

Appendix 2: The Proposed Public Spaces Protection Orders and results from the Public Consultation

Contents:

	Page number
Introduction	1
Glossary	2
The proposed Public Spaces Protection Orders:	3
▪ Control of alcohol consumption	3
▪ Vehicle Cruising (to include speeding, driving in convoy, racing, performing stunts, sounding horns and revving engines as to cause a nuisance, and wheel spins)	3
▪ Riding of mopeds to cause alarm etc.	
▪ Holding or throwing of Fireworks in a public place	4
▪ Dog Controls	4
▪ Persons loitering in Council housing blocks and on estates	6
▪ Intimidatory Begging	7
▪ Persons windscreen washing/selling goods	8
▪ Prostitution	8
▪ Smoking in enclosed playgrounds	8
▪ Flying of Drones	9
▪ Motor Vehicles (i.e. Those deposited on Council land or land adjoining the highway for an unreasonable period of time)	9

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 these sites can be found at 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

This section sets out the details of the proposed prohibitions and restrictions, the proposed location each would apply to and the draft legal wording. Where changes or new suggestions are made, the background is outlined.

The draft wording may need to be amended depending on the consultation responses, and which geographical areas the final prohibitions and requirements are to apply to in the Borough

Control of alcohol consumption

The following provisions are proposed to re-introduce the current PSPOs.

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

Proposal	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.
Where it will apply	Whole Borough
Recorded reports/complaints	Between 1st January 2018 and 30th November 2020, 39 calls were recorded by the Police (CAD Calls). 9 were recorded each year in 2018 and 2019, before rising to 21 calls in 2020. The highest numbers were consistently recorded in June each year.
Consultation results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 92% of respondents were in support of the prohibition of drinking after having been requested to stop, and ▪ 87% of respondents were in support of the person being required to hand over the alcohol when requested to do so
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The majority of comments on this prohibition were that it should only be invoked if the drinking is causing a problem/nuisance (although some called for an outright ban on drinking in parks and streets), and should not apply to social gatherings not causing annoyance. ▪ Some comments suggesting locations where this is a problem and also other ASB associated with drinking such as littering, intimidation and drug taking ▪ Some concerns about resources to enforce these provisions (and to the safety of persons enforcing it)
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. ▪ Council enforcement resource capacity will be enhanced, and also proactively targeted to locations where intelligence suggests the problem is greatest.
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal as drafted
Legal wording	1. Person(s) within the designated area shall not consume alcohol, or anything which the authorised person reasonably believes to be

	<p>alcohol, if requested to stop by an Authorised Person.</p> <p>2. Exemptions shall apply in cases where the consumption of alcohol is on premises or public space licensed under the Licensing Act 2003, or where the consumption of alcohol is authorised by virtue of Part III of the London Local Authorities Act 1990 (tables and chairs licences)</p> <p>3. Person(s) who breach this prohibition shall (with the exemption of the matters referred to in Paragraph 2 above) immediately surrender if requested in accordance with the requirements under section 63(2), alcohol, or anything which the authorised person reasonably believes to be alcohol, in his/her possession to an authorised person and the authorised person is thereafter authorised to dispose of any item under section 63(5) of the Act.</p>
--	---

Vehicle Cruising

Proposal	Participating in vehicle cruising activity as a passenger or driver of a vehicle, and/or congregating in the area to spectate vehicle cruising activity
Where it will apply	The A10 and A406 within the Borough boundaries, Enfield Retail Park EN1 1TH, Ravenside Retail Park N18 3HA, Tesco Car park in Glover Drive N18 3HF, Millmarsh Lane EN3, Riverwalk Road Business Park EN3 7QN, and Colosseum Retail Park EN1
Recorded reports/complaints	<p>There were 2,508 calls to the Police of 'Vehicle Nuisance Inappropriate Use' between 1st January 2018 and 30th November 2020, but this description may include other forms of vehicle use other than 'vehicle cruising'. (There were 738 calls in 2018; 847 in 2019; 923 in 2020). The highest numbers of calls were recorded in Southbury with 241, followed by 205 calls in Enfield Highway.</p> <p>There is a major concern over the safety of other road users and pedestrians. There are also concerns about excessive noise, verbal abuse and intimidation from 'boy racers' and spectators</p>
Consultation results	96% of respondents supported this proposal
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Several comments that car cruising/racing is a significant dangerous problem, causes significant noise disturbance and is intimidatory ▪ Support for the locations identified ▪ Three comments about The Ridgeway EN2 & circuit of Enfield Town, and one about Mollison Avenue ▪ A couple of comments that there should be organised events/meets for responsible enthusiasts ▪ Several comments calling for tougher vehicle cruising action also such as driving bans, prosecution and vehicles confiscated ▪ One comment about a fatality of a young women on the A10 resulting from high speed ▪ Comments on the need for enforcement
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PSPO powers do not extend to driving bans or confiscation of vehicles but other legislation can be used for these aspects ▪ Two further locations are mentioned by two respondents – but will be addressed separately as no evidence of a more widespread problem
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal as drafted
Legal wording	No person shall participate in vehicle cruising activity as a passenger or

	<p>driver of a vehicle and/or congregate to spectate vehicle cruising activity within the designated area in the Public Spaces Protection Order.</p> <p>Vehicle 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. using cars, motorbikes, mopeds, vans, trucks or lorries or other vehicles.</p>
--	--

Riding of mopeds to cause alarm etc.

Proposal	Riding of mopeds to cause alarm etc
Where it will apply	Whole Borough
Recorded reports/complaints	Issues with mopeds would be captured under the Police data for vehicle cruising
Consultation results	97% of respondents supported this proposal
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns supporting this proposal regarding dangerous use/racing, noise disturbance and riding on pavements (eg outside specific fast food takeaways) ▪ Some concerns also expressed about motorbikes, bicycles and electronic scooters ▪ A couple of comments that thought this proposal was not needed
Amendments / considerations after consultation	High level of concern expressed by the public Riding of bicycles and electronic scooters on the pavement are not permitted and regulated by other legislation
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal as drafted
Legal wording	Person(s) shall not ride a moped in such a manner as to cause, or likely to cause, alarm, distress or annoyance to members of the public or cause criminal damage by their use.

Holding and throwing of Fireworks

Proposal	The holding or fireworks to intimidate others or cause nuisance, alarm or distress, or throwing of fireworks
Where it will apply	Whole Borough
Recorded reports/complaints	611 calls were recorded by the Police for fireworks related calls between 1st January 2018 and 30th November 2020 (260 in 2018; 186 in 2019; 165 in 2020). 90% of calls were recorded each year in October and November, mainly in the Edmonton Green and Upper Edmonton areas.
Consultation results	98% of respondents were in support of this proposal
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There were several comments that fireworks should be banned for sale to the public and/or in public places (or only a public display) ▪ Several comments about the impact of noise on people and animals, pollution and danger ▪ Comments about fireworks being let off at times other than 5 November ▪ One comment about fireworks being let off last year by youths in Fore Street, Edmonton ▪ One comment about stopping use of traditional fireworks and using technology instead

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A couple of comments about including not letting off fireworks off at all within the proposal
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is existing legislation controlling the sale of fireworks, and retailers have a responsibility to take appropriate steps to ensure this. ▪ 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 or ban the sale of fireworks.
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal as drafted
Draft legal wording	Person(s) within this area shall not hold fireworks such as to intimidate others or cause nuisance, alarm or distress, or throw fireworks.

Dog Controls

The following provisions are proposed to replace the existing PSPOs.

Proposal	Prohibition of dog fouling and requirement to have a receptacle to pick up dog faeces and dispose of it appropriately
Where it will apply	Whole Borough
Recorded reports/complaints	333 reports of persistent dog fouling in public places and parks between 1 January 2018 and 13 December 2020 were reported to the Council.
Consultation results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 98% in support of the prohibition of dog fouling ▪ 95% in support of the requirement for persons in control of dogs to carry suitable receptacles to pick up dog mess
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A few comments that there should be more bins to dispose of dog mess, and to be emptied regularly and signage ▪ Agreement that this should be enforced/visible enforcement presence ▪ Many comments supportive of the proposals and the impact that dog mess has if not picked up by dog owners or leave bags of dog mess hanging on trees etc ▪ Several comments that they have seen dog owners let their dog foul and not pick it up (and who have been intimidatory when challenged about it) ▪ A couple of comments about particular problem locations, Barrowell Green space, King George's Field and Craig park ▪ One comment that the offence of failure to carry a bag is not proportionate ▪ One comment that guide dogs are trained not to foul in public areas and that persons with mobility issues should use equipment that allows them to pick up dog mess
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. ▪ Publicity and signage will be/is provided
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal as drafted
Legal wording	(1) If a dog defecates at any time in the designated area, 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 and remove the faeces from the land forthwith and appropriately dispose of it, unless he has a reasonable excuse for failing to do so; or 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>(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> <p>a) a person who is registered as a blind person in a register compiled under section 29 of the National Assistance Act 1948; or</p> <p>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.</p>
--	--

Proposal	Failure of the person in charge of a dog to have it on a lead at all times in the designated area
Where it will apply	Areas of parks and open spaces listed the draft PSPO Order No. 3
Recorded reports/complaints	45 reports recorded of dog behaviour in parks (combination of aggressive dogs, dogs not on leads and too many dogs being walked) between 1 January 2018 and 13 December 2020.
Consultation results	75% in support of this proposal
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A few comments that dogs should be allowed to be off the lead as dogs need to run and exercise – unless they are dangerous and should be kept on a lead or muzzle ▪ Some comments that dogs should always be on leads in public spaces ▪ A couple of comments about some people/children being scared if dog is not on the lead, or dogs out of control and attacking other dogs causing serious injury ▪ A couple of comments about dogs off leads dogs posing a threat to farm animals and fowl
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Initial comments on the questionnaire suggested a misunderstanding about the need for dogs to be on leads – people thinking it applied to all parks or all public places and not the few on the schedule. ▪ There are only 16 small parks where it is appropriate that this proposal would apply ▪ 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.
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal as drafted
Legal wording	<p>(1) A person in charge of a dog in the designated area must, at all times, keep the dog on a lead, unless –</p> <p>(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>

Proposal	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
Where it will apply	Areas of parks and open spaces listed the draft PSPO Order No. 4
Recorded reports/complaints	See above - 45 reports recorded of dog behaviour in parks (combination of aggressive dogs, dogs not on leads and too many dogs being walked) between 1 January 2018 and 13 December 2020.
Consultation results	90% of respondents were in support of this proposal
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some comments saying dogs should be kept on the leads and others that dogs should be allowed off the lead ▪ One comment that need to have council officers or signage to give the direction to put dogs onto leads if the dog is causing an issue
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 ▪ 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
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal as drafted
Legal wording	<p>1. A person in charge of a dog in the designated area must put the dog on a lead if directed by an authorised person unless–</p> <p>(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>

Proposal	Prohibition of dogs at all times in the designated area
Where it will apply	Areas of parks and open spaces listed the draft PSPO Order No. 5
Recorded reports/complaints	See above - 45 reports recorded of dog behaviour in parks (combination of aggressive dogs, dogs not on leads and too many dogs being walked) between 1 January 2018 and 13 December 2020.
Consultation results	76% of respondents were in support of this proposal
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some comments agreeing should be kept out of special areas ▪ A couple of comments that dogs should be allowed to visit parks
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Most of the comments were in support of excluding dogs from these certain areas such as childrens' playgrounds, splash pools, sports courts)
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal as drafted
Legal wording	<p>A person in charge of a dog must not, at any time, take the dog into, or permit the dog (including by not exercising sufficient control of the dog), to enter or to remain in, the designated area, unless–</p> <p>(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</p>

	so.
--	-----

Proposal	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.
Where it will apply	All parks
Recorded reports/complaints	See above - 45 reports recorded of dog behaviour in parks (combination of aggressive dogs, dogs not on leads and too many dogs being walked) between 1 January 2018 and 13 December 2020.
Consultation results	84% in support of this proposal
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Several comments that even 4 dogs seem to be too high a number for one person to control, and have observed this ▪ Request if licensed dog walkers can be easily identified so as to avoid unnecessary confrontations from park users ▪ Two comments referring to locations where this is a problem (Trent Park, Hilly Fields, Forty Hall) ▪ A couple of comments about needing more enforcement of this provision
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council enforcement resource capacity will be enhanced, and also proactively targeted to locations where intelligence suggests the problem is greatest.
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal as drafted
Legal wording	A person must not take more than four (4) dogs at the same time into the designated area, unless – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) in possession of valid insurance and a valid licence issued by the Council permitting up to six (6) dogs, or (b) he has a reasonable excuse for failing to do so; or (c) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his failing to do so.

Persons loitering in Council housing blocks and estates

Proposal	Loitering by persons in council housing blocks and estates causing nuisance etc, or using or dealing drugs, or causing damage or other anti-social behaviour
Where it will apply	All Council Housing Estates
Recorded reports/complaints	Residents have reported issues such as persons taking drugs, drinking alcohol, littering, sexual activity, urinating and defecating, graffiti and intimidating residents.
Consultation results	95% in support of this proposal
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Several comments that this is an issue that causes people to feel intimidated – when people loiter on stairs, in groups, littering, eating takeaways, using drugs ▪ A couple of comments that this issue is prevalent in other/public places too ▪ A few comments that this needs to be enforced, more resources used like CCTV and also means for residents to report instances 24/7
Amendments /	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enforcement resource capacity will be enhanced and CCTV used where

considerations after consultation	needed and possible, and means to report such instances by residents
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal as drafted
Legal wording	(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 (2) A person must leave the designated area immediately if requested by an authorised person

Intimidatory Begging

Proposal	Prohibition on persons begging in a manner reasonably perceived to be intimidating or aggressive or that they pose a risk to their safety or the safety of others.
Where it will apply	The whole borough
Recorded reports/complaints	Between 1st January 2018 and 30th November 2020, 949 calls were recorded by the Police (CAD Calls). (336 in 2018; 312 in 2019; 301 in 2020). Over the 3 years the highest numbers of calls were recorded in Edmonton Green in 2019 (114) and Upper Edmonton in 2020 (110). Police issued 25 FPNs for intimidatory begging between 1 January 2018 and 30 November 2020. The Council has also undertaken proactive work to target this activity.
Consultation results	95% of respondents supported this proposal
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Several comments supporting the proposal as have observed such begging on the A10 and A406 at the traffic lights, but also in Edmonton N18, Enfield Town, supermarket entrances and other places in the borough ▪ Several comments about how this causes intimidation to people ▪ A couple of comments that need more PCSO present and enforcement undertaken ▪ A couple of comments about the beggars being disabled but part of organised crime gangs/trafficked ▪ A couple of comments about how the beggars are endangering themselves on the road
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will continue to undertake targeted and enforcement work for this proposal ▪ If Council Officers or the Police have concerns about the vulnerability of persons begging they will take the necessary action/provide the support needed
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal as drafted
Legal wording	No person shall beg in a manner reasonably perceived to be intimidating, aggressive or causing nuisance, or pose a risk to their safety or the safety of others, unless he has a reasonable excuse for doing so; or the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his doing so.

Persons windscreen washing/selling goods

Proposal	Prohibit the presence of persons selling goods or offering services in the road when moving traffic comes to a stop.
Where it will apply	A10 and the A406 and within 150m of all junctions onto these roads
Recorded reports/complaints	There will have been recorded in Police data under any of the 3 generic ASB call categories (Nuisance, Personal and Environmental). Under these 3 combined categories, 98 calls were recorded in the last 3 years - 38 in 2018; 23 in 2019 and 37 in 2020. The Council has also undertaken proactive work to target this activity.
Consultation results	93% of respondents supported this proposal
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Several comments that people have found this to be very intimidating and dangerous for the sellers too ▪ A10 and A406 mentioned as problem locations in particular ▪ A couple of comments about needing CCTV for this ▪ One comment that this needs more enforcement ▪ One comment that these people need help to escape organised crime gangs
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The comments support the evidence that this activity continues to be a problem ▪ Will continue to undertake targeted and enforcement work for this proposal ▪ If Council Officers or the Police have concerns about the vulnerability of persons begging they will take the necessary action/provide the support needed
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal as drafted
Legal wording	Prohibit the selling of goods or offering of services when a vehicle becomes temporarily stationary in the designated areas.

Prostitution

Proposal	Prohibition of engaging in activities that relate to prostitution (e.g. kerb crawling, having sex for payment etc.) at any time.
Where it will apply	The Whole Borough
Recorded reports/complaints	Between 1st January 2018 and 30th November 2020, there were 428 prostitution-related calls to the Police. A significant number of these CAD calls took place in the Upper Edmonton ward (270 calls), followed by Edmonton Green (66 calls). Over the 3 years 145 calls were recorded in 2018, 172 in 2019 and 111 in 2020. Police issued 12 FPNs for prostitution between 1 January 2018 and 30 November 2020. The Council has also undertaken proactive work to target this activity.
Consultation results	93% of respondents supported this proposal
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Several comments about this being a significant issue in Edmonton N9 & N18 ▪ Several strong comments about how this impacts negatively on the area (Edmonton in particular) and unpleasant for children to see ▪ A few comments that needs more enforcement and enforcement capacity ▪ One comment that incidences need to be easier to report

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A couple of comments that the sex workers need support rather than fines, and it is the kerb crawlers and pimps who should be targeted
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 ▪ Will continue to undertake targeted and enforcement work for this proposal ▪ 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
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal as drafted
Legal wording	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.

Smoking in playgrounds

Proposal	Prohibition of smoking in playgrounds
Where it will apply	All playgrounds in parks and Council housing estates
Recorded reports/complaints	The Council is keen to make recreation areas as healthy as possible and protect users from the effects of second hand smoke
Consultation results	90% of respondents supported this proposal
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Several comments in support of this proposal and that smoking should not take place in playgrounds and around children ▪ A couple of comments that it might be difficult to enforce
Amendments / considerations after consultation	The Council operates a scheme inviting schools to have a voluntary ban of smoking outside the school
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal as drafted
Legal wording	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.

Vehicles deposited on land

Proposal	Vehicles deposited for an unreasonable amount of time
Where it will apply	On Council land (including parks and Council housing estates) and land adjoining the highway. 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/complaints	There were 600 calls to the Police between 1st January 2018 and 30th November 2020 regarding 'Vehicle abandoned - Not stolen'. (2018 - 171; 2019 - 236; 2020 - 193). However, this category does not breakdown the

	description any further about the nature of the alleged abandonment. The highest numbers were recorded in Palmers Green and Edmonton Green. Issues reported by Council housing officers about vehicles left on council estates.
Consultation results	96% of respondents supported this proposal
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Several comments about vehicles being double/tripled parked or taking up spaces on the road ▪ Several locations mentioned where cars left for long periods ▪ One comment that lots of abandoned vehicles or vehicles filled with rubbish and dumped ▪ One comment that vehicles need to be removed from estates quicker
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Often vehicles that are legal (ie declared off road or even taxed) are 'stored' for considerable periods on time on Council land or beside the highway causing annoyance and nuisance to other users, but existing legislation will not always apply s PSPO can be used ▪ Will continue to use existing legislation where vehicle is found to be abandoned or untaxed
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal as drafted
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.

Persons loitering

Proposal	Loitering of persons causing, or reasonably perceived to be causing, intimidation, harassment, alarm or distress and/or using or dealing drugs
Where it will apply	Ponders End Recreation Ground EN3, and Enfield Retail Park EN1
Recorded reports/complaints	Issues reported from the Police concerning persons loitering in these locations due to problems with intimidation, alarm, harassment and dealing drugs. Reports from the public concerning ASB caused by groups hanging around in Ponders End Recreation Ground
Consultation results	94% of respondents supported this proposal
Consultation comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Several comments that this should apply to other parks/across the borough (some locations provided such as Pymmes Park, Aldermans Hill, Edmonton Green, St Mary's/Nightingale Road) ▪ Several comments on how this is intimidating and also some criminal activity ▪ A couple of comments that authorities do not seem to take notice of this issue
Amendments / considerations after consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The named locations in the PSPO had a high level of concern by the Police and the public ▪ The other locations can be addressed using other powers
Recommendation	Proceed with the proposal as drafted
Legal wording	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No persons shall loiter within the designated area if they are causing, or reasonably perceived to be causing, intimidation, harassment, alarm or distress and/or using or dealing drugs; unless 2. the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his failing to do so. 3. A person must leave the designated area immediately if requested by

	an authorised person.
--	-----------------------