

# Gloucester City Council

<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Cabinet Briefing</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>20<sup>th</sup> June 2018</b>
	<b>Overview &amp; Scrutiny</b>		<b>2<sup>nd</sup> July 2018</b>
	<b>Cabinet</b>		<b>11<sup>th</sup> July 2018</b>
	<b>Council</b>		<b>12<sup>th</sup> July 2018</b>
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Public Spaces Protection Order</b>		
<b>Report Of:</b>	<b>Cabinet Member for Communities</b>		
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	<b>All</b>		
<b>Key Decision:</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Budget/Policy Framework:</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Emily Jones, Community Wellbeing Officer</b>		
	<b>Email: <a href="mailto:emily.jones@gloucester.gov.uk">emily.jones@gloucester.gov.uk</a></b>		<b>Tel: 39-6268</b>
<b>Appendices:</b>	<b>1. Consultation survey result and feedback summary table</b>		
	<b>2. PSPO Options appraisal</b>		
	<b>3. Draft PSPOs</b>		
	<b>4. Equality Impact Assessment</b>		
	<b>5. Safe and Attractive Streets Policy</b>		
	<b>6. Table of existing provisions addressing issues consulted upon</b>		

## FOR GENERAL RELEASE

### 1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To update Cabinet on the feedback received from the Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) public consultation, to seek approval on a revised PSPO and future work, having regard to that feedback.

### 2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 Overview and Scrutiny are asked to consider the draft PSPO proposals and make recommendations to Cabinet.

- 2.2 Cabinet is asked to **RESOLVE:**

- (1) The results of the PSPO consultation be noted;
- (2) To note that previous delegation, provided by Cabinet to the Head of Communities in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Communities and Neighbourhoods, for the authorisation of Public Space Protection Orders remains in place for all future PSPO proposals.

- (3) Delegated authority remains as above to implement the recommended Public Space Protection Orders contained in this report and drafted in **Appendix 3**, those being:
  - a) PSPO for Gloucester City relating to dog and alcohol nuisance provisions
  - b) PSPO to supersede the Gating Order for Organs Alley
  - c) PSPO to implement an Alcohol Free Zone for Gloucester City centre Taking in to account the views of Overview and Scrutiny and Council.
- (4) The PSPO creating an alcohol free zone for the City Centre/BID area is implemented at a future date, following further consultation with partner agencies.
- (5) Further consultation be undertaken in Barton and Tredworth to explore the appropriateness of implementing PSPO(s) there, following requests from residents, partner agencies and ward councillors.
- (6) Gating Orders that are currently in place are scheduled for individual reviews, with all being completed by the end of 2019.
- (7) A review and update of the Safe & Attractive Streets Policy and PSPO guidance takes place.
- (8) A Memorandum of Understanding is drawn up for both the night time and day time economies, between partner agencies who work within the City Centre and a "DaySafe" type meeting, to mirror NightSafe, is established.

2.3 Council is asked to endorse the PSPO proposals

### **3.0 Background**

- 3.1 Councils have a key role to play in helping make local areas safe places to live, work in and visit. Tackling nuisance and anti-social behaviour (ASB) continues to be a corporate priority for Gloucester City Council and our partner agencies.
- 3.2 In December 2017 Cabinet approved a public consultation for the potential use of Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPOs) in Gloucester following a change in legislation and requests made by stakeholders to explore the benefits of such an order. Overview and Scrutiny committee received a briefing in October 2016 and further had endorsed exploration of PSPOs.
- 3.3 A PSPO can be made by the council if they are satisfied that the activities specified within them:
  - have had, or are likely to have, a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality
  - are, or are likely to be, persistent or continuing in nature
  - are, or are likely to be, unreasonable
  - justify the restrictions imposed.

- 3.4 From October 2017, all current Dog Control Orders (DCOs), Designated Public Place Orders (DPPO's) and Gating Orders automatically became PSPOs. These PSPOs will remain in force for up to a maximum of three years and if not reviewed beforehand, will expire in 2020
- 3.5 Gloucester has the following existing orders in place:
- **DPPO** for Barnwood, Coney Hill and Hucclecote introduced 22.06.2009 and varied to include additional areas in 08 August 2011
  - **DPPO** for City Centre introduced 05.09.2002
  - **Gating Orders** Saffron Close Tuffley and Badger Close, Tuffley adopted on 27.10.2006
  - **Gating Order** Fielden , Abbeydale adopted on 22.04.2008
  - **Gating Order** Chadwick Close/Windrush, Tuffley adopted on 05.03.2008
  - **Gating Order** Organs Alley gating adopted on 08.04.2014
  - **Dog Control Orders** covering Citywide parks and open spaces, relating to dog fouling, dogs in children's play parks and dogs being on leads when requested, introduced on 23.02.2007
- 3.6 The December 2017 Cabinet approved delegated powers to sign off PSPOs go to the Head of Communities in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Communities and Neighbourhoods. However, due to public concerns and the level of interest, the Cabinet Member for Communities and Neighbourhoods took the decision bring these proposals through the full democratic process in order to demonstrate transparency.
- 3.7 The Council took a proactive approach to consultation and the survey was widely publicised. Public consultation took place from January to April 2018 via an online survey and on-street surveying. In addition, two working groups were convened; one with council officers and one with key stakeholders. Both working groups offered a variety of responses to how the Council should implement PSPOs. The Director of the Manifesto Club commended the consultation process, stating they were "pleased that [the Council] are undertaking such a thorough process before passing any order".
- 3.8 The online survey included free text options for every question, giving respondents the opportunity to clearly share their views. Detailed responses were received from residents, the Faith Forum, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, the Institute of Fundraising, Project Pilgrim, Pedlars association, Gloucester BID, the LVA, Liberty, the Manifesto Club, political parties and via a petition presented to Council.
- 3.9 During the consultation, a review was conducted of the work that the Council and partners already do to address issues raised in the draft PSPO. This highlighted existing effective work that is already being undertaken by the Council and partner agencies, details of which are included in **Appendix 6**. Consideration has also been given to the High Strength Alcohol report written by the Overview & Scrutiny Task and Finish Group which looks to address the impact of high strength alcohol on our communities.
- 3.10 This report sets out the results of the public consultation and evidence gathering process, and gives recommendations for the future implementation of PSPOs in Gloucester. The proposals made in this report have been shaped

by consultation feedback, Council and Police data, input from officer and stakeholder working groups, consideration of the work the Council and our partners already undertake including our Safe & Attractive Streets Policy and consideration of the practicalities of whether a PSPO would work as intended to address the issues raised.

- 3.11 192 online survey responses were completed, with several more received directly by email and through consultation meetings with various partners. In total, over 1300 individual comments relating to the PSPO have been reviewed.

- 3.12 Respondents to the online survey identified as follows:

<b>Demographic</b>	<b>Number of individuals</b>	
Resident living in City centre	63	33.5%
Resident living in wider city	81	43.09%
Person who works in City	55	29.26%
Business owner/manager	15	7.98%
Visitor to City	15	7.98%
Local Councillor	3	1.6%
Representative of VCS	6	3.19%
Local organisation	5	2.66%
Other	10	5.32%

*\*numbers do not total 100% as respondents ticked all boxes that apply to them. 4 respondents skipped this question.*

- 3.13 The consultation survey initially asked respondents to tell us how big a problem they felt a particular behaviour was. Later in the survey, each specific proposed PSPO term was given and respondents were asked whether they agreed with each provision, offering a free text area for them to give their reasons why, if they wished to. Further, it asked whether respondents felt that particular provision should apply only to the area proposed (the City centre) and again offered free text space, this time for them to propose other areas that should be covered by that provision. At the end of the questionnaire, another free text input was available for respondents to detail any issues they felt should be covered by a PSPO, which were not already proposed.
- 3.14 Ongoing consultation continued after the initial timescales via the working groups which included key partners; the Police, Business Improvement District (BID), Faith Forum, CitySafe, the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC), Gloucester City Homes (GCH), the Licensed Victuallers Association (LVA) and various teams within the Council after the online survey ended, in order to discuss the survey feedback, the workings of a potential PSPO and it's enforcement and look at alternative options. It is intended that key respondents will be updated of the final PSPO proposals ahead of Overview & Scrutiny.
- 3.15 It should be noted that existing Gating Orders were not included in this consultation. This is because Gating Orders have historically been put in place to address particular issues of anti-social behaviour in specific areas. It is more appropriate to re-visit these areas and conduct a more targeted consultation with the local community and residents who live in the immediate

vicinity so that these specific issues can be re-assessed. The Organs Alley Gating Order was assessed as part of this consultation as it sits within the proposed designated area. A schedule to review all other current Gating Orders is included in the recommendations of this report.

- 3.16 A number of individual issues of ASB were raised by residents via the comments sections on the online survey. A list of these issues has been collated to be shared with Solace and other relevant partner agencies to address.

### **Results**

- 3.17 Consultation survey results and individual responses gave a good variety of feedback in response to PSPO proposals. The table in **Appendix 1** details consultation feedback alongside the Council's response with rationale included. This table will be publicised on the Council website.
- 3.18 The table below gives headlines of the consultation feedback:

Question/issue	% respondents who said it <u>is</u> a problem (very big problem & fairly big problem combined)	% respondents who said it <u>is not</u> a problem (not a big problem & not a problem at all combined)	Proposed PSPO Term	% Agree with inclusion in PSPO (strongly agree & agree combined)	% Disagree with inclusion in PSPO (disagree and strongly disagree combined)	Other information available on this issue	Conclusion
Dogs not being on leads	19.68	75.0	Dogs to be <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>kept under control (on leads if requested)</li> <li>out of children's play parks</li> <li>dog fouling to be cleared up</li> </ul>	86.75	13.26	Existing powers are in place Citywide under Dog Control Orders but these powers will cease if not reviewed.	Without superseding these with a PSPO we are extremely limited in how we can deal with these issues.
Dogs in children's play parks	27.27	45.45					
Dog fouling	57.61	35.85					
Alcohol related nuisance	65.60	31.19	Alcohol to be surrendered if nuisance related	74.38	25.63	Two Designated Public Place Orders are currently in place but will cease if not reviewed. Almost 2300 alcohol related Police incidents in City centre & Kingsholm in last 2 years, with other hotspot areas reported.	Without superseding current DPPO with a PSPO we are limited in powers to deal proactively with alcohol related nuisance.
Psychoactive substances	45.45	36.9	Psychoactive substances to be surrendered if nuisance related	77.18	22.81	Street Aware can address this. No data held on how prevalent this issue is.	Limited data presents lack of evidence for including this in a PSPO.
Begging	61.5	34.22	Begging not permitted	64.91	35.1	Street Aware has successfully addressed this over the past 2 years. Begging already a criminal offence.	A PSPO could not offer any enhancement on the powers and procedures already in place.

Peddling/street trading	28.11	63.24	Peddling/street trading must have written consent from Council	62.83	37.17	No complaints data held. Pedlars Act provides legislation for licenses. Council Street Trading policy in place.	Legislation and current work already available to address any issues.
Aggressive charity collection	51.06	41.19	No aggressive charity collectors	76.67	23.33	No complaints data held. Existing legislation available to regulate charity collections, and agreement with Institute of Fundraising in place.	Regulation already in place via various legislation. Procedure for dealing with "fake" charity collectors to be clarified in reviewed Safe & Attractive Streets Policy.
Littering	71.03	26.78	Littering not permitted	86.02	13.98	Littering is already an offence under the Environmental Protection Act	Measures for enforcement already available. Not appropriate to duplicate in a PSPO.
Unattended items	31.55	56.69	Unattended items can be removed	66.19	33.82	Police procedures in place regarding suspicious items left unattended. An informal partnership process already in place regarding non-suspicious items left unattended on the street.	Procedures are already in place and have support of partner agencies. Can be further clarified in the updated Safe & Attractive Streets Policy.
Nuisance or ASB	60.69	34.76	Nuisance or ASB not permitted	75	25	Numerous pieces of legislation already exist to tackle various nuisance and anti-social behaviour.	PSPO unlikely to enhance existing powers, and would go against Council commitments to prevention and intervention work.
Direction to leave	32.06	36.41	Person must leave designated area	67.16	32.85	Some dispersal powers already available to Police	Existing powers available to use

			when requested				where specific issues are present
--	--	--	----------------	--	--	--	--------------------------------------



### Dog Control Orders

- 3.19 Existing Dog Control Orders are in place City-wide and 86.7% of respondents to the consultation agreed that these provisions should remain.

### DPPOs

- 3.20 Existing Designated Public Place Orders remain in force in the City centre and Barnwood, Coney Hill and Hucclecote, giving powers to deal with alcohol related nuisance. 65% of respondents said that alcohol related nuisance is a problem, and 74% agreed that this term should be included in a PSPO.
- 3.21 Data received from Police shows that in the last 2 years there have been almost 2300 alcohol related incidents reported to Police in the City centre and Kingsholm & Wotton wards alone. Many comments from respondents requested that drinking in the street be prevented altogether.
- 3.22 Kingsholm was included in the original proposed PSPO due to ongoing issues occurring there and requests from elected members. On-street drinking in certain areas of the City centre and Kingsholm has a reoccurring detrimental impact on the community, with respondents saying that they feel threatened and intimidated, and some residents experiencing additional harassment, alarm or distress ranging from noise nuisance to drinkers using their gardens as toilets.
- 3.23 Compared to the night time economy, where Police use specific dispersal powers regularly in response to alcohol related nuisance, the Council and its partners have difficulty addressing the culture and impact of daytime street drinking. A PSPO would give powers to tackle this issue more effectively through use of a proposed alcohol free zone in the BID area of the City.
- 3.24 Comments opposing the inclusion of an alcohol provision in a PSPO focussed on the support available to “street drinkers”. In the first instance when dealing with the issue of street drinking, the council would use the existing “engage, support and enforce” model through Street Aware, our approach detailed in the Safe and Attractive Streets Policy, which seeks to engage with people to change individual behaviours and prevent the need for enforcement action by connecting people with the help and support they need. Additionally, commissioned drug and alcohol support services conduct outreach in the City centre on a regular basis. Therefore proposals include an update of the policy to increase focus on this cohort. The Safe and Attractive Streets Policy is included for reference in **Appendix 5**.
- 3.25 Stricter guidelines on alcohol consumption in the designated area would support the vision for our City centre and build on the recent Purple Flag accreditation and High Strength Alcohol report from the Overview & Scrutiny Task and Finish group, encouraging a safer and cleaner environment for all and preventing further detrimental impact to those who live, work in and visit the City. This is especially pertinent when the City has an ambition to focus on culture and heritage, a strong tourism trade and will shortly be welcoming an influx of students, joining residents who want to feel safe when using the city centre.

### Begging & Unattended items

- 3.26 Proposals relating to Begging and Unattended Items in the original draft PSPO caused public concern, with suggestions from some organisations that these terms would be used by stealth to target rough sleepers. The Council has reiterated continuously, and continues to commit, that rough sleeping has never been included in any PSPO proposals for the City.
- 3.27 61.5% of respondents said that begging is an issue in the City, with 64.9% agreeing with its inclusion in a PSPO. Begging is currently addressed by strong partnership working through the “Street Aware” work of the Safe and Attractive Streets Policy which sees input from support, enforcement and advocacy partners and has helped create sustainable change within our City. A PSPO could not enhance this approach therefore it is proposed that begging is not included in any proposed PSPO.
- 3.28 56.6% said that unattended items are *not* an issue, however 66.1% felt that this term should be included in a PSPO. The term “unattended items” can be considered subjective and may refer to personal items associated with rough sleeping or to terrorism. Existing processes address both issues, therefore it is proposed that a proposed PSPO does not include unattended items.

#### Nuisance or anti-social behaviour (ASB) and Direction to Leave

- 3.29 60.69% of respondents felt that nuisance or anti-social behaviour in the city centre is a problem. 75% agreed that this term should be included in a PSPO.
- 3.30 Only 32% of respondents felt that “people causing a nuisance, not leaving the area when asked to do so” was a problem. 36% said this was not a problem, and the remaining 32% said they did not know. However, 67% of respondents felt a direction to leave should be included in a PSPO.
- 3.31 For these two issues, many responses focussed on groups of young people. Gloucester City Council and partner agencies have committed to the Children First strategy which aims to work with young people to change their behaviour through engagement and intervention, with enforcement as a last resort. This is in line with our Street Aware approach of “engage, support, enforce” and it is recommended that we endorse Children First in the reviewed Safe and Attractive Streets Policy rather than implement additional enforcement against young people.
- 3.32 There are already numerous pieces of legislation and work streams in place to tackle nuisance and anti-social behaviour, available to both the Council and Police, which range from informal interventions to legal action. Specifically relating to a direction to leave, Police can already implement a Dispersal Power for up to 48 hours where there are issues of ASB occurring in an area. For these reasons it is not proposed that Nuisance/ASB or Direction to Leave are included in a PSPO.
- 3.33 Psychoactive Substances, Peddling/ Street Trading, Aggressive Charity Collection and Littering were also consulted upon. It is not recommended that these are included in a PSPO, because there are already powers and processes in place to address these. Further information can be found in the table in **Appendix 1**.

### **Recommendations**

- 3.34 As a result of consultation feedback and the review of work already undertaken by the Council, it is recommended that we use the proposed PSPO to focus only on the issues that are important to residents and where the Council are most limited in powers to deal with these. In working with partners to explore existing provision, the consultation found that the majority of issues raised in the draft PSPO are being sufficiently addressed through Council and/or partnership working and that a PSPO would not enhance these particular issues further.
- 3.35 It is recommended that the following original proposed terms are implemented in a PSPO:
- Dogs under control, and to be put on leads when requested
  - Dogs not to be permitted in children's play parks
  - Those in charge of dogs to clear up dog fouling
  - Alcohol related nuisance
- It is further recommended that an alcohol free zone is implemented in the City centre/BID area to address the enhanced detrimental effect of drinking in this area.
- 3.36 It has been identified that the following terms included in the original draft PSPO are sufficiently covered by existing work or legislation available to the council and partner agencies, or that there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate a detrimental effect on the community, therefore it is *not* proposed that these terms are included in the final PSPO proposal:
- Psychoactive substances
  - Begging
  - Peddling/Street Trading
  - Aggressive charity collection
  - Littering
  - Unattended items
  - Nuisance or anti-social behaviour
  - Direction to leave
- 3.37 An appraisal of PSPO options is attached in **Appendix 2**. The recommended option is for:
- A City-wide PSPO to supersede existing Dog Control Orders and Designated Public Place Orders. This means that these provisions would remain in place in all areas within the City boundary.
  - An alcohol free zone for the original proposed designated area, which consists of the BID area and part of Kingsholm.
  - The Gating Order at Organs Alley to be superseded by a PSPO
- 3.38 **Appendix 3** shows draft copies the recommended Public Spaces Protection Orders and designated areas.
- 3.39 An alcohol free zone for the designated area would mean that on-street drinking is not permitted. Exceptions to this prohibition apply to the curtilage of licensed premises and events that have received a license or authorisation from the City Council. An alcohol free zone would not prevent events in the

designated area being able to serve alcohol, for example Christmas markets serving mulled wine.

- 3.40 An Equality Impact Assessment (also known as a People Impact Assessment) has been completed in relation to the proposed orders. A copy of this is attached in **Appendix 4**. The assessment found this proposal to be 'neutral' in impact. Equality Impact Assessments are designed to focus on the impact of a proposal on groups with protected characteristics under the Equality Act. However, the assessment is comprehensive and in addition it explores any potential impact on groups that are not classed as protected characteristics but may be affected by the proposed PSPOs, namely dog walkers and those consuming alcohol in public places, including street drinkers. The impact on dog walkers and people drinking alcohol is neutral as the proposals simply replace orders that are already in place. In relation to specific "street drinkers", i.e. individuals who regularly congregate and consume alcohol in the City centre area, an alcohol free zone will prevent this from occurring and it should be noted that any *potential* impact of this upon this group may occur to a very small number of people, and that the detrimental impact caused to the wider community by this activity outweighs the proportionality of changing the PSPO proposal.
- 3.41 Existing Gating Orders remain in place due to the automatic supersession of legislation. A recommendation of this report is that these orders are scheduled for review, which should be completed by the end of 2019.
- 3.42 In relation to future PSPOs proposed to tackle specific ASB issues in our communities, the initial responsibility for investigation and interventions will lie with Solace, the City Council and Police funded ASB Team. If a PSPO is identified as a potential option by Project Solace, the Community Wellbeing Team will support with scoping, consultation and implementation. In these cases, legal advice is that a consultation period of 6 weeks is deemed sufficient. It is recommended consultation can take place following notification being given to the Head of Communities and that the power to approve orders remains with the Head of Communities in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Communities and local ward Councillors.

#### **4.0 Asset Based Community Development (ABCD) Considerations**

- 4.1 The recommendations contained in this report are made with due regard given to the City Council's ethos of Asset Based Community Development and community cohesion. These recommendations are made with the intention of minimal disruption to the community and a focus on strengthening partnership working to achieve the shared positive vision for the City.
- 4.2 Future work listed below will be overseen by the Community Wellbeing Team. This will ensure ABCD considerations are made and that the work is community-focussed.

#### **5.0 Future Work and Conclusions**

- 5.1 Enforcement arrangements and resourcing:
- A procedure for the enforcement of the PSPO should be drawn up

- Update the relevant legal paperwork e.g. Fixed Penalty Notice pads
  - Identify the “authorised persons” to enforce the PSPO
- 5.2 It is proposed that Council and Police officers enforce the alcohol related provision, which would be no change to how the Designated Public Place Order was enforced.
- 5.3 Future enforcement strategies led by the City Improvement and Environment Team to address environmental crime including littering, will be looked at separately. Working in partnership with the Community Wellbeing Team, this separate work will also address the dog related provisions of the PSPO proposal.
- 5.4 Further consultation takes place with the Police around the procedures for enforcement of an Alcohol Free Zone for the City centre area.
- 5.5 Work be undertaken in Barton and Tredworth to explore the appropriateness of implementing PSPO(s) there, following requests from residents, partner agencies and ward councillors.
- 5.6 Publicity and communication:
- publicise any PSPO sufficiently and give members of the public enough time to be aware of the order coming in to effect
  - Signage should be erected in prominent places that are affected
  - A communications plan specifically relating to the PSPO should be drawn up
  - A communications plan is drawn up to raise public awareness on the various strands of work already in place by which Council and partners address the issues raised in the PSPO consultation.
- 5.7 Review:
- Work with partners to review, update and explore new options as part of the Safe & Attractive Streets Policy, considering a “Making Every Adult Matter” approach
  - The PSPO Guidance is updated to enhance guidance around PSPOs for specific ASB issues.
  - Schedule of reviews of current Gating Orders

## **6.0 Alternative Options Considered**

- 6.1 Implementing a PSPO with all 10 proposed terms as per the original example Order used for the consultation, would present various issues including; the viability of a PSPO successfully addressing some of the specified behaviours, the appropriateness of having a PSPO for certain issues where evidence doesn’t sufficiently justify imposing an Order, and in terms of negative publicity and prospect of legal challenge. Conflict would also arise with regards to the City Council’s existing commitments to support and intervention, particularly around young and vulnerable people, such as the Children First Strategy and the Safe and Attractive Streets Policy. The PSPO options appraisal in **Appendix 2** clearly states that this alternative is not recommended.

- 6.2 Another alternative to the proposed recommendations would be to not implement a PSPO at all in the City. However, this would leave the Council and partners unable to address certain behaviours, in particular the provisions for dog and alcohol related nuisance, as the legislation providing previous powers for these has been repealed and the only available alternative is now to implement PSPOs.

## **7.0 Reasons for Recommendations**

- 7.1 Legislative changes mean that we must review the appropriateness of existing public place orders and decide whether to supersede these with PSPOs. Additionally, residents, businesses and partner agencies in the City have made requests for certain behaviours that detrimentally impact our communities to be addressed.
- 7.2 The recommendations in this report have been made following widespread consultation and shaped by consultation feedback, Council and Police data, input from officer and stakeholder working groups, consideration of the work the Council and our partners already undertake and consideration of the practicalities of whether a PSPO would work as intended to address the issues raised.
- 7.3 Councils have a key role to play in helping make local areas safe places to live, work in and visit. Tackling nuisance and ASB continues to be a corporate priority for Gloucester City Council and our partner agencies. The recommendations made in this report are done so with the intention of ensuring that our public places can be enjoyed free from nuisance and anti-social behaviour.
- 7.4 The recommendations in this report compliment strands of work from various partnerships and initiatives including NightSafe, the Stronger Safer Gloucester Partnership, Street Aware, Purple Flag and the Overview and Scrutiny Task and Finish Group for high strength alcohol.

## **8.0 Financial Implications**

- 8.1 There will be a financial cost to:
- a) Signage and publicity of the PSPOs. This is estimated at around £15 per sign. Costs may include a publicity campaign but this is to be advised by the Comms Team.
  - b) Training and updating of enforcement documents such as Fixed Penalty Notice pads.

(Financial Services have been consulted in the preparation of this report)

## **9.0 Legal Implications**

- 9.1 PSPOs must be lawfully implemented in line with legislation and with due consideration to Human Rights. The recommendations made in this report have been done so with guidance from One Legal.

(One Legal have been consulted in the preparation of this report)

## **10.0 Risk & Opportunity Management Implications**

- 10.1 Having regard to the consultation feedback, the recommended PSPO option mitigates risk by proposing that only existing orders are superseded, with one variation to consider stricter rules on alcohol in the City centre.
- 10.2 The results of this consultation offer an opportunity for the Council to promote the existing work that we do to tackle the issues raised in the original draft PSPO.

## **11.0 People Impact Assessment (PIA):**

- 11.1 A full People Impact Assessment has been completed and is included in **Appendix 4**.

## **12.0 Other Corporate Implications**

### Community Safety

- 12.1 Keeping Gloucester a safe and enjoyable place to live, work and visit is the basis of the Stronger Safer Gloucester Partnership and strategy. All of the information and evidence considered as part of this consultation process indicates that the implementation of a PSPO will give enhanced powers to delegated officers to ensure this.

### Sustainability

- 12.2 The implementation of any PSPO should be in partnership with the Police and relevant partner agencies to ensure that PSPOs can be sustainably resourced. The implementation process will be overseen by Community Wellbeing.

### Staffing & Trade Union

- 12.3 None identified.

### Safeguarding

- 12.4 None identified