

### Purpose

The public consultation was undertaken following approval from a full Cabinet meeting of 9<sup>th</sup> January 2016, in accordance with section 72 of the Antisocial Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. The consultation sought to obtain public views, particularly of the locally affected community on:-

- the restricted activities specified within the proposed order;
- the boundary of the Order
- the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road N15
- The Impact of gating the above alleyway

### Methodology

- 1.0. Consultation process began on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2016. Details of the consultation were available on line and online questionnaire was activated. Printed Consultation packs were received late afternoon on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2016.
- 1.1 ASBAT undertook a door knocking exercise, making contact with residents and businesses, at almost every property in the affected locality. Officers undertook direct engagement, explaining the consultation and PSPO; this took place during the day, evening and also weekends to maximise contact with the community. Where direct engagement was not possible a copy of the Consultation questionnaire was left for the occupant(s) to complete. Officer also attended residents' meetings and a Ward Panel meeting, as well as facilitated public consultation meetings, disseminating information about the PSPO consultation and questionnaires. An outline of the engagement undertaken by ASBAT is detailed in the attached table at appendix A
- 1.2. In recognition of the impact that the PSPO is likely to have on the Eastern European men who hang around outside Wickes, coupled with their unlikely access to the internet where the PSPO was publicised we undertook direct engagement with this group on 17<sup>th</sup> March 2016. To maximise engagement the area was attended early morning and we were assisted by:-  
Benjamin Sebok      TRIO – Thames Reach      Polish speaker  
Izzet Bicmen                      ASBAT                      Turkish speaker

With assistance from above we were able to speak to about 40 males to explain PSPO and ascertain their views. They were mostly of Romanian and Bulgarian origin with a couple of them from Hungary. All of those spoken to stated that they understood why the Council wanted to put this order in place. They agreed there were issues with litter, people urinating in the street and residents' gardens, men blocking the pavements and harassing women. They generally agreed that there was fighting and the behaviour was at times aggressive and intimidating. The pattern was for any Bulgarian spoken to, to

put the blame for the anti-social behaviour upon the Romanians, and vice versa. The Romanians accused the Bulgarians of being drinkers, rough sleepers and urinating. The Bulgarians accused the Romanians of doing drugs, intimidating women and fighting all the time. Both parties accuse the other of causing a nuisance. However the impression gained from the men spoken to, it would appear that the Bulgarians are rough sleeping on the street. The Romanians spoken to indicated to Benjamin that they were renting accommodation. Some of the men spoken to, though not able to speak English, indicated that they had been in the UK for some time, had National Insurance numbers but were struggling to gain employment. A Bulgarian male when asked his name, took out his ID and stated, 'this is the name they gave me'. We have since been advised that purchasing fake IDs to enter the UK is common place. One young Romanian spoke fluent English, but was still struggling to obtain long term employment owing to lack of CV, qualifications and the ability to obtain qualifications, although he had experience in his native country. A Hungarian man who appeared to be 50-60 years old stated that men gathering outside Wickes had been going on for years and that no order would stop this – the men do not fear being arrested; they will go to jail (get a shower and food) and when they come out will return to outside Wickes – because this is the only way to get employment.

- 1.3 ASBAT was also assisted by Kenny Wilkes (Street Enforcement Officer) who was able to engage with several businesses in West Green Road, enhancing response from local business. 21 completed Questionnaires
- 1.4. It is estimated that between 1100 questionnaires were distributed by ASBAT. In addition to the above about 400 blank questionnaires were left at Wickes for distribution to customers. Also about 200 blank questionnaires were given to Tottenham Green Safer Neighbourhood Team for distribution to the public in their ward in the borderline streets and areas. Both Wickes and SNT were advised that no further direction was permitted after 18<sup>th</sup> March 2016 and the closure of the consultation on 18 April 2016. They were advised to destroy any remaining blank questionnaires.

### Data Analysis

- 2.0. The responses to the 5 key questions of the Consultation Questionnaire reaped an overwhelming support for the proposed PSPO and the gating order for the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road

**Q1A. Do you agree that the terms of the proposed public spaces protection order are clear?**

Yes	No	I don't know	Total	No reply
446	15	14	475	-
94%	3%	3%	100%	-

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

---

**Q2A. Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?**

Yes	No	I don't know	Total	No reply
432	27	16	475	-
91%	6%	3%	100%	-

**Q3a. Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?**

Yes	No	I don't know	Total	No reply
389	48	26	475	12
82%	10%	5%	100%	3%

**Q4a. Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?**

Yes	No	I don't know	Total	No reply
365	40	64	475	6
77%	8%	13%	100%	1%

**Q4b. Do you live in a property that joins or is next to the footpath**

Yes	No	I don't know	Total	No reply
64	385	11	475	15
13%	81%	2%	100%	3%

**Q5A Would you be able to use an alternative route?**

Yes	No	I don't know	Total	No reply
335	22	64	475	54
71%	5%	13%	100%	11%

- 2.1. The consultation process targeted people living and working within the affected area of the proposed PSPO, as they would be expected to be most affected by the Order. To ensure their views were fully represented respondents to the questionnaire were asked to identify their post code and specify whether or not they were a resident, local business or work in the area.

Resident	Local Business	Work in the area	Total	No reply
335	66	56	475	18
71%	14%	12%	100%	4%

354 respondents specified a N15 post code. From this we were able to ascertain that 91% of those who stated they lived or worked in the N15 area were in favour of the restricted activities of the PSPO; 82% agreed with the specified boundary of the proposed PSPO. 77% agreed with the closure of the alleyway between Roslyn and Southey Road. Only 32 of the respondents living or working in the N15 area disagreed with the gating order (representing 9%)

- 2.2. The characteristics of all respondents to the PSPO can be viewed in the tables attached in Appendix B. Additional comments made by Respondents to the key questions and within the general comments box are recorded in Appendix C

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

### APPENDIX A

DATE	AREA
25 <sup>th</sup> February	Door knocking at all properties on the following roads: Suffield Road Kerswell Close Regency Terrace Initial contact with Seven Sisters Market
26 <sup>th</sup> February	Seven Sisters Market – engagement with businesses within the Market Hall Door knocking at all properties Victoria Crescent
27 <sup>th</sup> February	Door knocking at all properties on the following roads: Roslyn Road Greenfield Road Birstall Road
29 <sup>th</sup> March	Attended Victoria Road Residents Association Meeting. All residents in attendance welcomed the PSPO and supported the provisions. Resident’s representative from Pagin House would like the boundary extended as Pagin House currently excluded – 15 copies of Questionnaire given to Rep to circulate to tenants of Pagin House
1 <sup>st</sup> March	Tottenham Green Ward Panel - 15 in attendance Again all attendees supported the PSPO. Again would like the boundary extended to include a little more of Tottenham Green Ward, namely: Other side of West Green Road; further up West Green Road to Lawrence Road; Braemar Road, Kirkton Road through to West Green Road. This extension would include the main shopping parade and areas prioritised for police patrols for ongoing ASB
2 <sup>nd</sup> March	St Ann’s Library – Public meeting 4.30 – 6.30 7 Questionnaire completed on-line, 12 Questionnaire forms completed, 6 Questionnaire distributed for return

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

3 <sup>rd</sup> March	<p>Door knocking at all properties on the following roads:          West Green Road          Elizabeth Road          Southey Road          Culvert Road          Russell Court</p> <p>CHANEL Public Meeting 7pm- 9pm. It was not practical to use the meeting room given its location in the canteen which was not in use. Therefore Joan and Zaffar interacted with the public in the reception area. This was primarily users of the college: students, staff and governing body members.</p>
4 <sup>th</sup> March	<p>Joan, Zaffar and Scholar – attended Apex House to engage with staff and users. Details of the consultation had been circulated to all Apex staff via email and ASBAT attended Apex House to explain the consultation further and collect any completed forms. ASBAT took the opportunity to engage with residents/users attending Apex House for advice and assistance with Housing, to ascertain their views</p> <p>St Ann’s Library – public meeting 4pm – 6.30pm</p>
8 <sup>th</sup> March	<p>St Ann’s Library – public meeting – 4pm -6pm</p>
9 <sup>th</sup> March	<p>Roslyn Road &amp; others – residents meeting, about 20 attendees. Included residents from Roslyn Road, Seaford Road, Elmar Road, Brunel Walk, and Lomond Close.</p> <p>Key concerns for these residents were the litter/fly-tipping and street drinking. They felt that collections and litter patrols not effective. Often rubbish is left around litter bins. Park was very badly affected</p>
15 <sup>th</sup> March	<p>Carried out additional door knocking on properties of Stonebridge Estate and questionnaires left with the Sheltered Scheme</p>
17 <sup>th</sup> March	<p>Interaction with men outside Wickes 6.30am – 9am, to explain PSPO and ascertain their views</p>

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

### APPENDIX B

### AGE

	Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?					Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?					Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?				
	Yes	No	don't know	Total	No reply	Yes	No	don't know	Total	No reply	Yes	No	don't know	Total	No reply
Under 16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16-24	17	1	-	18	-	17	1	-	18	-	12	1	4	18	1
	4%	4%	-	4%	-	4%	2%	-	4%	-	3%	3%	6%	4%	17%
25-44	174	15	8	197	-	152	24	16	197	5	148	18	29	197	2
	40%	56%	50%	41%	-	39%	50%	62%	41%	42%	41%	45%	45%	41%	33%
45-64	182	7	6	195	-	168	14	9	195	4	154	14	24	195	3
	42%	26%	38%	41%	-	43%	29%	35%	41%	33%	42%	35%	38%	41%	50%
65+	47	4	1	52	-	42	7	1	52	2	39	6	7	52	-
	11%	15%	6%	11%	-	11%	15%	4%	11%	17%	11%	15%	11%	11%	-
Prefer not to say	3	-	-	3	-	2	-	-	3	1	3	-	-	3	-
	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%	8%	1%	-	-	1%	-
No reply	9	-	1	10	-	8	2	-	10	-	9	1	-	10	-
	2%	-	6%	2%	-	2%	4%	-	2%	-	2%	3%	-	2%	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>6</b>

## GENDER

	Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?					Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?					Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?				
	Yes	No	don't know	Total	No reply	Yes	No	don't know	Total	No reply	Yes	No	don't know	Total	No reply
<b>Female</b>	212	12	9	233	-	191	22	16	233	4	179	17	34	233	3
	49%	44%	56%	49%	-	49%	46%	62%	49%	33%	49%	43%	53%	49%	50%
<b>Male</b>	193	14	6	213	-	173	25	8	213	7	164	21	25	213	3
	45%	52%	38%	45%	-	44%	52%	31%	45%	58%	45%	53%	39%	45%	50%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	4	1	-	5	-	4	-	1	5	-	5	-	-	5	-
	1%	4%	-	1%	-	1%	-	4%	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%	-
<b>No reply</b>	23	-	1	24	-	21	1	1	24	1	17	2	5	24	-
	5%	-	6%	5%	-	5%	2%	4%	5%	8%	5%	5%	8%	5%	-
<b>Total</b>	432	27	16	475	-	389	48	26	475	12	365	40	64	475	6

## SEXUAL ORIENTATION

	Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?					Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?					Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?				
	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	Total	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	Total	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	Total
<b>Heterosexual</b>	254	23	40	4	321	273	23	16	9	321	254	23	40	4	321
<b>Bi sexual</b>	3	1	2	0	6	1	2	2	1	6	1	2	2	1	6
<b>Gay</b>	10	1	0	0	11	6	5	0	0	11	8	1	2	0	11
<b>Lesbian</b>	5	0	1	0	6	2	3	1	0	6	4	0	2	0	6
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	53	11	3	0	67	50	12	5	0	67	44	10	12	1	67
<b>No Reply/ blank</b>	61	1	2	0	64	57	3	2	2	64	54	4	6	0	64
<b>Total</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>475</b>

## GENDER REASSIGNMENT

	Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?					Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?					Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?				
	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	Total	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	Total	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	Total
Yes changed	3	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	0	3
No change	330	23	15	0	368	297	41	21	9	368	281	30	53	4	368
Prefer not to say	32	3	0	0	35	29	2	3	1	35	27	6	2	0	35
No Reply/ Blank	67	1	1	0	69	60	5	2	2	0	56	3	8	2	69
<b>Total</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>475</b>

## RELIGION OR BELIEF

	Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?					Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?					Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?				
	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL
Christian	174	4	6	0	184	162	10	7	5	184	148	14	20	2	184
Hindu	12	0	0	0	12	11	0	1	0	12	11	0	1	0	12
Muslim	59	2	1	0	62	51	5	3	3	62	50	3	9		62
Sikh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jewish	3	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	3
Rastafarian	3	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	3	2	0	1	0	3
Buddhist	4	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	4	3	0	1	0	4
No Religion	105	15	5	0	125	89	23	9	4	125	86	17	19	3	125
Prefer not to say	47	5	2	0	54	43	7	4	0	54	41	5	7	1	54
Other/blank	25	1	2	0	28	23	3	2	0	28	22	1	5	0	28
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>475</b>

## MENTAL OR PHYSICAL DISABILITY

	Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?					Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?					Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?				
	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL
Yes	55	3	1	0	59	50	4	2	3	59	47	4	7	1	59
No	309	21	14		344	280	36	21	7	344	261	31	48	4	344
Prefer not to say	9	1	0	0	10	7	1	2	0	10	7	1	2		10
blank	59	2	1	0	62	51	6	3	2	62	50	4	7	1	62
<b>Total</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>475</b>

## MARRIAGE and CIVIL PARTNERSHIP

	Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?					Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?					Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?				
	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL
Single	141	9	5	0	155	124	17	10	4	155	115	15	23	2	155
Married	145	8	3	0	156	131	14	8	3	156	130	7	18	1	156
Co-Habiting	49	4	5	0	58	41	8	7	2	58	40	9	8	1	58
Separated	8	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	8	7	0	1	0	8
Divorced	33	3	3	0	39	31	4	1	3	39	30	4	3	2	39
Widowed	10	0	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	10	8	0	2	0	10
Same Sex Civil Partnership	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
No Response	45	3	0	0	48	43	5	0	0	48	34	5	9	0	48
<b>Total</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>475</b>

## PREGNANCY and MATERNITY

	Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?					Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?					Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?				
	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL	Yes	No	Don't know	blank	TOTAL
Pregnant	4	1	0	0	5	4	0	1	0	5	4	0	1	0	5
Not Pregnant	336	23	14	0	373	297	44	23	9	373	282	30	55	6	373
No Response	92	3	2	0	97	88	4	2	3	97	79	10	8	0	97
<b>Total</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>475</b>
Had a baby in the last 12 months	6	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	6	5	0	1	0	6
Have not had a baby in the last 12 months	323	25	15	0	363	289	42	22	10	363	270	36	53	4	363
No Response	103	2	1	0	106	94	6	4	2	106	90	4	10	2	106
<b>Total</b>	<b>432</b>				<b>475</b>					<b>475</b>					<b>475</b>

## ETHNIC GROUP

ETHNIC GROUP	Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?					Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?					Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?				
	Yes	No	I don't know	Total	No reply	Yes	No	I don't know	Total	No reply	Yes	No	I don't know	Total	No reply
White British	128	13	5	146	-	110	21	11	146	4	106	16	20	146	4
	30%	48%	31%	31%	-	28%	44%	42%	31%	33%	29%	40%	31%	31%	67%
White Irish	11	1	-	12	-	9	1	1	12	1	9	-	3	12	-
	3%	4%	-	3%	-	2%	2%	4%	3%	8%	2%	-	5%	3%	-
White Other Greek / Greek Cypriot	3	-	1	4	-	3	-	1	4	-	3	-	1	4	-
	1%	-	6%	1%	-	1%	-	4%	1%	-	1%	-	2%	1%	-
White Other - Turkish	22	2	-	24	-	21	1	-	24	2	19	-	5	24	-
	5%	7%	-	5%	-	5%	2%	-	5%	17%	5%	-	8%	5%	-
White Other - Turkish Cypriot	3	1	-	4	-	2	2	-	4	-	3	1	-	4	-
	1%	4%	-	1%	-	1%	4%	-	1%	-	1%	3%	-	1%	-
White Other - Kurdish	7	-	1	8	-	7	1	-	8	-	7	1	-	8	-
	2%	-	6%	2%	-	2%	2%	-	2%	-	2%	3%	-	2%	-
White Other - Gypsy / Roma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White Other - Irish Traveller	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-
	0%	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
Black or Black British: African	49	-	2	51	-	49	2	-	51	-	39	4	7	51	1
	11%	-	13%	11%	-	13%	4%	-	11%	-	11%	10%	11%	11%	17%
Black or Black British: Caribbean	74	1	-	75	-	63	5	3	75	4	60	5	9	75	1
	17%	4%	-	16%	-	16%	10%	12%	16%	33%	16%	13%	14%	16%	17%
Asian or Asian British: Indian	9	-	-	9	-	9	-	-	9	-	9	-	-	9	-
	2%	-	-	2%	-	2%	-	-	2%	-	2%	-	-	2%	-
Asian or Asian British: Pakistani	6	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	6	-
	1%	-	-	1%	-	2%	-	-	1%	-	2%	-	-	1%	-
Asian or Asian British: Bangladeshi	5	-	-	5	-	4	-	-	5	1	5	-	-	5	-
	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%	8%	1%	-	-	1%	-
Asian or Asian British: East African Asian	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-
	-	4%	-	0%	-	-	2%	-	0%	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
Mixed: White and Black African	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-
	-	-	6%	0%	-	-	-	4%	0%	-	-	-	2%	0%	-
Mixed: White and Black Caribbean	4	-	-	4	-	4	-	-	4	-	4	-	-	4	-
	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%	-
Mixed: White and Asian	4	-	-	4	-	2	2	-	4	-	4	-	-	4	-
	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%	4%	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%	-
Chinese	2	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	2	-
	0%	-	-	0%	-	1%	-	-	0%	-	1%	-	-	0%	-
Any other ethnic background	52	7	6	65	-	49	7	9	65	-	43	11	11	65	-
	12%	26%	38%	14%	-	13%	15%	35%	14%	-	12%	28%	17%	14%	-
Prefer not to say	11	1	-	12	-	9	3	-	12	-	7	1	4	12	-
	3%	4%	-	3%	-	2%	6%	-	3%	-	2%	3%	6%	3%	-
No reply	41	-	-	41	-	39	2	-	41	-	37	1	3	41	-
	9%	-	-	9%	-	10%	4%	-	9%	-	10%	3%	5%	9%	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>6</b>

### APPENDIX C – Other comments

**Q1A Do you agree that the terms of the proposed public spaces protection order are clear?**

**Q1B If you answered No, how could the terms be made clearer?**

Q1b is a biased and undemocratic question. It assumes by disagreeing with the proposed public spaces protection order, I am saying that the terms are not clear. The terms are clear but I think they are unfair, undemocratic and discriminatory. The men at the entrance to Wickes are just poor working men who are trying to make a living; they are not hurting anybody and, although I use Wickes all the time, they have never hassled me; they just ask politely if I would like some help. All that is needed is a mobile toilet or at least a sign to the toilet on the corner of Seven Sisters Road and the High Road. Come on Haringey, you can do better than this!

However worried about where people will go

Concerns re: ASB. Have not seen myself but worry about putting people into unsafe situations i.e. homelessness, deportation etc Human rights, welfare of people. Difficulty finding work

They could be made clearer with an explanation as to why it is felt necessary to take these measures. vague terms such as 'obstruction', 'annoyance', 'other unacceptable or offensive behaviour' are all too loosely defined. how is one to know if one is breaching these terms.

I do not know what 'more powers' with regard to the Police and Council means. I can guess, but it is not clear.

It is not clear how much of a problem this is as this part of the justification relies on anecdotal, unsubstantiated and unquantified reports. To justify this you need to make clear that the community as a whole thinks this is a problem; has a real survey been done? Nobody has asked me.

Points 1-5 are clear, although these appear totally different to Point 6. There is no connection between Points 1-5 and Point 6 at all. The Footpath should remain open and policed as any other Footpath would be.

DON'T KNOW HAVEN'T HAD ANY PROBLEMS

AS LONG AS ACTION IS CONSISTENT. BIGGER POLICE PRESENCE. MAYBE FINE CONTRACTORS

Congregating on stairwell and bin areas on estates. Allowing dogs to run loose intimidating residents and fouling grass areas

Seems inhumane. people have the right to get together. how do we know people won't abuse this. Police will abuse young people and workers

Breach of civil liberties. The terms are unclear - especially the "two or more persons". The police will abuse their powers. This is illegal! The police already failed, so why should our area change?

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

---

I would also like Haringey to follow in Enfield's footsteps and ban spitting. It is rife in this area & totally disgusting. Also dumping, major issue but all I see are a few signs here & there & the dumping continues. These issues are both anti-social behaviours & linked to PSPO

There does NOT need to be a PSPO. Any concerning behaviour (i.e. public urination, harassment) are illegal and police already have powers to deal with these

The first five points are clear. Although there is NO connection made with these and point six - closure of the footpath. The footpath should remain open and policed as any other footpath

### **Q2A. Do you agree with the public spaces protection order restricting these activities?**

### **Q2b. If you answered No, please tell us the reason for your answer**

I agree with most parts of it but I'm unsure about the part concerning people outside Wickes seeking casual labour. I'm aware of the illegality....my main concerns are for their health and safety. I have never had a problem with this group of men,

They are looking for work, however I am not sure if arresting them is necessarily the best form of action. Maybe if there were more public toilets available to them.

Same reasons as above. They should put toilet facilities in place.

I don't mind them

These people are workers looking for jobs; they may have a beer early in the morning, which seems to me more an illness, alcoholism, than antisocial behaviour. They have never annoyed me. They are polite.

Criminalising the listed behaviours has historically always been ineffective. I recognise you're being squeezed by Tory budgets which makes it hard to look for genuine solutions, but this is not the answer to antisocial behaviour; it's criminalising a symptom, not solving a problem.

People forced to literally beg for work which is very low paid and have no employee rights shouldn't then also be attacked by the rest of us which is what this PSPO does

I live 5 mins from Wickes and pass the car park nearly every day. I have never once had any grounds for annoyance from anyone 'loitering' outside. In my opinion, it is not a crime to 'congregate', 'loiter' or drink alcohol. Anything that might constitute criminal behaviour is already adequately covered by the existing laws. You do not need to criminalise these people who are trying to get some work. The fact that the people targeted are mainly Roma men, suggests to me that the object of this PSPO is racist. Roma people were enslaved in Europe for hundreds of years. Trying to find casual labour is a sign of joblessness, not of criminality.

It is unacceptable to prevent people from gathering meaning people can no longer meet at all, to chat, or walk together, or to meet up, or take part in a lawful demonstration, to meet prior to going on to another activity such as a trip via the train station or shopping etc. Preventing a group of 'two or more' means even two people cannot stand together at all. How far apart must they stand to be within the suggested restriction? It is unacceptable to

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

---

prevent people from meeting each other in order to offer, or seek, work, hardly evoking an environment that would help people into work. It is also unacceptable to prevent people from 'having an open container of alcohol' in this area.

Excess criminalisation is unlikely to work, and can instead lead to net widening and up-tariffing. The idea, it seems, is to target people looking for casual work. Clearly these guys are desperate, and must have ended up in their unenviable position due to being vulnerable. How many have been trafficked? The best way to address this is through proper engagement and outreach work. Have council officials thought about this creatively? There are apparently going to be 5,000 new jobs being created in Haringey, and a lot of construction going on. Why not work with the developers and find positive, helpful ways to link some of these guys with jobs, and actually do something which will be of benefit to everyone, including the community? Police and civil enforcement resources are scarce enough. It'd be much better to focus them on serious issues such as gangs and dangerous drivers.

It's not clear how this would actually solve the core of the problem here. It would just push people elsewhere. It also appears to be exclusively targeted at migrant labourers, who are definitely not the only people engaging in "anti-social behaviour" in the area (groups on Culvert Road gathering with dogs is far more of a concern to me).

But I would prefer it be replaced by bringing these men into the regular workforce. Bit of a bigger project.

Clearly those people queuing every day for work outside Wickes are in a much harder material position than me and than many other residents of the area. I have never seen any antisocial activity beyond a couple of people (who may or may not be seeking work, how can you tell?) who have had a bit too much to drink. This targeting of almost exclusively migrant workers fits into a nasty and dangerous culture of blame which I do not want to endorse. I don't think it's appropriate that police are there moving people along. If you are worried about public urination, how about pointing the finger at the utter lack of public toilets in the area, which is down to the council.

Point 6 is NOT an activity. Closure of the Footpath is NOT necessary - it has been utilised since the surrounding area was built upon in the early 1900's and this should remain the case.

YES THIS IS BAD IN THE AREA IN OUR ESTATE

THIS IS A PROBLEM ON THE ESTATE

I think, someone getting arrested for urinating in public is a bit overboard as it depends heavily on circumstances

People in the borough should be contributing more to raise funds to help the people causing problems

I think it is unfair to prevent people from trying to find work, which is what the people who gather round Wickes are doing. Preventing the drinking & public urination & mess are okay, but not people asking/seeking casual work

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

---

Tackle the problem itself. People will always come but having orders won't make it go away. It will move elsewhere

Our area should not change to accommodate the failure of appropriate police action. This is a disgusting proposal that only serves bullies !! Urinating and consuming alcohol in public spaces is a problem. WE DO NOT HAVE POLICE SERVICE. ONLY BULLIES

It seems as though the genuinely antisocial behaviour is already covered by other laws/acts. I have no problem with 'loitering' if it is non-threatening. I don't want to make lives harder

The order seems mean spirited. These are poor people trying to earn money - the vast majority I'm sure are orderly

I live in the area and have not witnessed any more illegal activity than elsewhere in the Borough

NEED MORE SECURE

About time !

I agree with points 1-5 but not with point 6 closure of the footpath is not necessary and is not an activity

**Q3a. Do you agree with the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order boundary area?**

**Q3b. Are there any changes you would make to the proposed boundary?**

Think it could go further but agree if it is a hot spot

This needs to be further extended to the area off Broad Lane, opposite 8-22 Victoria Road. Where there are groups of males that gather on a regular basis. This is where all the cafes are. Sleeping in cars, drinking and leaving a mess.

Should be extended to include the Apex House Car Park. As this is an area where drinkers congregate in the evening.

It needs to be wider because people will just be moved elsewhere

Broaden the area to cover stone bridge and the whole of West Green Road. These areas have been historic as hot spot over the years

It should also include areas around the station exits and parades of shops along seven sisters road. Aggressive begging really unacceptable.

Office car park

It could be wider to cover more areas

My concern is that this scheme is going to force those committing ASB in to other parts of the area and I feel that the exclusion zone should be extended as soon as similar incidents

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

---

start occurring in nearby areas, this should be a hard line approach to all those committing ASB in all parts of Tottenham at every instance

As Chair of the Tottenham Green Ward Safer Neighbourhood Panel, and also a resident of Roslyn Road, I feel it is vital that for effective policing and reduction of antisocial behaviour including public consumption of alcohol, urinating in gardens and streets, littering etc, that the western boundary be extended a short distance to include Braemar Road, Kirkton Road and the 'Ramp' (at the junction of Brunel walk and Lomond Close). Also I feel that the 'zone' include the north side of West Green Road from the High Road westwards to the end of the shopping parade at Lawrence Road. These suggestions were also minuted at the last Ward SNT Panel Meeting. I understand that the Safer Neighbourhood Police Team would be favourable to this suggestion understanding it would be beneficial in reducing antisocial behaviour. Thank you for your consideration.

It could be wider to cover more areas

I am in favour of extending the PSPO westwards to include Braemar Road, Kirkton Road and the Ramp between Brunel Walk and Lomond Close. Also to include the Northern side of West Green Shopping Parade from the High Road to Lawrence Road.

I'm in favour of extending the PSPO westwards to include Braemar Road, Kirkton Road and the Ramp between Brunel Walk and Lomond Close. Also to include the Northern side of West Green Shopping Parade from the High Road to Lawrence Road

Yes, extend to include Braemar Road, Kirkton Road, and the car park/ community garden where these two roads meet.

Problems will just move on

Not nice they are messy

They are only round here when police are looking for them

I believe the boundary should stretch as far as Lawrence road along west green road and should include Braemar & Kirk ton roads. There is a significant amount of anti-social behaviour on these roads, especially on Kirkton and that stretch of West Green Road.

Expand the area to include Kirkton Road, and ramp that connects Kirkton Road/Braemar Road/Seaford Road

Toilets, public toilets, for them and others to urinate

Get rid of it entirely.

Get rid of it altogether

I would not have any PSPO whatsoever. The police are making an issue out of something that isn't an issue because it looks untidy and involves an ethnic minority whom they are prejudiced against.

I have been informed that this is increasing and would support the extension.

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

---

Extend westward to include Braemar and Kirkton Roads

To close a public footpath, that is marked on maps etc, is totally unacceptable. As an example the footpath is a means for people living to the east of Greenfield road, and in Greenfield road, to reach seven sisters school. There will be many other people inconvenienced by not being able to use the footpaths. People walking to and from the station would also be inconvenienced considerable, including visitors to the area. If such an area were to be imposed, people who currently meet within it would simply find somewhere else nearby. There should be no restrictive PSPO anywhere in the boundary area.

Scrap it.

If the people using the street to urinate just move into an area outside the red border can the border be widened?

Include Stonebridge Road as people could congregate there.

Include Page Green Terrace. The hedge along the High Road edge is just perfect for men to piss against.

A boundary is NOT required - if people are committing crimes etc then they should be dealt with accordingly. This Order could result in a situation where neighbours talking in the street are classed as criminals or anti social. There is no logic to this at all.

It is too large related to the area causing the problem and the route cause. It should only be 100-200m around Wickes, and does not need to extend and engulf seven sisters station and the Latin market where totally different groups of people congregate, and could be unreasonably affected by the additional rights of this order.

But needs to include the car parking areas at Apex House - groups congregate there to drink, smoke and sleep on grassed area

ENLARGE AREA TO COVER HIGH ROAD N15

ENLARGE BOUNDRY AREA TO COVER WHOLE OF HARINGEY

SHOULD BE WIDER TO INCLUDE STONEBRIDGE ESTATE - THEY ALL COME HERE, DRINKERS, DRUG USERS

WHAT ABOUT STONEBRIDGE ESTATE

BUT PLEASE EXTEND TO INCLUDE STONEBRIDGE ESTATE

YES MAKE BIGGER INCLUDE STONEBRIDGE ESTATE AREA

THIS WILL PUSH ALL THE PROBLEMS INTO STONEBRIDGE ESTATE - MAKE BOUNDARY BIGGER

EXTEND TO INCLUDE STONEBRIDGE ESTATE

INCLUDE STONEBRIDGE ESTATE

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

---

CAN YOU STOP PEOPLE COMING ONTO THIS ESTATE (STONEBRIDGE), DRINKING, SLEEPING  
DRUG ISSUES ON MY ESTATE, LOTS OF NOISE / LITTER. COVER STONEBRIDGE ESTATE

COVER MORE AREA

NEED TO ENLARGE THE BOUNDRY AREA

WHERE PROBLEM IS CONTAINING IT

It should include Pagin House which is on Braemar Road. This block suffers from people from Wickes sleeping in the garden at the back and breaking into sheds and outhouses

Include service road to Seven Sisters market hall

Putting fencing around the grass area, like it is in St Ann's Road

This proposal order only serves to downgrade our area and fails to identify the failure of the police. This should of already come out of the police budget not the residents. The police already bully the residents - this proposal is a license to abuse residents. There is already 'Public Order' and 'Stop & Search' powers !?! USE THEM! URINATING BY MEN IS A REGULAR OCCURANCE

This should be extended as Stone bridge Road there are groups too

Please look carefully at some of these council estates where these people hanging out. Pushing drugs, drinking and loitering within these boundaries. Main area Helston Court. It is serious

No I am happy with your proposals

Maybe block off the patch of ground outside the block of flats number 21-23 flats. This never gets cleaned up and it is just used as a rubbish bin, dumping ground & gets overflowed with rubbish & nothing gets done about it. It's called a community garden

The public Spaces protection Order should also please include Stonebridge Road which is already suffering from some anti-social behaviour

Stonebridge Estate should be in the boundary because of people (boys mainly) gathering at the entrance of near the Council Apex House

If you wish to go ahead with the order, all Stonebridge road should be included. There are often gangs of youths playing loud music often late at night

There does not need to be a PSPO in this area - the behaviour of people around here is not offensive or intimidating

I would like my boundary to be include Ashmount Road. I will have to think about it. I don't think gates should be included. These are loitering at night and dumping of rubbish to front of the building

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

---

Please include Stonebridge Road too. They already have started to group on the road just by the communal bins. This causes the same concern to the residents there

I would like to include Ashmount and Earlsmead

Question: Why is Stonebridge Road excluded? I'd be concerned that the current proposed would push offenders onto our estate

Perhaps if successful expand the PSPO Boundary  
Adding Stonebridge Road because of anti-social drinking in the evenings  
Boundary extended to include Stonebridge Road

Can you please include Pagin House in the proposal boundary. It is a small building and might have been forgotten. Could you include all of Culvert Road as it is unclear on map if you do.

If people are committing crimes/obstructions etc- then this should be dealt with via law enforcement. Surely there is no boundary to this. Such an order could result in neighbours speaking in the streets being classified as criminals

YES, add Apex House area as well

I am confused and a little concerned as to how this order would be used to those using the small park at the end of Roslyn Road. At present the park is both filthy and unsafe at night. However the order should not be used to stop people hanging out or using the park

Yes please include Stonebridge road. All of the activities listed in the PSPO are also happening here. Specifically on the corner closest to Wickes where the estate bins are. Fly tipping, urinating, consuming alcohol and loitering. This area needs to be included or the behaviour will just be pushed towards my house

No I think it's an area in which there are a lot of current problems

YES, the boundary should include Stonebridge Road. As there are issues with drug dealing, gangs of youth, defecating, drinking, dumping of rubbish, urinating, dog fouling, so called residents without parking permits colluding with parking enforcement officers who block park and escape fines. Robbery of cars with SAT NAV, & prostitution in alleyways & flats where they break in and have sex in doorways whilst residents are at home.

Boundaries not clear Cover West Green Road and Stonebridge Road & Seven Sisters Tube stations

Need clearer boundaries  
What about displacement?

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

---

**Q4a. Do you agree with the proposed gating of the alleyway between Roslyn Road and Southey Road?**

**Q4b. Do you live in a property that joins or is next to the footpath**

**Q4c. If access to the alleyway was restricted, what impact would this have on you?**

61 Residents responded saying 'no', 'n/a', 'none' or 'no impact'

- Do not live near the alleyway
- Protect the area from anti social behaviour
- I don't know the area. I just work for the Council.
- Not much but it does provide a much shorter route from Roslyn Rd to Southey Rd for those who need it. Having said that, maybe very few people actually do need it.
- I do use the alleyway for access relatively frequently, but the impact of it being gated isn't clear
- Already I reroute along Greenfields Road
- No. Police should patrol this area. But it is a dangerous area.
- Leave it open
- Very convenient to get to West Green Road
- Alternative route but convenient short cut
- It is a nice short cut
- Should only be last resort. Not good lighting in alley way
- Walled off would be better
- It would increase journey time for pedestrians to West Green Road
- Can't residents have a key to access the alley.
- Would rather to leave alley open, use it to get to West Green Road. Just need more lighting and to be kept clean.
- Occasionally I would need to take a longer route.
- It would feel safer, and would remove an area where people could hide or be unseen.
- I've hardly used the alleyway for a couple of years now in any case. I used to use it regularly as a cut through to get to West Green Road. There's often needles and broken glass on the pathway and judging by the stench of urine, it's often used as a toilet. In places, it's so narrow there's barely space for 2 people to pass and when you're a woman of a little over 5 ft and the person or persons coming the other way are big young men with hoods up believe me it's hard not to feel scared. Pretty much the only people I see using it these days are those who are just looking for a quick way to get out of sight.
- It would mean that I would have to walk two streets around to get to my usual walkway
- I will feel fenced, no gates, leave spaces open to residents
- None it would benefit
- It would restrict my access. I would not like this. I live a few streets away.
- Not any as I do not use it
- This alley should have been closed a long time ago. I know of many incidents which have affected my family and friends over many years.
- I do use seven sisters station; this would make journeys to and from it longer if I were visiting, as an example, the east end of Roslyn Road
- It'd inconvenience pedestrians.
- Little
- I wouldn't have to occasionally hold my breath walking past...
- (If it's locked, can immediately nearby residents have keys?)
- It would mean travelling in the opposite direction to reach the retail facilities on West Green Road

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

---

- We are very far from that place so can't make any comment or statement
- MY DAUGHTER AND I USE IT, WOULD CAUSE DELAYS, WALK AROUND THE LONG WAY. I HAVE SEEN MEN IN THERE DRINKING, SMOKING
- NONE, APART FROM MAKING THE AREA SAFER
- NONE DON'T LIVE NEAR THE ALLEYWAY OR USING IT
- Inconvenient might have to try others
- No impact whatsoever, I never use it
- If the alleyway were gated it is important that it is still cleared regularly to prevent build up of rubbish
- I would have to take a different route
- It's on my morning route, but I'll just have to run a bit further. I run up the alleyway to avoid having to go out to Seven Sisters Road and run past all the groups of men hanging around in Wickes
- A lot could open back gate more instead of treading in human poop
- Hopefully there'll be less fly tipping & loitering
- I live in Southey Road - It would mean longer walk to (and especially from) many shops.
- Walking home from, in particular Tesco and Sainsbury when laden with shopping would be inconvenient & I am not aware that there is all that much anti-social behaviour in the alleyway (not during daylight hours at least)
- Walking a longer distance than usual. It is a cut-through that saves walking. This proposal will affect the residents, more than the loitering
- It doesn't affect me as I don't use the alleyway day or night as not safe to do so. Also if you are going to install a gate that's lockable it might be a waste of time as people who go through the gate don't close it so they will get in that way
- Would add extra time to my journey to the supermarket
- No impact, but sometimes I use it to take a short cut
- one would have to walk all the way round on seven sisters road to get to West Green Road
- Impact on footpath as it is a short cut to do shopping
- getting to the PO & Doctors quickly on foot
- None. We do not use the alleyway. If restricted, resident should have access key
- DO NOT KNOW
- We'd be very happy because there is so much problems from these people always going to the toilet. selling drugs and fighting. I am scared to go down there. it is dangerous
- I will be safe from fear, I will have peace of mind and help us from noise which always wakes me up at night. Will protect gangs from enter our area
- I would have to use the high road or the bus
- I would need to walk further but agree that the path should be closed
- It's a long way to Tesco!! "Lockable gate" yes !! but is there a key!
- An extra couple of minutes walk around but to be hones I do that anyway because I don't want to face a group of men!
- None as I can walk up Elizabeth Road then onto Southey Road or Culvert Road, Russell Road the Southey Road
- Would we have keys for access?
- Lives nearby to alleyway. It would improve my safety and freedom of movement, also my peace of mind
- LIMITED IMPACT
- It would mean going in the opposite direction to where I wanted to go - making it less easy to access retail facilities on West Green Road

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

---

- None it will make life better
- no much
- Very little
- Sometimes use it as a short cut in the day time
- it would mean it would take me longer to get to West Green Road
- It would make my property more secure, as well as removing the problem of rubbish being dumped there and people gathering there late at night
- None at all

### Q6. If you have any general comments around the proposals please tell us

- Please close alleyway behind 152 to 16 Victoria crescent also
- I have a general comment about the notion of a 'group of two or more' being obstructive or intimidating. Two people are not a group; they are just two people e.g. me and my son or me and my partner. Would we be split up if we were hanging around the proposed restricted area? Not only does this seem a bit over the top but it would be very hard to enforce. I don't live in the area but I think this is a point of general principle.
- Really good ideas to prevent existing anti-social behaviour.
- The Council needs additional powers to tackle the level and type of anti social behaviour in the area.
- I am a woman and I avoid walking past Wickes- I choose to go to the Tottenham Hale Retail Park which is further away from me for hardware supplies. It is intimidating walking past and being cat called, especially if you walk into the car park of the store. I also find that if they are moved on, many other members of the group regularly move towards other streets such as Earlsmead Road where they continue to drink and urinate in resident's gardens or along the wall of the brick building by the Earlsmead Road entrance to Seven Sisters tube station. I have also seen them congregate and urinate in the public park, opposite the nursing home on Rangemoor Road- and where children from Earlsmead Primary School use the basketball courts. There has also been a spike in anti-social behaviour along Wakefield Road and Pembroke Road with young men racing or revving their motorbikes at all hours, kicked in fences, and graffiti. I welcome any measures to tackle anti social behaviour in the Seven Sisters area.
- The people who stand around on the street are very intimidating. I leave the house at 7am and they are standing there staring and making comments. It's awful and very scary. They need to be moved along, the place looks messy. The litter and urinate in my garden and I have witness someone doing a poo. It's disgusting
- likelihood is that the groups causing the issue surrounding Wickes will just move location to an area not covered by the proposal and the cycle will start again
- Large groups of men gather for the chance of work, they are in such numbers you have to walk into the street or vehicle entrance/exit for Wickes. Female colleagues do suggest they find the leering of groups of men quite intimidating but don't see it as something they would report,

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

---

- I agree with it because a lot of people try and come into the cafe and steal things. Recently someone came in and stole a phone from a customer. By Paddy POWER THERE are lots of trouble and empty beer cans and bottles
- This is a problem at all the wicks. Corners about how the police use this order. They may use it to move on law abiding people
- There is a lot of problems with drunk men some come from the bookies and cause problems. They try and steal from the shop. You try and stop them and they want to fight with you.
- There is a lot of problems with drunk men some come from the bookies and cause problems. They try and steal from the shop. You try and stop them and they want to fight with you.
- I totally agree. I feel very uncomfortable when I walk past Wickes.
- No impact for me so no objection.
- It would be great to be able to walk along Seven Sisters to the station without having to feel like you are being looked at. Also the amount that sit on the wall by Elizabeth Road. Some times are worse. Makes you want bad weather as less people.
- No
- I think restriction or gating the alleyway may result in inconveniences to may legitimate users who access through for good reasons. Right of way may no longer be a right way if it is restricted or a gate installed.
- I have lived in the area for nearly 5 years. I walk past Wickes on the way to the tube station every day. I was initially surprised by the men who wait for casual labour outside Wickes, but in that time I have never felt threatened or unsafe as a result. I think that this order tackles two separate issues indiscriminately. I do feel that the alley is sometimes used for drug dealing and other illegal activity. But since that is already illegal I feel like police should already have the powers to deal with this. I think the issue around Wickes is separate, and is about supply and demand. If there were no demand round there, it seems casual labourers wouldn't congregate. It's not clear from the information supplied why tackling supply is the answer to this issue.
- I can't see how a lockable gate would be the answer as people with keys may be tempted to leave the gate open. I do not know the alleyway, but in my experience designing out ASB is the most effective way of tackling problems so I can see how the gate is a good idea, and in this instance some council funding to make the Alley Way look bright, colourful, clean & tidy, maybe with some plants dotted about & better lighting could go a long way in tackling the problems
- Antisocial behaviour is in part due to the presence of Wickes. There should be an onus on the store to tackle the problem of on-street urination through provision of in-store toilet facilities by this business. In addition, the council should ensure that the public toilets on Tottenham High Road, adjacent to Apex House should be replaced in any proposed redevelopment of that site, to ensure some public toilet facilities exist in the area.
- Please restrict the use of mopeds and cycles on the pavement and pathways

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

---

- I have to pass the men outside Wickes every single morning; they leer at me and whistle. It is very disrespectful.
- RESPONDENT IS POLISH LABOURER WORKING IN PROPERTY ON THE ESTATE
- Gets hassled when on her walking passed Wickes feels vulnerable
  
- I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW THE REGENERATION WILL AFFECT THEM FINDING JOBS
- Don't want to use alternative route
- Gating alley way will mean journey will take longer from SOUTHEY road
- Alley needs more lighting and to be kept clean
  
- Please gate this alley as it's a dumping ground for rubbish and other mess, it is dark and creepy and the area would feel a lot safer without this.
  
- I know this is a problem that both the council and the police have tried to tackle for a few years and I'm very much hoping that something more can be done. Every single morning I have to walk through the hoards of men hanging around Elizabeth Road. Some of them aren't so bad, but some are not so good. Some will purposely stand in your way; some will spit at your feet as you go by. Years ago they weren't such a rough lot and I used to think that at least they were making an effort to get work. Now as some of them are already drinking at 8 in the morning, I'm guessing work isn't the reason they're there. I hate that walk from Elizabeth Road to the station. I hate it 5 days a week, 52 weeks a year. I can always tell if the police have turned up near the station to question these men because as I leave home loads of them are running down Elizabeth Road, straight down the alleyway in Southey Road. They know once they get to the end they can disperse in about 5 directions.
  
- It would be useful if the gated was accessible by people in the neighbourhood, but I do not know how possible this is.
  
- Proper jobs and health professionals to help alcoholic to come out of their addiction
- I do not agree with these proposals and will be opposing them throughout the process.
  
- We don't want gated alleyways and we don't want laws targeted against particular minorities, criminalising non-criminal activities. Standing around looking for work is not a crime and should not be made so. This law looks racist. Likely enough, these people had few opportunities in their home countries and are now trying to gain some meaningful, paid employment here. So what? People want their homes done up cheaply, this is the free market in action. If there is some exploitative racket behind this, then tackle that, not the victims. If you don't want people urinating in the streets, put up some public toilets. I appreciate the services the council provide but please don't make a mountain out of a molehill. It looks untidy - cities are untidy and that is the joy of them - don't criminalise untidiness. It's false morality, penalising jobless people for not looking 'civilised'. p.s. in your ethnic monitoring form you put 'gypsy/Roma' under 'white other'. Eastern European Roma would certainly not describe themselves as white. Perhaps British Roma would.
  
- This is severely restricting people use of these public spaces, possibly leading to criminalisation.
- Criminalisation is unhelpful and unlikely to work. Engage with those guys and incentivise the developers who are receiving so much public money as it is to employ these guys on their sites.

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

---

- This Company owns Seven Sisters Market Hall at 231- 243 High Road, Tottenham N15 5BT. We also control the service road off Suffield Road which serves the rear of the building and adjacent retail premises. We welcome the introduction of powers to prevent anti-social behaviour in this area as we suffer from same in the service road so are constantly forced to take management action to deter same. The service road is private property and the Traders in the Market Hall are harassed by persons loitering to seek casual labour, the consumption of alcohol in public, overnight sleeping in cars, occasional drug-dealing and fouling by drug-users and persons urinating in the roadway. We are stepping-up measures to control this and have evicted illegal squatters and persons running unauthorised vehicle repair businesses in the service road and removed large amounts of refuse. We have introduced overnight gate security and will soon install CCTV coverage of the area. Contrary to the suggestion of a local complainant (who we understand lives on Suffield Road) these problems are NOT caused by Traders from the Market who are very keen to see them resolved. We have served banning notices on several individuals who frequented the Market and will soon be reintroducing a properly-policed Pay & Display car park and overnight security patrols. We remain concerned that displacing antisocial activity from Wickes car park etc will transfer it to our site and that public consumption of alcohol is encouraged by large off-licences on West Green Road and Seven Sisters Road. We continue to co-ordinate with the Met Police Safer Neighbourhoods Team and would welcome the service road being included within the area covered by a legislation.
- Well done - about time too - and thank you!
- Please implement this ASAP to move the people on. The recent parking consultation in the area should also help with this problem if the St Ann's CPZ is increased.
- Do you know that there are now groups of men hanging around outside Screwfix on Rangemoor Road (i.e. other side of the High Rd from 7Sis Rd, across Page Green)? Not many yet, but if Wickes is out of bounds it will shift to there. And then they will be pissing in my garden instead. I understand that B&Q in Tottnm Hale is closing so that won't be a new pick-up location. This is going to need lots and lots of very visible enforcement. The High Road has been a no-alcohol area for years now but I have never seen that being enforced. If it succeeds it will displace this lump-labour collection point away from this area, I am intrigued to know where it will pop up instead. Going for the employers is the only way to 'cure' it. Minimum wage enforcement would be a start. As your report says that attempts to follow the vans have not worked, you need to infiltrate the men, there's no mention of attempts to do this in your reports. As they are rumoured to work for £30 a day, a bit more than that could bring in useful information.
- See above. I think it is a massively overblown issue which could be mitigated better by the provision of public toilets and (if you are worried about drugs and alcohol) attention to addiction services in the borough instead of this appalling idea of sweeping people off the streets because you don't like what they look like, smell like or sound like.
- Closure of the Footpath would result in a longer trip to the shops & render it pretty difficult when carrying heavy shopping etc.
- If you're going to prohibit people for soliciting for labour from vehicles, why not extend this to soliciting for sex. I have been kerb crawled on Roslyn Road and it was very unpleasant.

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

---

- The proposal given makes neighbourhood safe and better and to make this area better living place is a good idea. because we are struggling with such kind of behaviour and activity around out business
- Trades people picking up casual workers should be held accountable too. No tax on wages, no checks workers eligible to work etc.
- DON'T BE IT
- I am in support of this proposal. I have visited Wickes for DIY materials on a number of occasions and it is not a pleasant experience. Lots of men hanging around, approaching you when you get out of your car. This has been a problem for years and really does need to be tackled. I know, a number of things have been tried already but they have had very little impact. I hope that this proposal is put in place and it has the desired effect.
- I WOULD LIKE PEOPLE TO STOP COMING ONTO THE ESTATE (STONEBRIDGE) AND DRINKING AND CAUSING ASB
- IT IS A GOOD IDEA. IT IS GOOD FOR THE LOCAL AREA. I HAVE GONE PAST AND HAVE SEEN THEM AND THEY ARE INTIMIDATING
- IT WILL BE GOOD FOR COMMUNITY
- In the vicinity of the business, sit in the paved area drinking smoking & urinating at any time of the day. This is very unpleasant as the smell is very bad. people blocking the pavement as they stand around in large groups
- I think it is a very good idea. I use Wickes from time to time and I see the men standing around. I was there last Sunday and we were scared to leave the car. There is also a problem near the paved area of men drinking smoking weed and pissing there it is disgusting. There should be more public toilets
- My observation is drug dealing near these shops once Sainsburys close up
- I think the best thing is to put CCTV in the area for evidence. The atmosphere is not good here especially the park area. Since Paddy Power has been there it has changed the area the types of people who go there deal drugs. You don't want to go in there. It was a bad decision by the Council to put that park area there (West Green Road Pocket park). It does not improve the area.
- The paved area near the shops was very bad idea. "The creeps come out at night". The drinking and the littering is unacceptable. It is intimidating for a woman walking through that area at night. We objected to Paddy Power coming into West Green Road, but now they are here they should do something about what goes on in there. We have seen their customers weeing in the park area.
- TRY TO GIVE A GOOD SOLUTION TO US
- I'm not sure what's been happening in front of Wickes Store, but it's usually people willing to do cheap labour there. Let them.
- NOTHING
- I'd suggest to build more public toilets
- Please see accompanying letter dated 21.3.2016 to Eubert Malcolm supporting the proposal and suggesting restrictions on off-sales of alcohol and further patrols by Met police to service yard at rear Seven Sisters Market Team, 231-243 High Road N15 5BT. Letter from Seven Sisters Market Hall - referred to above held by Joan Appavoo -ASBAT.

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

---

Keys points: We welcome the introduction of powers to prevent anti-social behaviour in the proposed area as we suffer from the same in our service yard road. We are constantly forced to take management action to deter same on this private property and Traders in the Market Hall are harassed by persons loitering to seek casual labour, the consumption of alcohol in public, over night sleeping in cars, occasional drug-dealing and fouling by drug users and persons urinating in the roadway. We have served banning notices on several individuals who frequented the Market and will soon be reintroducing a properly-policed Pay & Display car park and overnight security patrols. We are however concerned that displacing anti-social activity from Wickes car park etc will transfer it to our site and that the public consumption of alcohol on the service road and Suffield Road is encouraged by off-licences on West Green Road and Seven Sisters Road. We suggest restricting such uses would go a long way to resolving that problem. We would welcome the service road being included within the area covered by such legislation

- This should have been done a long time, although we have had dispersal order in the past, but that was a waste of time
- Special attention must be made to Victoria Crescent, Kerswell Close and Culvert Road stairwells and bin areas. Drug dealing and using is extremely high in these areas especially during spring to summer daily
- Please deal with the problem when moving people on
- People will move more towards Victoria Crescent and Kerswell Close. How will the problem go away. it will move elsewhere
- Who are the people that employ these gangs of men? They should be punished too. I feel very sorry for the people who live like in the houses where the gangs loiter
- I don't believe this to be an appropriate consultation and fear that the residents views do not really matter - wasted exercise. The council have failed to put pressure on the police to do their job and provide an appropriate service. The police are too busy abusing their powers, wasting public money and failing to deliver a service to our area that is effective. The police ruined our area.
- This should have been done years ago !
- Please make this happen. We dont not feel safe having the alley behind our garden and also smells of urine. In general, I have to walk on the road to pass the groups of men at Wickes and the end of Greenfield Road. My female friends are scared of them.
- it would be nice for members of the community to be able to walk down the road without being harassed by those people
- Could access to the alleyway be given to residents who wanted it either through paying a fee to obtain a key for access or some other option that could be provided to residents?
- I'll be happy if these work at as soon as possible. It's a nuisance with these people. messing up the community, need addressing urgently
- I think it is a very good idea all this project, cause I've been victim of all those men standing in front of Wickes, they are in the way all the time, stalking me and other women and even once, one of them started to tell me things very close to me and

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

---

followed me a few steps on my way, he looked drunk. I can't go to work and come back home in peace of mind with all those men (big groups) in front of my house (flat)

- If used an alternative route it'll increase the amount taken to walk
- This problem will be passed onto another area Prostitution at the end of Elizabeth Road N15 & Drug dealing in my front garden - Southey Road, have gone (hopefully) - which does make me feel safer Please prosecute gang leaders & those picking up men for work at Wickes. these men are upholding the problem Please work with community groups, mental health/alcohol services - some of the men at Wickes are very unwell, Repatriation?/Detox Services
- The proposals are fine far as stopping any public nuisance but will not address the main cause/issue, which is people wanting/looking for work. If the Council could provide some formal platform for people to provide & access short term (or long term) labour this may well help the situation & save all the problems these orders are designed to address
- Hugely improve our quality of life. We live next to the alleyway and regularly witness the following:- drug dealing, human excrement, fights, motorbike & bikes speeding down, sexual activity, alcohol consumption - loitering in the entrance of the alleyway, sitting on our wall drinking, urinating, constant rubbish in our garden, we were burgled & the burglars accessed our property from the alleyway unseen flytipping, vile smell, especially in the summer, broken glass, poo & wee pose a health hazard to my 2 years old son and baby daughter I feel threatened by the presence of groups of men drinking at the entrance to my house
- It is not quite clear to me what problem is being 'solved' here. Do people feel menaced? or object to casual labour? I think there might be better, more positive solutions available, e.g. if public urination is an issue, is this order going to change anything? would a public toilet be better? okay, not necessarily a practical/affordable solution, but a better one in theory. Yes?
- Please see previous page, to include spitting & dumping, littering! Littering is another anti-social behaviour surrounding these loitering people. Where are the fines? Where are the enforcement officers pulling people up on this unacceptable behaviour
- I would find an alternative route
- If Stonebridge Road is not included it will suffer increased anti-social behaviour
- Please close this alley
- There is too much noise in our area such loud music throughout till late at night, riding motor-cycle with very loud engine, shouting, throwing cans of beer in front of the doors. this is Stonebridge Road area which needs to be taken into account
- Stonebridge estate where the basket ball court is used as football court. There are always groups gather at the alleyway. As a tenant I am very worried
- I live in Ashmount Road. We have people trying to get into our building at night. I found a man sleeping in side my building at 7am. I woke him up and asked him to leave

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

---

- I would like to see cameras installed on Ashmount Road n/r Seven Sisters Station
- Please, do go ahead with this proposal. It's a shame not to do anything about these problems, Tottenham residents deserve better. Thank you!#
- Please put a stop to men urinating and messing in the alleys at the bottom of Russell Road leading through to Elizabeth Road. It is disgusting & smelly and children come through on the way to school not nice at all drink cans and food waste gets thrown everywhere.
- I have no issues thus far. Since the West Green pub has been closed. The anti-social behaviour and noise has reduced greatly. (I live in Brunswick Road)
- I have friends & family live in those areas whom I visit sometimes, but because of what's going on especially on evenings I don't anymore.
- PS. A gating of the footpath between Elizabeth Road and Culvert Road would be much appreciated (ps back of 607, 609, 66, 613, 615, 617 etc)
- When police the police
- It would be much longer and more difficult to carry heavy shopping
- I don't use the alleyway
- yes, the alleyway between Elizabeth Road and the fence is used for the purposes of offering prostitution , selling things on the bike and using as toilet and poos, urinate, and old mattresses all over this alleyway, the most popular hidden place to be so anti-social.
- If the proposals kept the park cleaner and safer then I would agree. Otherwise the men hanging outside Wickes looking for work don't really bother me. I would like to take this opportunity to ask the council to do something about the park. I fear taking my niece or dog there, as there is so much rubbish, broken glass, chicken bones and sometimes needles
- I have lived the area for over twenty years, and these consultation have be never ending! Plus who are picking up the cost !!! How long will it take Haringey Council for a final decision make!
- I recently found people drinking alcohol in the locked stairwell of the building. They were jamming the doors so they wouldn't lock when slammed, in order to gain access. I am concerned that more of this will happen if my road is not included in the PSPO boundary. Stonebridge Road n15 5PF
- I think it would be helpful to install CCTV to cover the area on Elizabeth Road just along from the café before the houses. This spot is frequently used both for fly tipping and by men urinating (in daylight as well as at night) - it is very unpleasant to have to walk past this and a visible camera should be some deterrent.
- I am very much in favour of the proposal and think it should be implemented as soon as possible

## Appendix 4 - PSPO Consultation Report

---

- Why was Stonebridge excluded from the proposals? If you don't include Stonebridge Road in the boundary, the individuals that are currently doing this anti-social behaviour will spill over into Stonebridge and it already has loads of anti-social behaviour that is spiralling out of control. This has been reported to no avail. Police should have records of this for you to check
- THIS IS NEEDED