



## Canterbury City Public Space Protection Order Consultation responses

### 1. Introduction

Consultation on Canterbury City Council's (CCC) plans to create a new Canterbury City Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) took place between Monday 17 July 2023 and Monday 11 September 2023.

PSPOs help to stop nuisance behaviour that affects the quality of life of other people.

They can be used to protect the public from behaviour which is persistent and unreasonable and is having, or is likely to have, a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the area.

In 2020, CCC introduced a PSPO to help council officers and the police deal with anti-social behaviour in the city.

The current PSPO is due to expire in November 2023.

This consultation sought views on the activities within the proposed PSPO, these included:

- someone drinking in public areas causing alarm harassment or distress
- shouting, swearing or causing other alarm, distress or harassment to others - whether in the area or living nearby
- begging
- urinating or defecating in any public place
- graffitiing, fly posting and affixing notices, pictures or signs to property without the owner's permission
- refusing to stop busking, or other street entertainment, when asked to by an authorised officer
- climbing onto, or jumping from any building or structure owned, managed by or on behalf of the council
- trading as a pedlar (and remaining in any location for more than 10 minutes, locating themselves within 50 metres of their previous location and obstructing the highway or a shop entrance)
- the anti-social behaviour of delivery riders.

These activities replicate the existing Order with the addition of addressing the behaviour of anti-social delivery riders in Canterbury city centre which, at certain times of the day, is dedicated to pedestrians.

In addition, we have expanded the description of what is meant by begging to reduce impact on the community.

Respondents were encouraged to comment on the specific activities listed in the PSPO. For each activity they were asked to do this by:

- outlining whether they had witnessed the activity
- how often they had witnessed the activity
- what time of day they had witnessed the activity
- whether this was a first-hand or anecdotal sighting of the activity.

Respondents were also asked to what extent each activity had a detrimental impact on their quality of life as well as for general comments in relation to the proposed PSPO.

A total of 110 responses were received.

## 2. Executive summary

The main findings from the consultation are:

- Over 80% of respondents feel that anti-social behaviour is a problem in Canterbury city centre.
- The activities witnessed by the highest number of people are **begging**, the **anti-social behaviour of delivery riders**, and **shouting, swearing or causing other alarm, distress or harassment to others**, with over 70% of respondents having seen these activities take place first-hand.
- The activities witnessed by the lowest number of people are **refusing to stop busking when asked to by an authorised officer**, **trading as a pedlar**, and **climbing onto, or jumping from any building or structure owned, managed by or on behalf of the council**, with less than 20% of respondents having seen these activities take place.
- The main locations cited for the prevalence of all activities in the proposed PSPO included Canterbury High Street, Westgate, Whitefriars, and general comments about the city centre as a whole.
- The activities which respondents feel have a detrimental effect on their quality of life are the **anti-social behaviour of delivery riders, shouting, swearing or causing other alarm, distress or harassment to others, drinking in public areas**, and **begging**, with over 60% of respondents feeling this way.
- The activities which respondents feel have far less of an impact on their quality of life are **trading as a pedlar, refusing to stop busking when asked to by a authorised officer**, and **climbing onto, or jumping from any building or structure owned, managed by or on behalf of the council**, with less than 20% of respondents feeling this way.
- Concerns for safety and the cleanliness of the city centre were cited as the main reasons why people feel certain activities have a detrimental effect on them.
- Although the level of disagreement with the activities included within the PSPO as a whole was very low, of the 15 people who disagreed, 7 expressed disagreement with including **begging** in the Order.
- A number of other comments were received regarding the PSPO proposal more generally. The most frequent of these highlighted that enforcement needs improving.

### 3. Consultation methodology

Consultation took place between Monday 17 July 2023 and Monday 11 September 2023. The following methods were used to seek views:

- an online questionnaire, which received **103** responses
- a paper version of the questionnaire, **one** of which was returned
- written representations were also welcomed and **six** were received.

The consultation was promoted in the following ways:

- an article on the council's newsroom site
- posts on the council's social media channels
- an in-person meeting where council officers were present to answer questions and take suggestions from the public.

Additionally, the following stakeholders were emailed directly to encourage them to respond to the consultation:

- Parish councils
- CCC councillors
- Residents' associations
- Local 'Friends of' groups
- Canterbury Coastal Clinical Commissioning Group
- East Kent Hospitals University NHS Foundation Trust
- Environment Agency
- Kent and Medway CCG (engagement team)
- Kent County Council (KCC), Head of Paid Service
- KCC, Community Wardens
- Kent Fire and Rescue Service
- Kent Police
- Police and Crime Commissioner
- South East Coastal Ambulance Service
- South East Local Enterprise Partnership
- Canterbury 4 Business
- Canterbury Connected Business Improvement District
- Visit Kent
- Canterbury Housing Advice Centre
- Citizens Advice Bureau
- Forward Trust
- Kent Savers Credit Union
- Northgate Ward Community Centre
- Plastic Free Canterbury
- Rising Sun Domestic Abuse
- Thanington Neighbourhood Resource Centre
- Canenco
- Canterbury Cathedral
- Canterbury Festival
- Kent Cultural Transformation Board
- Canterbury Society
- Civic organisations - impact for Lord Mayor
- District Councillors
- Kent Association of Local Councils (KALC)
- KCC, Councillors
- KCC, Arts and Regeneration
- KCC, Social Services
- KCC, 18+
- Local Democracy Forum (Canterbury)
- MPs
- Blean Initiative
- Canterbury Climate Action Partnership (CCAP)
- Kent and Medway Biological Record Centre
- Kentish Stour Countryside Partnership
- Natural England

- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)
- St Dunstan's Horticultural Society
- Woodland Trust
- Age UK Canterbury
- Canterbury Inter-Faith Association (CANDIFA)
- Disability Advisory Panel (DAP)
- Ethnic Minority Independent Council (EMIC)
- HiKent
- Nigerian Community Association
- Polish Educational Club in Kent (PECK)
- Karibu Community Action Kent
- Kwan Ngei Chinese Association
- Canterbury and District Jewish Community
- Canterbury Muslim Cultural Centre
- Porchlight
- Canterbury Christ Church University
- Canterbury College
- Students Unions
- University for the Creative Arts at Canterbury
- Catching Lives
- Community Safety Partnership
- East Kent Spatial Development Company
- Unison
- British Transport Police
- Deliveroo
- Uber Eats
- Whitefriars
- Just Eat

## 4. Findings

### 4.1. Questionnaire responses

A total of 104 completed questionnaires were submitted, 103 of which were online and one was a paper copy.

#### 4.1.1. Respondent profile

Over 80% of respondents are residents of the Canterbury district.

A resident of the Canterbury district	85.6% (89)
A visitor to the Canterbury district	1.0% (1)
A worker in the Canterbury district	5.8% (6)
A business, organisation or community group	7.7% (8)
A city, county, parish or town councillor	N/A
An MP	N/A
Other	N/A

*NB: The eight responses listed as 'A business, organisation or community group' were received from Alliance of Canterbury Residents Associations (ACRA), Finn's, Revivals, Boots, Canterbury Business Improvement District, Fenwick, Happy & Glorious, and McDonald's.*

The majority of people responding are aged between 55 and 74.

Under 18	N/A
18 to 25	3.8% (4)
26 to 34	6.7% (7)
35 to 44	14.4% (15)
45 to 54	17.3% (18)
55 to 64	18.3% (19)
65 to 74	22.1% (23)
75 to 84	8.7% (9)
85 and above	N/A

*NB: 9 respondents did not give their age*

More females responded than males.

Male	35.6% (37)
Female	51.0% (53)
Prefer to self-describe	1.9% (2)

*NB: 12 respondents did not give their gender*

#### 4.1.2. Anti-social behaviour

Respondents were asked whether they thought that anti-social behaviour was a problem in Canterbury city centre.

An overwhelming majority of people feel that anti-social behaviour is a problem in Canterbury city centre.

Yes	86.5% (90)
No	6.7% (7)
Don't know	6.7% (7)



#### 4.1.3. Someone drinking in public areas causing alarm harassment or distress

Approximately two thirds of respondents have witnessed someone drinking in a public area.

The most common place that this has been witnessed is Canterbury High Street, although Westgate, Burgate, and Whitefriars were also among the highest witnessed locations for this activity.

The frequency of this activity was split somewhat, however a third of respondents stated that they have witnessed someone drinking in a public place more times than they can count.

The majority of respondents cited witnessing this activity in the afternoon and all those that stated they have witnessed this activity, witnessed this first-hand.

Cumulatively, half of the respondents feel that this activity had a detrimental effect on the quality of their life to an extent.

The reasons for this are rooted in the nature of the behaviour being aggressive, intimidating and impacting on people's level of safety.

<b>Whether people have witnessed this</b>	
Yes	65.4% (68)
No	29.8% (31)
Don't know	4.8% (5)

Areas witnessed:

- High Street: 22 comments
- Westgate: 10 comments
- Burgate: 8 comments
- Whitefriars: 7 comments
- St Georges: 6 comments
- St Dunstan's: 5 comments
- Dane John: 4 comments
- Bus Station: 3 comments
- City Centre: 3 comments
- Castle Street: 2 comments
- Bigglestons Link: 1 comments
- Northgate: 1 comment
- Wincheap: 1 comment

<b>How often people have witnessed this</b>	
More times than I can count	30.9% (21)

10+ times	23.5% (16)
Five to nine times	17.6% (12)
Two to four times	23.5% (16)
Once	4.4% (3)

<b>What time people have witnessed this</b>	
Morning	14.7% (10)
Afternoon	52.9% (36)
Night time	17.6% (12)
Other, please specify (for example: weekends, school holidays) below <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Anytime of day x4</i></li> <li>• <i>Afternoon and night x2</i></li> <li>• <i>Weekends and holidays x1</i></li> </ul>	14.7% (10)

<b>Who witnessed this</b>	
Me, this is a first-hand recollection	100.0% (68)
Someone else, this is hearsay/anecdotal	N/A

<b>The extent to which this has a detrimental effect on people's quality of life</b>	
A great deal	23.1% (24)
A fair amount	37.5% (39)
Not very much	29.8% (31)
Not at all	9.6% (10)

Respondents were asked why this activity has a detrimental effect on their quality of life and the following comments were received:

- Aggressive behaviour: 20 comments
- Don't feel safe: 15 comments
- Feel intimidated: 8 comments
- Nervous about walking home alone: 5 comments
- Detracts character of the city: 4 comments
- They leave a mess: 3 comments
- Fear of being knocked over: 2 comments
- Causes distress to family members: 2 comments
- Disturbed nights sleep: 1 comment

- Car getting damaged: 1 comment
- Avoid certain areas due to behaviour: 1 comment

#### 4.1.4. Shouting, swearing or causing other alarm, distress or harassment to others - whether in the area or living nearby

Nearly three quarters of respondents have witnessed shouting, swearing or causing other alarm, distress or harassment to others.

The most common place that this has been witnessed is Canterbury High Street, although Whitefriars and Westgate Gardens were also highlighted as locations where this activity has been witnessed the most.

Most respondents said that they have witnessed shouting, swearing or causing other alarm, distress or harassment more times than they can count.

Respondents witnessed this activity at different times of the day but mainly in the afternoon or evening. All respondents have witnessed it first-hand.

Overall, most respondents feel that this activity has a detrimental effect on the quality of their life to an extent.

A quarter of respondents said that this activity does not have much of a detrimental impact on them.

Safety concerns were a common reason for this impact, with others stating that they find this behaviour distressing and unpleasant (for children too).

Whether people have witnessed this	
Yes	72.1% (75)
No	23.1% (24)
Don't know	4.8% (5)

Areas witnessed:

- High Street: 23 comments
- Whitefriars: 11 comments
- Westgate Gardens: 8 comments
- City Centre: 7 comments
- St George's: 5 comments
- Burgate: 5 comments
- Castle Street: 4 comments
- Northgate: 3 comments
- St Dunstan's: 2 comments
- Wincheap: 1 comment
- Canterbury West Station: 1 comment
- Linden Grove: 1 comment
- St Radigund's Street: 1 comment

<b>How often people have witnessed this</b>	
More times than I can count	34.7% (26)
10+ times	17.3% (13)
Five to nine times	25.3% (19)
Two to four times	20.0% (15)
Once	2.7% (2)

<b>What time people have witnessed this</b>	
Morning	8.0% (6)
Afternoon	45.3% (34)
Night time	30.7% (23)
Other, please specify (for example: weekends, school holidays) below <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>All day x11</i></li> <li>• <i>Just during the daytime x1</i></li> </ul>	16.0% (12)

<b>Who witnessed this</b>	
Me, this is a first-hand recollection	100% (75)
Someone else, this is hearsay/anecdotal	N/A

<b>The extent to which this has a detrimental effect on people's quality of life</b>	
A great deal	37.5% (39)
A fair amount	28.8% (30)
Not very much	24.0% (25)
Not at all	9.6% (10)

Respondents were asked why this activity has a detrimental effect on their quality of life and the following comments were received:

- Don't feel safe in the evenings: 11 comments
- Feels intimidating: 11 comments
- It's distressing: 10 comments
- Aggressive behaviour: 9 comments
- It's unpleasant: 8 comments

- Makes me worried and nervous: 5 comments
- Puts me off visiting the city centre: 4 comments
- Bad environment for children: 3 comments
- Lack of police: 1 comment
- Disturbs sleeps: 1 comment

#### 4.1.5. Begging

Most respondents have witnessed someone begging in Canterbury city centre.

Canterbury High Street was by far the most common place respondents have witnessed the act of begging, with St Dunstan's being cited as the next highest place for this.

Two thirds of respondents stated that they have witnessed someone begging more times than they can count. Only 4 respondents stated that they had seen this activity between one and four times.

Approximately half of respondents see begging take place in the afternoon, however other comments suggest that the activity is witnessed all day.

All those that stated they have witnessed this activity, witnessed this first-hand.

The level of impact this has on respondents was mixed, with a quarter of people stating begging affects their quality of life a great deal.

Cumulatively, approximately 60% of respondents feel that begging has a detrimental effect on the quality of their life to some extent.

Respondents feel that begging is a form of harassment and leaves them feeling unsafe. A high number of comments also highlighted that help should be provided to those begging in the street.

<b>Whether people have witnessed this</b>	
Yes	87.5% (91)
No	10.6% (11)
Don't know	1.9% (2)

Areas witnessed:

- High Street: 43 comments
- City Centre: 18 comments
- St Dunstan's: 11 comments
- Whitefriars: 8 comments
- Westgate Gardens: 7 comments
- St George's: 7 comments
- St Peter's: 4 comments
- Castle Street: 2 comments
- St Stephen's: 1 comment
- Northgate: 1 comment
- Kingsmead: 1 comment

<b>How often people have witnessed this</b>
---

More times than I can count	67.0% (61)
10+ times	16.5% (15)
Five to nine times	12.1% (11)
Two to four times	4.4% (4)
Once	N/A

<b>What time people have witnessed this</b>	
Morning	20.9% (19)
Afternoon	51.6% (47)
Night time	4.4% (4)
Other, please specify (for example: weekends, school holidays) below <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All day x17</li> <li>• At various times, hard to specify x2</li> <li>• Only morning and afternoon x1</li> </ul>	23.1% (21)

<b>Who witnessed this</b>	
Me, this is a first-hand recollection	100% (91)
Someone else, this is hearsay/anecdotal	N/A

<b>The extent to which this has a detrimental effect on people's quality of life</b>	
A great deal	24.0% (25)
A fair amount	36.5% (38)
Not very much	26.9% (28)
Not at all	12.5% (13)

Respondents were asked why this activity has a detrimental effect on their quality of life and the following comments were received:

- Harassment: 12 comments
- Don't feel safe: 9 comments
- Beggars should be given help if needed: 8 comments
- Doesn't give a great impression: 8 comments
- Distressing for everyone: 7 comments
- Intimidating: 6 comments
- Causes anxiety and tension: 4 comments



- Most of them seem to be a scam: 3 comments
- Makes city looked dirty: 1 comment
- Concern they are exploited: 1 comment
- Puts me off visiting: 1 comment
- Upsetting for children: 1 comment

#### 4.1.6. Urinating or defecating in any public place

Over half of respondents have not witnessed someone urinating or defecating in a public place within the city.

Canterbury High Street, Castle Street, and Burgate (among others) were cited as spots where this activity has been seen.

One third of respondents stated that they have witnessed this activity between two and four times, and a quarter of respondents said that they have seen it take place more times than they can count.

The time that people witness the activity is mixed across the board and all sightings have been a first-hand recollection.

Approximately half of respondents said this activity has a minimal effect on their quality of life. This view was split evenly between people saying that it has either very little or no effect on them whatsoever.

That being said, almost a third of respondents feel that this activity does have a large impact on their quality of life because it is unhygienic and shows no respect for the appearance and cleanliness of the area.

<b>Whether people have witnessed this</b>	
Yes	34.6% (36)
No	54.8% (57)
Don't know	10.6% (11)

Areas witnessed:

- High Street: 8 comments
- Castle Street: 5 comments
- Burgate: 4 comments
- Greyfriars Gardens: 2 comments
- Linden Grove: 2 comments
- St Dunstan's: 2 comments
- Dane John: 1 comment
- St George's: 1 comments
- Station car parks: 1 comment
- Toddlers Cove: 1 comment
- St Peter's: 1 comment
- Union Street: 1 comment
- Bus station: 1 comment
- St Radigund's: 1 comment

<b>How often people have witnessed this</b>	
More times than I can count	25.0% (9)
10+ times	11.1% (4)
Five to nine times	13.9% (5)
Two to four times	30.6% (11)
Once	19.4% (7)

<b>What time people have witnessed this</b>	
Morning	16.7% (6)
Afternoon	33.3% (12)
Night time	22.2% (8)
Other, please specify (for example: weekends, school holidays) below <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>All day x6</i></li> <li>• <i>Daytime only x2</i></li> <li>• <i>In the evenings x2</i></li> <li>• <i>Mainly in the morning x1</i></li> </ul>	27.8% (10)

<b>Who witnessed this</b>	
Me, this is a first-hand recollection	100% (36)
Someone else, this is hearsay/anecdotal	N/A

<b>The extent to which this has a detrimental effect on people's quality of life</b>	
A great deal	28.8% (30)
A fair amount	18.3% (19)
Not very much	26.0% (27)
Not at all	26.9% (28)

Respondents were asked why this activity has a detrimental effect on their quality of life and the following comments were received:

- It's disgusting: 17 comments
- Causes bad smells: 10 comments
- Make places look dirty: 6 comments
- Harassment: 4 comments
- Highlights need for more public toilets: 3 comments

- It's a health hazard: 2 comments
- There's no need for it: 1 comment
- Off putting going into city centre: 1 comment
- Links with anti-social behaviour: 1 comment

#### 4.1.7. Graffitiing, fly posting and affixing notices, pictures or signs to property without the owner's permission

Approximately two thirds of respondents said that they have not witnessed graffitiing.

Those that have, cited Canterbury city centre as the main area for this activity taking place.

Over half of all respondents who have seen graffitiing take place said that they have witnessed it more times than they can count.

For these people, most instances have been seen at various times of the day and a quarter of respondents said that they have witnessed it in the evenings as well.

Most people recalled their experience as a first-hand recollection, although some responses are based on anecdotal evidence.

The extent to which this has a detrimental effect on people's quality of life is mixed with a higher proportion of people suggesting that graffitiing does not have a huge impact on them.

However, reasons for why it does have an effect on people were rooted in the activity being offensive and making the area look messy and unattractive to look at.

<b>Whether people have witnessed this</b>	
Yes	24.0% (25)
No	61.5% (64)
Don't know	14.4% (15)

Areas witnessed:

- City Centre: 6 comments
- High Street: 3 comments
- St Dunstan's: 2 comments
- Lansdown Rd: 1 comment
- St Peter's St: 1 comment
- Castle St: 1 comment
- Dane John: 1 comment
- Greyfriars Gardens: 1 comment
- Station car parks: 1 comment
- Whitehall Bridge: 1 comment
- St Radigund's: 1 comment
- Whitefriars: 1 comment

<b>How often people have witnessed this</b>	
More times than I can count	52.0% (13)

10+ times	16.0% (4)
Five to nine times	8.0% (2)
Two to four times	20.0% (5)
Once	4.0% (1)

<b>What time people have witnessed this</b>	
Morning	16.0% (4)
Afternoon	16.0% (4)
Night time	24.0% (6)
Other, please specify (for example: weekends, school holidays) below <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>All times x7</i></li> <li>• <i>Unknown x3</i></li> </ul>	44.0% (11)

<b>Who witnessed this</b>	
Me, this is a first-hand recollection	92.0% (23)
Someone else, this is hearsay/anecdotal	8.0% (2)

<b>The extent to which this has a detrimental effect on people's quality of life</b>	
A great deal	18.3% (19)
A fair amount	19.2% (20)
Not very much	31.7% (33)
Not at all	30.8% (32)

Respondents were asked why this activity has a detrimental effect on their quality of life and the following comments were received:

- Makes the area look messy: 12 comments
- It's offensive: 5 comments
- It's a form of criminal damage: 4 comments
- A lot of time and resources spent cleaning: 3 comments
- It's unacceptable: 1 comment
- No care for the environment: 1 comment
- Damage to personal property: 1 comment

#### 4.1.8. Refusing to stop busking, or other street entertainment, when asked to by an authorised officer

Approximately 80% of respondents stated that they have not witnessed someone refusing to stop busking by an authorised officer and for the few that had, Canterbury city centre and the High Street were cited as areas where this has been seen taking place.

Over the past 12 months, most respondents have seen this occur in the afternoon, between two and four times.

Those who have witnessed someone refusing to stop busking state that it has little effect on their quality of life, and for respondents who are affected by the act, they find it offensive.

Whether people have witnessed this	
Yes	2.9% (3)
No	80.8% (84)
Don't know	16.3% (17)

Areas witnessed:

- City Centre: 1 comment
- High Street: 1 comment

How often people have witnessed this	
More times than I can count	N/A
10+ times	33.3% (1)
Five to nine times	N/A
Two to four times	66.7% (2)
Once	N/A

What time people have witnessed this	
Morning	N/A
Afternoon	100% (3)
Night time	N/A
Other, please specify (for example: weekends, school holidays) below	N/A

<b>Who witnessed this</b>	
Me, this is a first-hand recollection	100% (3)
Someone else, this is hearsay/anecdotal	N/A

<b>The extent to which this has a detrimental effect on people's quality of life</b>	
A great deal	7.7% (8)
A fair amount	8.7% (9)
Not very much	36.5% (38)
Not at all	47.1% (49)

Respondents were asked why this activity has a detrimental effect on their quality of life and the following comments were received:

- It's offensive: 3 comments
- Sounds bad: 2 comments
- Maintain the order: 2 comments
- Unnecessary: 2 comments
- Illegal: 1 comment



#### 4.1.9. Climbing onto, or jumping from any building or structure owned, managed by or on behalf of the council

Approximately 70% of respondents state that they have not witnessed someone climb or jump from any council run building or structure.

The most common place that this has been witnessed is Canterbury High Street, although Castle Street and Toddlers Cover are also among the higher witnessed locations for this activity.

Most respondents have witnessed this occur between two and nine times, primarily in the afternoon or nighttime. All of these sightings are described as first-hand recollections.

Cumulatively, 80% of respondents feel that this activity does not have a detrimental impact on their quality of life. However, some comments suggest that people feel the activity is dangerous, offensive, and intimidating.

<b>Whether people have witnessed this</b>	
Yes	19.2% (20)
No	70.2% (73)
Don't know	10.6% (11)

Areas witnessed:

- High Street: 7 comments
- Castle Street: 3 comments
- Toddlers Cove: 2 comments
- Whitefriars: 2 comments
- St George's: 1 comment
- In parks: 1 comment
- Bus station: 1 comment
- Linden Grove: 1 comment

<b>How often people have witnessed this</b>	
More times than I can count	5.0% (1)
10+ times	5.0% (1)
Five to nine times	35.0% (7)
Two to four times	40.0% (8)
Once	15.0% (3)

<b>What time people have witnessed this</b>
---

Morning	15.0% (3)
Afternoon	50.0% (10)
Night time	25.0% (5)
Other, please specify (for example: weekends, school holidays) below <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Anytime x1</i></li> <li>• <i>After school x1</i></li> <li>• <i>Weekends x1</i></li> </ul>	10.0% (2)

<b>Who witnessed this</b>	
Me, this is a first-hand recollection	100% (20)
Someone else, this is hearsay/anecdotal	N/A

<b>The extent to which this has a detrimental effect on people's quality of life</b>	
A great deal	11.5% (12)
A fair amount	8.7% (9)
Not very much	40.4% (42)
Not at all	39.4% (41)

Respondents were asked why this activity has a detrimental effect on their quality of life and the following comments were received:

- Dangerous: 5 comments
- Offensive: 3 comments
- Causes damage: 2 comments
- Intimidating: 2 comments
- Anxious about safety: 1 comment
- Set an example for good behaviour: 1 comment
- Unnecessary: 1 comment
- Waste of money: 1 comment

**4.1.10. Trading as a pedlar (and remaining in any location for more than 10 minutes, locating themselves within 50 metres of their previous location and obstructing the highway or a shop entrance)**

Just over 70% of respondents have not witnessed someone trading as a pedlar (and remaining in a location for longer than 10 minutes).

For those who have witnessed pedlars trading, Canterbury High Street was cited as the obvious location for this activity and respondents stated that they see it occur more times than they can count.

Half of respondents have witnessed it in the afternoon, with others suggesting that pedlars trade at all times throughout the day.

All respondents who have witnessed this, witnessed it first-hand. However, nearly half of them feel that it does not have much bearing on their quality of life.

<b>Whether people have witnessed this</b>	
Yes	7.7% (8)
No	71.2% (74)
Don't know	21.2% (22)

Areas witnessed:

- High Street: 6 comments
- St Peter's: 1 comment
- Longmarket: 1 comment

<b>How often people have witnessed this</b>	
More times than I can count	75.0% (6)
10+ times	N/A
Five to nine times	12.5% (1)
Two to four times	12.5% (1)
Once	N/A

<b>What time people have witnessed this</b>	
Morning	12.5% (1)
Afternoon	50.0% (4)

Night time	N/A
Other, please specify (for example: weekends, school holidays) below <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>At all times</i></li> <li>• <i>Daytime</i></li> <li>• <i>Morning and afternoon</i></li> <li>• <i>During holiday period</i></li> </ul>	37.5% (3)

<b>Who witnessed this</b>	
Me, this is a first-hand recollection	100% (8)
Someone else, this is hearsay/anecdotal	N/A

<b>The extent to which this has a detrimental effect on people's quality of life</b>	
A great deal	5.8% (6)
A fair amount	7.7% (8)
Not very much	45.2% (47)
Not at all	41.3% (43)

Respondents were asked why this activity has a detrimental effect on their quality of life and the following comments were received:

- Controlling trade: 2 comments
- Should be a wider city ban: 1 comment
- Anti-social: 1 comment
- Offensive: 1 comment
- Looks messy: 1 comment

#### 4.1.11. The anti-social behaviour of delivery riders

Over 80% of respondents have witnessed the anti-social behaviour of delivery riders.

The most common place that this has been witnessed was Canterbury High Street, although the city centre more generally is also cited with respondents mentioning Whitefriars and St George's as specific areas where this activity has been seen.

Nearly three quarters of respondents state that they have witnessed the anti-social behaviour of delivering riders more times than they can count.

The majority of respondents cited witnessing this activity in the afternoon, with some additional comments suggesting that it takes place throughout the day.

All but one respondent stated they have witnessed this activity first-hand.

Overall, 60% of respondents feel that the anti-social behaviour of delivery riders has a detrimental effect on the quality of their life to a large extent.

The reasons for this are rooted in the nature of the riders behaviour being dangerous and inconsiderate, with multiple comments making reference to safety concerns.

<b>Whether people have witnessed this</b>	
Yes	82.7% (86)
No	11.5% (12)
Don't know	5.8% (6)

Areas witnessed:

- High Street: 40 comments
- City Centre: 29 comments
- Riders are aggressive: 6 comments
- Whitefriars: 4 comments
- St George's: 4 comments
- St Dunstan's: 3 comments
- St Peter's: 3 comments
- Burgate: 2 comments
- St Radigund's: 2 comments
- Westgate: 2 comments
- Wincheap: 1 comment
- Castle Street: 1 comment
- Tower Way: 1 comment
- Bus station: 1 comment

<b>How often people have witnessed this</b>	
More times than I can count	72.1% (62)
10+ times	11.6% (10)
Five to nine times	11.6% (10)
Two to four times	4.7% (4)
Once	N/A

<b>What time people have witnessed this</b>	
Morning	12.8% (11)
Afternoon	37.2% (32)
Night time	15.1% (13)
Other, please specify (for example: weekends, school holidays) below <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>All day x29</i></li> <li>• <i>Very common after 6pm x1</i></li> </ul>	34.9% (30)

<b>Who witnessed this</b>	
Me, this is a first-hand recollection	98.8% (85)
Someone else, this is hearsay/anecdotal	1.2% (1)

<b>The extent to which this has a detrimental effect on people's quality of life</b>	
A great deal	60.6% (63)
A fair amount	19.2% (20)
Not very much	14.4% (15)
Not at all	5.8% (6)

Respondents were asked why this activity has a detrimental effect on their quality of life and the following comments were received:

- Dangerous: 41 comments
- Don't feel safe: 14 comments
- Not fair to pedestrians: 9 comments
- Accidents will happen: 7 comments
- It's intimidating: 4 comments
- Harassment: 3 comments

- Affects businesses: 2 comments
- Cyclist also a problem: 2 comments
- It's illegal: 1 comment
- Puts me off Canterbury: 1 comment

#### 4.1.12. Level of overall disagreement

Respondents were asked to state if they disagreed with any of the activities listed in the proposed PSPO.

Only 14% of respondents said that they disagree with specific elements of the PSPO. This suggests that there is strong support for all elements of the PSPO.

Yes	14.4% (15)
No	74.0% (77)
Don't know	11.5% (12)

For those respondents that did express some level of disagreement, the following activities were cited:

- Begging: 7 comments
- Anti-social behaviour of delivery riders: 2 comments
- Busking: 2 comments
- Urinating in a public place: 1 comment

One respondent stated that they disagreed with all of the activities listed.

#### 4.1.13. Other comments

Respondents were asked to highlight any other comments related to the PSPO proposal. The following comments were received:

- Enforcement needs improving: 18 comments
- Anti-social behaviour is a problem in the district: 13 comments
- Cycling and e-bikes should be considered: 12 comments
- PSPOs are an effective tool: 4 comments
- Littering is an issue: 4 comments
- Pavement advertising boards are an issue: 3 comments
- Begging is an issue: 3 comments
- Drugs are a concern: 3 comments
- Theft is an issue: 2 comments
- Delivery riders should be licensed: 2 comments
- PSPOs are ineffective: 2 comments
- Cycling should be permitted in pedestrian areas: 2 comments
- Loss of parks: 1 comment
- Skateboarding is an issue: 1 comment
- Discrimination is an issue: 1 comment
- Speeding of cars and motorbikes is an issue: 1 comment
- Buskers are an issue: 1 comment
- Begging should be excluded from the PSPO: 1 comment
- Busking should be excluded from the PSPO: 1 comment



- Graffiti should be excluded from the PSPO: 1 comment
- Concerns for privacy if enforced with cameras: 1 comment
- More security camera should be used: 1 comment
- Punishment should be more severe if order is disobeyed: 1 comment
- Illegal parking is an issue: 1 comment

## 4.2. Written representations

A total of six written representations were received.

### 4.2.1. Kent Police & Crime Commissioner

The Commissioning Project Officer to the Kent Police & Crime Commissioner submitted the following comments on the PCC's behalf via email:

*[...] Thanks for the notification of the impending renewal of this PSPO. I have liaised with the local district commander and Inspector who have both expressed their support of the PSPO proposal.*

*Both mentioned E-scooter, but recognise that there is legislation on this and so I think that has been discounted from being included in this PSPO?*

*Once the public consultation has taken place, if there are no amendments to the wording within the PSPO, can you let me know and I can put forward the recommendation to the Commissioner to approve its renewal.*

### 4.2.2. A resident and former councillor

A resident and former councillor submitted the following comments via email:

*[...] I make the following comments based on my experience over the last few years as lead councillor and portfolio holder for enforcement and open spaces. I left the council in May having served for the last 12 years. By profession I am a retired senior police officer. I prepared the initial draft of the last two PSPO's (Stour Parks and Gorrell Valley and Coastal) and saw them through the Council. I was aware that this issue was next on the list to be dealt with. PSPO's provide a valuable part of the enforcement tool kit and usefully set a standard of behaviour for our open spaces and public areas. Once enacted they can be of use in support in respect of proceedings relating to injunctions and community protection notices. They are an important part of helping to maintain the quality of life in any particular area. The renewal of the existing order is essential given that many of the behaviours listed continue to take place and an enforcement tool is needed particularly as I continue to receive comments that the area in question has gone downhill. Things have been made worse by abuses by food delivery riders and such abuse puts vulnerable people at risk. The new proposals are to be applauded. In addition Canterbury is plagued by individuals who choose to camp out in shop doorways in the city centre. Such conduct is a lifestyle choice as there is adequate provision by state and charity for the homeless. This behaviour blights the city centre and can be intimidatory as well as diminishing the quality of life in an important international tourist area. In addition I am aware of the nuisance that can occur where licences to place A frames, tables and chairs are exceeded and this clutters the Main Street as well as providing hazards for the visually impaired. There have also been complaints in respect of skateboard noise that can adversely affect residents as well as providing a hazard to pedestrians.*

*Accordingly please add the following clauses:*

*1. Failure to remove any item of bedding, table, chair, notice or any other thing on being required to do so by an authorised officer.*

*(This could be used as justification for CCC to remove the item if unattended)*

*2. To use or ride on any skateboard in any zoned area as indicated by signage.*

*(The zone could be determined by ward councillors in consultation with an appropriate director).*

**Enforcement:**

*The downside of the PSPO in this council district has been the attitude of the police and council staff in respect of enforcement. This tends to be reactive rather than proactive with a history of no proactive patrols. The one exception to this has been litter but this has not always been directed and supervised by the Council Enforcement Manager in the way one would expect. Signage has and continues to be appalling. Signs are too small, poorly placed and extremely late in delivery (It took some 18 months for signs to appear in respect of the Stour Parks). Again this is indicative of poor supervision and there are some bad examples on the coast which have been highlighted months ago but nothing has happened. Unless these issues are resolved with alacrity then there would seem little point in PSPO's other than their value in setting out a standard of appropriate behaviour.*

*I note the questionnaire seeks information on age, race and sexual predisposition of the correspondent. Such issues are not relevant to the matter in hand and I will not be responding to them.*

**4.2.3. A resident**

A resident submitted the following comments via email:

*[...] The delivery drivers and riders use pedestrian roads as they have to rush their deliveries. They often have electric bikes which are quite fast and Mill Lane and Blackfriars St are an easy cut through. A number of elderly people live here.*

*There is also the problem of persistent illegal parking in Blackfriars St. One resident uses the turning bays to park using a Blue Badge - not displaying the time of arrival either. The gentleman in question is able to walk fine and could easily use St Radigans. It means that cars cannot turn and speedy bikes add to the chaos and today, when I needed to use the bay to unload shopping for my 90 year old neighbour, I could not get close to her house.*

**4.2.4. A resident**

A resident submitted the following comments via email:

*[...] Regarding the consultation; I agree wholeheartedly with the intent. However, as with many policies they tend to fail because there are not sufficient enforcement officers, so if you do not intend to support this properly then it will be a complete waste of time and effort.*

*As an example I refer you to existing rules about pedestrian zones and one-way streets, in particular Sun Street. On several occasions I (70 yr old) have been narrowly missed by cyclists (both pedal powered and electric) motor scooters and cars all going the wrong way up this street.*

*It is a regular occurrence for the Deliveroo, Just eat, etc riders to ride down this street in both directions commonly during the restricted time period but no authority will take action. A random watch and application of fines would soon circulate amongst them and stop this dangerous behaviour.*

*I have mentioned it to the local Community Officers leader (who at the time was extolling us with the agreement to install more cameras) that there are cameras overlooking Sun Street so why do they not take action particularly when a motor scooter goes the wrong way. He stated they did*

*not have the resources to review the footage.*

*The fact escaped him that installing more cameras was pointless if you do not have the resources to review the footage.*

*So, in summary, my response to your plan is: do not bother unless you intend to enforce the rules with adequate staffing!!*

#### **4.2.5. A resident**

A resident submitted the following comments via email:

*[...] I have just responded to consultation on anti social behaviour in Canterbury. Last week I wrote to complain about the same. This is becoming a major problem in our city and outlying streets and the council needs to have more PCSO presence, at least CCTV cameras to capture events and deter such behaviour.*

*I reported an incident to police just before Xmas and had no response as evidence was insufficient. An e scooter in the pavement collided with me, a pedestrian, and I was then abused by the rider for not moving out of the way. We argued and he threatened me. He then followed me into town on his scooter in an attempt to intimidate me.*

*As a 64 year old resident I do not feel the police or council are providing sufficient controls on this type of behaviour.*

*What is the council's strategy proposal for managing this situation?*

#### **4.2.6. Rough sleeper initiative team**

The council's Street Population Coordinator submitted the following comments via email:

*Begging near cashpoints is a prevalent issue in Canterbury. Members of the public have raised complaints about feeling pressured and unsafe when approached by beggars near ATMs. The presence of individuals loitering in doorways or next to ATMs, often using signage, children, animals, or receptacles to solicit money, has been reported as a cause for concern.*

### 4.3. Public meeting

A public meeting was held at Tower House, Westgate Gardens, Canterbury on Wednesday 9 August 2023 from 5pm to 7pm.

The event was promoted via email to a wide array of stakeholders on the council's newsroom website as well as social media channels.

The event was attended by 10 people. Five of these were residents living in the district, two attendees represented a business, two were CCC councillors, and one was a resident from outside of the district.

The main areas that were highlighted as 'hotspots' where the proposed activities take place were Sun Street, North Lane, and Greyfriars Gardens.

The following comments were made by residents:

- Delivery riders need educating on the laws of the road in this country
- A law is not a law unless it is enforced
- The problem around the anti-social behaviour of delivery riders is a social problem that stems from employers
- Consideration should be given for a camera near 'Siesta'
- Consideration should be given for drones
- This issue is not just the police's responsibility, it should be a joint responsibility
- Teenagers causing anti-social behaviour are seen in Greyfriars Garden everyday, despite reporting this, nothing happens
- New activities should not be introduced into the PSPO if the current ones are not being enforced effectively
- Delivery riders are on the rise so we need to adapt to a new way of ordering
- Deliveroo have a responsibility to tell their riders to slow down
- Delivery riders leave their bikes idling in the streets.

The following comment was made by a councillor:

- The vast majority of delivery riders are not employees, they are freelance.

The following comments were made on behalf of businesses:

- This seems to have come about following pandemic as people have changed the way they use services
- Engagement sessions are both important and effective with delivery riders, these can be organised through Deliveroo
- Delivery riders do engage well across the country and there is a structure elsewhere for trying to manage this issue.

The following questions were asked during the Q&A session:

- How are you getting the message out about the consultation?

- When do officers enforce as they are scarcely seen?
- Do enforcement officers have the power to stop a vehicle?
- Are there suitable staff resources to support the implementation of this PSPO?
- Is there funding to employ more enforcement officers?
- Is there a publicly available enforcement policy?
- Have you tried engaging or educating as opposed to enforcement?
- Would this order be enforceable against people under 18?

## **5. Conclusions**

Overall, the survey results show that there is general support for most of the activities proposed for the new Canterbury City PSPO.

This report provides a range of information about when, where and how frequently the proposed activities have been witnessed by respondents.

While respondents expressed that some activities had a more significant impact on their quality of life than others, these figures should be considered in conjunction with other evidence contained within the report.

It is clear that anti-social behaviour is regarded as a problem by an overwhelming number of respondents which suggests that action is needed.

Given the response rate and overall engagement during the consultation period, residents seem engaged with the tackling of anti-social behaviour.

It is hoped that the findings from this consultation provide useful insight as to how the council will proceed during its review of the Canterbury City PSPO.