| Option | Rationale in favour | Rationale against | Recommendation |
|--|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 1. Full PSPO as specified in draft order | Greater powers in dealing with issues across the city Will bring together various strands of work Replaces and enhances existing orders which will expire in 2020 | Primary focus is enforcement Duplicating existing legislation Some provisions of the Order will be either be in contradiction to or will duplicate already existing work streams, which can be brought together in a policy rather than an enforcement order. Resourcing implications of enforcement of full Order Will require full process maps for all of the individual provisions of the Order. Staffing, training and court costs for enforcement In reality some of the proposed provisions are not practicable to deal with the issues they were intended to address (e.g. dealing with young people v. Children First strategy) High possibility of negative publicity Potential of legal challenge Enforceability of the order depends on authorised persons being present to witness offences | This option is not recommended |
| 2. Focussed PSPO for the wider City | 1. There is sufficient work already being carried out, or legislation already available, to address most of the issues raised in the | Local authorities can attract negative publicity simply for implementing PSPOs. However, this proposal is for a minimal order | This is the recommended option |

with individual gating orders for specific locations

Alcohol and Dogs to be kept in a PSPO that covers the entire City in order to incorporate the existing powers that have been superseded by PSPOs

To also incorporate the current Gating Order in place in the city centre

- draft PSPO. We should not be duplicating existing legislation.
- 2. Government guidance states that we should look to address root causes of issues. Using existing work streams ensures this (e.g. Street Aware)
- **3.** However, the options are fewer for Dogs and Alcohol related nuisance. A minimal PSPO will address this.
- **4.** This option addresses issues reported in the wider city.
- **5.** Responds to the feedback given in Consultation
- **6.** Enhanced provision is possible for a potential Alcohol Free Zone in the city centre.
- **7.** City protection officers are already in post and offer an enhanced service within the city centre
- **8.** 3GS partnership being commissioned for environmental offences
- 9. Minimal complaints received by Council and Police about several of the issues raised in PSPO. This could be due to underreporting. The City Council can reassess the need for a more wide ranging PSPO after 6 months if it becomes apparent that issues

- which bucks the trend nationally for more prescriptive PSPOs.
- **2.** Enforceability of the order depends on authorised persons being present to witness offences

| | are occurring. | |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| 3. No PSPO for the City | A number of areas in the original proposal are addressed without the need for a PSPO, however see point 1 opposite. City protection officers are already in post and offer an enhanced service within the city centre 3GS partnership being commissioned for environmental offences therefore a PSPO for this is not necessary Council and Police complaints data is limited and relies on reporting from members of the public. This could be due to underreporting. The City Council can reassess the need for a more | A number of issues would not be covered if existing Orders are not superseded, including: Dog Control Orders have been superseded by PSPOs therefore a PSPO is necessary to continue with these provisions. Designated Public Place Orders have also been superseded by PSPOs. Gating Orders have been superseded by PSPOs. |
| | can reassess the need for a more wide ranging PSPO after 6 months if issues reported. | |