friends of Parks groups.</li> <li>▪ There are only 15 small parks where it is appropriate that this proposal would apply (see schedule 2 in Appendix 5)</li> <li>▪ It is appreciated that dogs need to be exercised and nothing in the dog control proposals stops dogs being exercised. Dogs can be walked off the lead in the vast majority of parks. As such there are no plans to introduce designated parks or times when dogs can be walked.</li> <li>▪ The provision of ‘reasonable excuse’ could be considered for a registered blind person or person using an assistance dog found to have a dog off the lead in a designated area</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Proceed with the proposal</b>
Draft legal wording	<p>(1) A person in charge of a dog on any land detailed must, at all times, keep the dog on a lead, unless –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) he has a reasonable excuse for failing to do so; or</li> <li>(b) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his failing to do so.</li> </ul>

<b>Proposal 5</b>	<b>Failure of the person in charge of a dog to have it on a lead in the designated area when directed by an authorised officer</b>
Where it will apply	Areas in Schedule 3 (in Appendix 5) of the list of parks and open spaces
Change from existing	<p>When the dog has been observed as causing distress or annoyance, or is considered likely to, the person in control will be asked to place the dog on a lead.</p> <p>The proposal is that it would apply in areas covered by the existing Dog Control Orders and new parks/play areas since the existing Dog Control Orders were made (such as Russell Road Open Space).</p>
Recorded reports/complaints	Very little recorded data about issues with this. Officers report that there appears to have been a high degree of compliance because of the Dog Control Order being in place.
Consultation results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 89% of respondents were in support of this proposal (85% in total support and 4% in support but with some changes)</li> </ul>
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ One comment that dogs on leads by direction should be left to the discretion of the owner as they know their dog best</li> <li>▪ A couple of comments that dogs should only be asked to be put on the lead if the dog is being aggressive or misbehaving</li> <li>▪ The Kennel club commented on the consultation regarding dogs on lead by direction as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Welcomes more flexible proposals for ‘dogs on lead by</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



	direction' so that can target those dog owners that do not have their dogs under control
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Dog owners would only be asked to put their dog on the lead by an authorised officer if they were causing annoyance, nuisance or being aggressive</li> <li>▪ This proposal would apply to over 100 of the parks and open spaces where dogs are permitted to be off the lead, and only requested to be put on the lead for reasons of nuisance or aggression</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Proceed with the proposal</b>
Draft legal wording	(1) A person in charge of a dog on any land detailed must put the dog on a lead if directed by an authorised person unless – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) he has a reasonable excuse for failing to do so; or</li> <li>(b) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his failing to do so.</li> </ul>

<b>Proposal 6</b>	<b>Prohibition of dogs at all times in the designated area</b>
Where it will apply	Areas in Schedule 1 (in Appendix 5) of the list of parks and playgrounds in Council housing estates
Change from existing	Dog exclusion areas would apply to areas in parks such as children's play areas, multi-use games courts and tennis courts where it would be inappropriate for dogs to mix with park users. The proposal would apply in areas covered by the existing Dog Control Order and new parks/play areas since the existing Dog Control Orders were made such as Durants Park splash pad, the fenced off area surrounding the pond at Conway Recreation, the new pond in Jubilee Park, Church Street and Bourneside Recreation Tennis Courts, Broomfield Park Garden of Remembrance, the multi-use games area in Oakwood Park and the playgrounds in Trent Park and Enfield Playing Fields.
Recorded reports/complaints	In 2015/16, 8 FPNs were issued for dogs being in banned areas. There is very little recorded data about issues with this. Officers report that there appears to have been a high degree of compliance because of the Dog Control Order being in place.
Consultation results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 81% of respondents were in support of this proposal (76% in total support and 5% in support but with some changes)</li> </ul>
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There were several comments in support of dogs being excluded from childrens' playgrounds</li> <li>▪ One comments that they could be allowed in on leads and warned if the owner takes them off the lead.</li> <li>▪ The Kennel club commented on the consultation regarding dog exclusion areas as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ They do not usually oppose Orders to exclude dogs from playgrounds or for them to be on leads in tennis courts etc. as long as alternative provision is made for dog walking</li> <li>○ The provision needs to allow for persons registered blind or using an assistance dog</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Amendments / considerations after	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Most of the comments were in support of excluding dogs from childrens' playgrounds, and no clear comments about excluding dogs</li> </ul>

consultation	<p>from the small number of parks listed in schedule 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The provision of 'reasonable excuse' would be considered for a registered blind person or person using an assistance dog found to have a dog in a dog exclusion area</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Proceed with the proposal</b>
Draft legal wording	<p>(1) A person in charge of a dog must not, at any time, take the dog onto, or permit the dog (including by not exercising sufficient control of the dog), to enter or to remain on, any land detailed, unless- (a) he has a reasonable excuse for failing to do so; or</p> <p>(b) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his failing to do so.</p>

<b>Proposal 7</b>	<b>The maximum number of dogs in a person's charge is four unless in possession of a valid licence issued by the Council permitting up to six dogs.</b>
Where it will apply	All parks
Change from existing	<p>No existing Order.</p> <p>These measures are being considered due to concerns raised about dogs being out of control and the proliferation of walkers with a large number of dogs.</p>
Recorded reports/complaints	10 complaints recorded between April 2013 to April 2016 on the Council database about persons walking large numbers of dogs in parks, particularly Trent park. Friends of Parks have raised concerns frequently about dogs being out of control and the proliferation of walkers with a large number of dogs to control
Consultation results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 83% in support of this proposal (78% in total support and 5% in support but with some changes)</li> </ul>
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There were 11 comments that the number of dogs that should be walked depending on the behaviour and control of the dogs, or their breed or size</li> <li>▪ There were 14 comments that the number of dogs walked should be limited to a maximum of 4 dogs</li> <li>▪ There were 5 comments that people should be able to walk as many dogs as they want</li> <li>▪ There were 3 comments that the maximum number of dogs should be limited to 2 dogs</li> <li>▪ The Kennel club commented on the consultation regarding maximum dog numbers as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The maximum number of dogs can be arbitrary and does not address the actual control of dogs which can be influenced by a number of factors (eg size and training of dogs)</li> <li>○ Suggests that this provision may legitimise people walking dogs up to the maximum (and not being in control) or intensify dog walking in other areas, or leaving dogs in vehicles in excess of the maximum giving rise to welfare issues</li> <li>○ Suggests using outcomes such as ensuring dogs do not run up to people uninvited and 'dogs on leads by direction' instead</li> <li>○ Suggests looking at accreditation schemes instead for commercial dog walkers</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 16% (127 respondents) suggested changes or disagreed with the proposed limits as they said that the number allowed depended on the behaviour and control of the dog, and also that the maximum should be 4 dogs</li> <li>▪ The majority - 78% (623 respondents) agreed with the maximum being 4 dogs unless issued with a licence to allow up to 6 dogs.</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Proceed with the proposal</b>
Draft legal wording	<p>(1) A person must not take more than four (4) dogs at the same time onto the land detailed, unless -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) in possession of insurance and a valid licence issued by the Council permitting up to six (6) dogs, or</li> <li>(b) he has a reasonable excuse for doing so; or</li> <li>(c) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his doing so.</li> </ul>

## 5. Persons loitering in council estate blocks

<b>Proposal 8</b>	<b>Prohibition of persons not legally resident in the Council housing block from entering (or having entered, remaining within) that block unless able to demonstrate they are visiting a named legal resident of that block, and to leave when requested by an authorised person – this wording has been amended</b>
Where it will apply	All Housing Estates owned by the Council and Registered Social Landlords – amended to include only Council owned housing estates
Recorded reports/complaints	In the year 2015/16, the Council Housing ASB team dealt with 28 nuisance cases involving youths, and had 19 ongoing cases regarding youths/people coming into blocks taking drugs, drinking, leaving litter behind, graffiti and intimidating residents. Recently, Council Neighbourhood Officers have also reported issues with person loitering in specific blocks causing damage, drug taking and intimidation.
Change from existing	No existing Order Residents have reported issues such as persons taking drugs, drinking alcohol, littering, sexual activity, urinating and defecating, graffiti and intimidating residents.
Consultation results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 92% in support of this proposal (87% in total agreement and 5% agreeing but with some changes)</li> </ul>
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 5 comments that persons loitering should not be covered by this unless they are causing a problem</li> <li>▪ 4 comments that 'loitering' needed to be defined further</li> <li>▪ 3 comments that it is not just visitors but also residents of estates that are loitering, and one suggestion apply it instead to groups of 3 or 4</li> <li>▪ 3 comments that this activity is intimidating</li> <li>▪ 2 comments asking how it will be monitored (eg CCTV)</li> <li>▪ 2 comments that youth centres should be provided on estates for young persons to gather socially</li> <li>▪ 1 comment that this activity occurs on private housing estates also</li> <li>▪ 1 comment specifying issues on the Lytchet estate</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 1 comment to keep estate gates locked where provided</li> <li>▪ Some concerns were expressed that persons undertaking legitimate purposes might be captured by this proposal (such as postmen, political and other canvassers).</li> </ul>
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Registered Social landlords in the Borough were invited to participate in the consultation, but we did not receive any responses from them</li> <li>▪ Monitoring will be undertaken by Council Officers and the Police</li> <li>▪ The term 'loiter' refers to persons lingering without a productive or legitimate purpose, so would not capture persons going about purposeful or legitimate business – so long as they are not causing intimidation etc</li> <li>▪ As a result of feedback from the consultation the draft wording is amended to apply to any persons (residents and non-residents) but only if they are causing nuisance, intimidation, harassment, alarm or distress, or using or dealing drugs, directly or indirectly causing damage or other anti-social behaviour</li> </ul>
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal - <b>but amended to remove housing estates run by Registered Social Landlords from the prohibition, and apply the PSPO to any persons if they are causing nuisance etc.</b>
Draft legal wording	<p>(1) No persons shall loiter within the designated area if they are causing, or reasonably perceived to be causing, nuisance, intimidation, harassment, alarm or distress, or using or dealing drugs, directly or indirectly causing damage or other anti-social behaviour</p> <p>(2) A person must leave the designated area immediately if requested by an authorised person</p> <p><b>Applies to all Council owned housing estates</b></p>

## 6. Intimidatory Begging

<b>Proposal 9</b>	<b>Prohibition on persons begging in a manner reasonably perceived to be intimidating or aggressive.</b>
Where it will apply	St Marks Road, the northern section of Hertford Road, Green Lanes, A406 and Fore Street – <b>to be amended to apply to the whole borough</b>
Change from existing	No existing Order High level of public concern reported about intimidation and harassment caused.
Recorded reports/complaints	Between April 2013 and April 2016, there were 844 calls to the Police (CAD calls) concerning begging. Repeat locations in the past 4 months were St Marks Road, the northern section of Hertford Road, Green Lanes, and Angel Road/Fore Street.
Consultation results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 90% of respondents supported this proposal (87% totally agreed and 3% agreed but with some changes)</li> </ul>
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 6 comments naming other locations such as outside Sainsburys, Bush Hill Park, Palmers Green, Enfield high street, and outside Tesco in Ponders End, and felt intimidating</li> <li>▪ 5 comments that there must be a lack of options for people if they have to beg</li> <li>▪ 4 comments that people should not have to beg as the UK has a social</li> </ul>

	<p>security system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 2 comments that face to face charity collectors should be included</li> <li>▪ 2 comments that persons that beg should not be fined</li> <li>▪ There were general comments for a number of the behaviours in this section that they should be borough-wide rather than the specific locations</li> </ul>
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There may be a number of reasons why persons beg, and may they not have access to the benefits welfare system</li> <li>▪ If Council Officers or the Police have concerns about the vulnerability of persons begging they will take the necessary action/provide the support needed</li> <li>▪ Comments were clear that begging is a problem not just confined to the areas identified in the proposal – but a much wider issue</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proceed with the proposal but amend the scope to cover the whole Borough.</li> </ul>
Draft legal wording	<p>(1) No person shall beg in a manner reasonably perceived to be intimidating or aggressive <b>or causing nuisance</b>, or pose a risk to their safety or the safety of others, unless-</p> <p>(a) he has a reasonable excuse for doing so; or</p> <p>(b) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his doing so.</p> <p><b>Applies across the whole borough</b></p>

## 7. Possession, use, consumption and supply of psychoactive substances

<b>Proposal 10</b>	<b>Prohibition of the consumption, use, possession and supply of intoxicating substances in a public place</b>
Where it will apply	Whole borough
Change from existing	No existing Order. There are concerns about used canisters and other packaging from intoxicating psychoactive substances being seen discarded on streets, estates and parks (formerly known as 'legal highs') indicating usage.
Recorded reports/complaints	Difficulty in obtaining data as very few complaints recorded. Staff in the Parks Service have found and removed canisters/packaging from parks. There is unrecorded evidence of canisters and packaging from these substances found on housing estates
Consultation results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 95% of respondents supported this proposal (94% totally agreed and 1% agreed but with some changes)</li> </ul>
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Some comments about drug taking also, and some specific locations mentioned</li> <li>▪ Specific locations mentioned where legal highs canisters seen</li> <li>▪ One comment that 'legal highs' should be banned</li> </ul>
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Comments about specific locations for drug taking have been passed to the Police</li> <li>▪ It is illegal to supply/sell psychoactive substances (formerly known as 'legal highs') but not to use or possess them</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Proceed with the proposal</b>
Draft legal wording	(1) Prohibit the consumption, use, possession and supply of intoxicating substances and shall surrender intoxicating substances to an authorised

	<p>person when directed to do so.</p> <p>Such substances do not include caffeine, <b>nicotine</b> or alcohol, cases where the substances are used for a valid and demonstrable medical use, substances given to an animal as a medicinal remedy and tobacco.</p>
--	--

## 8. Persons windscreen washing/selling goods

<b>Proposal 11</b>	<b>Prohibit the presence of persons selling goods or offering services in the road when moving traffic comes to a stop.</b>
Where it will apply	A10 and the A406 and within 150m of all junctions onto these roads
Change from existing	No existing Order. Concerns about persons windscreen washing and selling goods (eg drinks, flowers) frequently pestering motorists at traffic lights in an intimidating and annoying manner.
Recorded reports/complaints	Data does not appear to be specifically recorded for this activity.
Consultation results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 91% of respondents supported this proposal (87% totally agreed and 4% agreed but with some changes)</li> </ul>
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 5 comments that this activity was a problem in Bounds Green, A406 and A10 for some time</li> <li>▪ 5 comments saying that these persons should not be fined</li> <li>▪ 2 comments that the activity was dangerous/intimidating</li> <li>▪ Single comments covering lack of options for such people, provide them a licence/pay tax, not a problem anymore, that they provide a service and that the prohibition should be borough wide</li> </ul>
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The comments support the evidence that this activity is a problem and has been for some time and appears to be focused on the main trunk roads of the A10 and A406</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Proceed with the proposal</b>
Draft legal wording	(1) Prohibit the selling of goods or offering of services when a vehicle becomes temporarily stationary in the designated areas.

## 9. Prostitution

<b>Proposal 12</b>	<b>Prohibition of engaging in activities that relate to prostitution (e.g. kerb crawling, having sex for payment etc.) at any time.</b>
Where it will apply	Upper Edmonton and Edmonton Green wards - <b>extend it to the whole borough</b>
Recorded reports/complaints	<p>Between 1 January 2016 and 21 April 2016, there were 135 prostitution-related calls to the Police (CAD calls). The majority of these CAD calls took place in Upper Edmonton ward (74 calls), followed by Edmonton Green (50 calls). Between April to December 2016, there were 142 CAD calls regarding prostitution – mostly in Edmonton Green and Upper Edmonton, and 28 sightings of prostitution on CCTV in Lower and Upper Edmonton. Between September and December 2016, there were 62 stops/arrests of prostitutes by Safer Estates officers in Joyce/Snells estates. Between 16/09/2016 and 01/11/2016 – proactive patrols in Fore Street Corridor by Police found:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sex workers Seen -50</li> <li>• Cautions - 18</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arrests - 12</li> <li>• CPN Warnings -10</li> <li>• CPN Issued - 2</li> <li>• Searches - 8</li> <li>• Accounts - 26</li> </ul>
Change from existing	No existing Order. High level of prostitution activity witnessed and enforced, and littering associated with this activity found.
Consultation results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 89% of respondents supported this proposal (85% totally agreed and 4% agreed but with same changes)</li> </ul>
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 11 comments that prostitution should be dealt with like in Amsterdam and controlled/designated zones provided to stop exploitation</li> <li>▪ 6 comments that support should be provided to sex workers rather than fines</li> <li>▪ 5 comments that kerb crawlers, pimps and traffickers should be targeted</li> <li>▪ 3 comments that the prohibition should be borough wide and not just the two wards, and there were general comments for a number of the behaviours in this section that they should be borough-wide rather than the specific locations</li> <li>▪ 3 comments that this is already a criminal matter and is a Police matter to deal with</li> <li>▪ 3 comments – one saying it is a big issue in N18, and another comment saying that there were issues in Albany Park/Addison Road and Arnos Park</li> <li>▪ 1 comment that fining sex workers would perpetuate the activity as they would need the money to pay the fine</li> </ul>
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The rationale behind designated/controlled areas for prostitution is understood and has been piloted in Leeds, but the Council does not have plans to provide such areas.</li> <li>▪ When the Police or Council staff find sex workers, consideration is always taken as to whether support or action is needed in terms of their vulnerability or potential exploitation/trafficking</li> <li>▪ Part of the Police’s strategy is to prosecute kerb crawlers and the resultant bad publicity act as a deterrent.</li> <li>▪ This activity is already a criminal matter and the Police and Council undertake joint operations. However, the use of a PSPO provides an additional enforcement tool by the use of a FPN</li> </ul>
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal - <b>but extend it to the whole borough</b>
Draft legal wording	(1) Person(s) shall not loiter, solicit or engage in the provision of sexual services, or engage, loiter or solicit with a view to engaging in obtaining sexual services in the designated area.

## 10. Smoking in playgrounds

<b>Proposal 13</b>	<b>Prohibition of smoking in any playgrounds</b>
Where it will apply	All playgrounds in parks and Council housing estates
Change from existing	No existing Order. This proposal reflects and extends the current voluntary ban for the borough’s park playgrounds which is communicated through signage but

	there is no legal enforcement. The Council is keen to make recreation areas as healthy as possible and protect users from the effects of second hand smoke
Recorded reports/complaints	Data not recorded for this activity
Consultation results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 94% of respondents supported this proposal (91% totally agreed and 3% agreed but with some changes)</li> </ul>
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 3 comments that e-cigarettes should be allowed</li> <li>▪ 2 comments that smoking should be banned anywhere near children</li> <li>▪ 1 comment that smoking should be banned within 50m of schools</li> </ul>
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Council operates a scheme inviting schools to have a voluntary ban of smoking outside the school</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Proceed with the proposal</b></li> </ul>
Draft legal wording	(1) No person shall smoke tobacco, tobacco related products, smokeless tobacco products (including electronic cigarettes), herbal cigarettes, or any illegal substances, within the boundaries of an area designated as a children's playground.

## 11. Flying of Drones

<b>Proposal 14</b>	<b>Prohibition of flying of drones unless the safety conditions are met</b>
Where it will apply	Whole borough
Change from existing	No existing Order Concerns about invasion of privacy and risk to (manned) aircrafts.
Recorded reports/complaints	Data not recorded for this activity
Consultation results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 82% of respondents supported this proposal (76% totally agreed and 6% agreed but with some changes)</li> </ul>
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 16 comments that there should be a total ban on drones</li> <li>▪ 15 comments that drones should only be permitted in designated areas (eg of parks) or fly zones</li> <li>▪ 13 comments that respondents have experienced noise, intrusion to privacy and that concerned that drones are used in crimes, and one comment that a neighbour's drone was used to spy into their young daughter's bedroom</li> <li>▪ 11 comments that drone owners should be licensed or register or be trained</li> <li>▪ 9 comments that drones are dangerous</li> <li>▪ 5 comments that drones should only be used on a person's own home/private property</li> <li>▪ 2 comments that children should be allowed to fly drones if they are no causing any problems</li> <li>▪ 2 comments that should be allowed for organised drone events or clubs</li> <li>▪ 1 comment asking if the prohibition applied to model aircraft</li> </ul>
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The prohibition does not apply to model aircraft</li> <li>▪ It is clear that there are experiences and concerns about intrusion caused by drones</li> <li>▪ The Government have consulted on views about registering and</li> </ul>



	<p>competency tests of owners of drones of 250g or more.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The PSPO proposals would allow for the flying of drones in designated areas by clubs or individuals with the permission of the Council</li> <li>▪ The proposal seeks to set a balance between allowing the use of small drones for recreational purposes, and larger drones only with permission of the Council or the Civil Aviation Authority</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Proceed with the proposal – and add in that the Council needs to be satisfied there is no risk to privacy in granting permission for drones flying</b>
Draft legal wording	<p>Prohibit the flying of drones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Unless the drone weighs less than 250g and is used for recreational purposes, and is flown safely and without risk of invasion of privacy</li> <li>▪ If the drone weighs between 250g and 20Kg, flying must be with the prior express permission of the Council <b>and will need to be satisfied that there is no risk to privacy in the use of the drones.</b></li> <li>▪ Flying of a group of drones requires prior express permission/licensing by the Council <b>and will need to be satisfied that there is no risk to privacy in the use of the drones.</b></li> </ul> <p>Drones greater than 20Kg and those used for commercial purposes need the express consent of the Civil Aviation Authority.</p>

## 12. Vehicles deposited on land

<b>Proposal 15</b>	<b>Vehicles and towed vehicles are prohibited to be parked on council land, land adjoining the highway, footpaths or bridleways for unreasonable period of time without express consent of the Council.</b>
Where it will apply	On Council land (including parks and council housing estates) and land adjoining the highway
Change from existing	No existing Order Concerns about vehicles being left for considerable periods of time taking up spaces, or being parked in unsuitable places, and vehicles are sometimes being lived in.
Recorded reports/complaint	Data not recorded specifically for this issue. Problems reported by Neighbourhood Officers and other Council officers.
Consultation results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 95% of respondents supported this proposal (93% totally agreed and 2% agreed but with some changes)</li> </ul>
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Some comments that taxed and insured vehicles should be permitted to park anywhere (and one comment – so long as not causing a danger)</li> <li>▪ One comment that cars parked by non-residents for long periods near Hilly Fields</li> <li>▪ Two comments that travellers should have somewhere to set up a community</li> <li>▪ One comment that the provision should not cover people’s homes or drives</li> </ul>
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Often vehicles that are legal (ie declared off road or even taxed) are ‘stored’ for considerable periods of time on Council land or beside the highway causing annoyance and nuisance to other users, but existing legislation will not always apply</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ This provision was not specifically aimed at travellers; although they might be captured by it. There are no plans to provide a site for travellers.</li> <li>▪ The provision does not apply to people's homes or drives</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Proceed with the proposal</b>
Draft legal wording	No person shall, without reasonable excuse, deposit a motor cycle, vehicle, trailer, caravan or similar on Council land or land adjoining the highway, for an unreasonable period of time without express prior written consent of the Council.

### 13. Parking around Schools

<b>Proposal 16</b>	<b>Parking around schools</b>
Where it will apply	Whole borough
Change from existing	No existing Order. Illegal and inconsiderate parking around schools has led to reports of aggressive behaviour between drivers and also drivers and pedestrians. The most serious issue is the danger posed to children due to irresponsible parking and vehicle manoeuvring. Obstructive parking of residents' drives also takes place.
Recorded reports/complaints	1648 PCNs issued in 2015/16 for illegal parking near primary schools
Consultation results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 86% of respondents supported this proposal (80% totally agreed and 6% agreed but with some changes)</li> </ul>
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There were several comments that drop off/pick up around schools was a big issue, and that signage and yellow lines are ignored</li> <li>▪ Some school locations were specifically mentioned (Goat Lane, Eversley, Edmonton, St Pauls, Worcester, Green Road)</li> <li>▪ There were several comments that suggested that schools should have a designated 'drop off' zone where cars pull up, let out the children to the care of school staff and then the vehicle immediately leaves ('kiss and drop')</li> <li>▪ Several comments that children need to be driven to school especially by working parents and need to be able to drop them off</li> <li>▪ A few comments that more parking should be provided by the Council</li> <li>▪ A couple of comments that provision or exemptions need to be made for blue badge holders and children with mobility problems (eg injury), and collection from school in case of emergency (eg child becomes ill) or medical appointment</li> <li>▪ A couple of comments that speed limit should be reduced near schools (eg 10 or 20mph) – some saying at school times and term time only</li> <li>▪ A few comments that parking near schools need to be monitored by CCTV</li> <li>▪ A few comments that parents should be fined if repeat offending</li> <li>▪ One comment that parking permits should be issued at schools</li> <li>▪ One comment to reinstate the lolly pop lady at Raglan School as she tackled persons parking illegally</li> <li>▪ A couple of comments that not sure what the areas that would be designated</li> </ul>

Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There is clearly an issue with parking around schools during drop off and pick up times</li> <li>▪ Some helpful suggestions about a staffed drop off arrangement – not sure if possible at all/most schools</li> <li>▪ CCTV is an effective means of monitoring this issue – but is also costly</li> <li>▪ The proposal could compliment the schools streets project and could be used in locations where the school streets project would not be appropriate</li> </ul>
Recommendations	Recommended that more detailed appraisal of the options be considered by the Cabinet member for Environment and the Director of Regeneration and Environment
Draft legal wording	No person shall, without reasonable excuse, drop off or pick up pupils between 8am to 9.30am and 2.30pm to 4pm around schools in the designated areas.

#### 14. Riding of mopeds

<b>Proposal 17</b>	<b>Riding of mopeds</b>
Where it will apply	Whole Borough
Change from existing	No existing Order Irresponsible riding of mopeds causes a major danger to other road users and pedestrians. This includes causing criminal damage to land, parks, playing fields etc. For example, a school playing field may be damaged because of ruts left behind by motorcycles riding over it.
Recorded reports/complaints	Problems and issues reported by the public and Police. Little recorded data.
Consultation results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 98% of respondents supported this proposal (97% totally agreed and 1% agreed but with some changes)</li> </ul>
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There were several comments about concerns about the use of mopeds - concerns about robbery, harassment and acid attacks and riders deliberately not wearing helmets so they are not chased by Police</li> <li>▪ One comment about mopeds ridden on grassed areas of Forty Hall</li> <li>▪ One comment about moped gangs in the eastern corridor of the borough (which was also mentioned in a meeting with one of the local MPs in relation to Millmarsh Lane)</li> <li>▪ One comment about takeaway moped riders being dangerous</li> <li>▪ Cattlegate Road mentioned as a location for problem moped riders</li> </ul>
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ High level of concern expressed by the public</li> </ul>
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal – with minor amendment in red
Draft legal wording	No person shall ride a moped in such a manner as to cause, <b>or likely to cause</b> , alarm, distress or annoyance to members of the public or cause criminal damage by their use.

#### 15. Loitering of persons

<b>Proposal 18</b>	<b>Loitering of persons</b>
--------------------	-----------------------------

Where it will apply	Ponders End Recreation Ground and Enfield Retail Park
Change from existing	No existing Order
Recorded reports/complaints	Not provided by the Police, but would be available.
Consultation results	This was not specifically consulted on – however, feedback from the Police and the public was received during the public consultation
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Police requested that the Council consider a prohibition on persons loitering in these locations due to problems with intimidation, alarm, harassment and dealing drugs</li> <li>▪ Several comments from the public expressed concerns about ASB caused by groups hanging around in Ponders End Recreation Ground</li> </ul>
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ High level of concern expressed by the Police and the public</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Proceed with the proposal</b>
Draft legal wording	No persons to loiter in the designated area such as to cause, or reasonably be perceived to cause, intimidation, alarm, harassment or distress to others and/or to deal or use drugs

#### General and additional comments:

There was an opportunity at the end of the questionnaire for respondents to add any other comments.

The following is a table of the themes:

Number of comments	Comment	Response
19	If the PSPO is implemented it needs to be enforced/more enforcement resource is needed	Existing Council and Police enforcement resources will be used to enforce the provisions. Targeted proactive patrols and enforcement will be undertaken at specific times and locations as needed A wide range of Council officers will be authorised to undertake enforcement of PSPOs.
14	Litter and flytipping is a big problem/locations were specified/why was flytipping or littering not included as a proposal?	Litter and flytipping are significant environmental issues. Litter and flytipping were not included in the PSPO proposals because specific and adequate enforcement provision is already made. There are Fixed Penalty Notices for littering (£80) and for flytipping (£400). The locations mentioned for flytipping and littering have been passed to the waste enforcement unit for action.
12	Thankyou – quality of life has	Support for the introduction of PSPOs to address

	deteriorated in the area (locations specified such as EN3, Edmonton and Edmonton Green, Fillebrook, Ponders End Park, Enfield Highway, N9) Want to make it nicer again	concerns and improve the quality of life of residents.
5	Proposals too strict/nanny state/concerned about loss of freedoms	The purpose of PSPOs is to address antisocial behaviour that is causing issues to residents so that the majority of residents can feel safe and enjoy public spaces. The Equalities Act and Human Rights Act have been considered in relation to the proposed PSPOs and documented in the Cabinet report and Appendix 4.
5	Bring back Parks Police/need more police resource as insufficient	Enforcement resources for the Council and the Police are limited. There are no current plans for the Council to fund Police for the parks.
5	Youths/adults seen smoking and dealing drugs openly, and drinking/Locations specified (Broomfield Park, New River Gardens, Gentlemens Row, Enfield Library Gardens, corner of Seafield Road, Oakhill Park, Highlands Village)	This information has been passed to the Police.
3	Need a 24-hour response number	Council resources do not support a 24-hour enforcement service. Problems should be reported via the Council's website. When enforcement is required outside of office hours, this will be arranged and targeted to the locations. Telephone number 101 or the Police neighbourhood team numbers should be used to contact the Police if needed.
3	Ban children on bikes doing stunts and wheelies in the middle of the road and on the pavement	It is appreciated that this activity does occur but there was not sufficient concern raised for this to be incorporated into a PSPO as it would not meet the evidential test in the legislation.
3	Provide education, signs and warning not fines (in different languages to encourage compliance)	Signage will be provided to advise the public if a PSPO is introduced, but limitations on size would not permit the signage to display different languages. In most cases, the default is that fixed penalty notices will be issued on the first instance and not a warning.
2	Schools should be responsible for the behaviour of children after school at shops and bus stops	The behaviour of school children is a shared responsibility between the pupils primarily, but also parents, the school and wider community.
2	Most of the ASB mentioned are illegal anyway, and so should be enforced already	Some of the provisions are already a criminal matter but may not have an enforcement option of a fixed penalty notice, or a FPN of £100. FPNs are an

		efficient and cost-effective enforcement option.
2	Need to spend resources on support rather than enforcement as many of the affected groups affecting the ASB are poor or vulnerable	There are no new or additional enforcement resources. Existing enforcement resources will be used but by a wider number of Council officers. It is recognised that some of the behaviours are carried out by vulnerable persons and persons on low-income. Appropriate action and support will be provided as needed by enforcement officers.
1	Cars being sold behind the shops in Kempe Road, Enfield and causing problems for road users	This has been referred to the Envirocrime team.