

Appendix 3 – Results of the Consultation

Q1

Do you support the introduction of this Public Space Protection Order designed to assist the Police in dealing with the various types of anti-social behaviour?

Answered: 114

Skipped: 0

Yes, I agree	105	92.11%
No, I Disagree	6	5.26%
I don't know	3	2.63%

Comments received ;

It will just move the problem elsewhere

All it does is move the problem elsewhere, like the one in Broadgate. A bigger project is needed across the city to tackle antisocial behaviour rather than the way the Council is doing it now. The piecemeal approach is clearly not working. Look at the data

The stated issues of knives and drug dealing are already illegal and can be dealt with under existing law. The proposals could prevent the public exercising their right to protest.

It potentially criminalises the young people on the street not the exploiters. It will create more debt and poverty

But I think it needs to cover more areas of the city

I'm not convinced that the city centre PSPO has been entirely successful and whether the police have the resources to implement and manage additional PPSPO's

The proposal is contrary to current government guidance and was never intended to be used in these circumstances and the grounds have not been adequately evidenced . The measures are draconian and would amount to making lawful association criminal and be a breach of civil liberty and human rights.

Police already have adequate powers to deal with criminality...the powers amount to a significant infringement of civil liberty...we need more police resources to use their existing powers not draconian measures to prevent citizens to congregate lawfully.

There are high levels of ASB in this area, an area where I work full time, and I fully support this proposal

If they are breaking a law, arrest them. If they are not breaking a law, leave them alone. This power is open to misuse and can be manipulated to suit any officers/forces/police agenda.

Q2

Do you agree with the area to be covered by the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order?

Answered: 114

Skipped: 0

Yes, I Agree	95	83.33%
No, I Disagree	15	13.16%
I Don't know	4	3.51%

Comments Received

too wide....covers a lot of areas where young people are naturally such as near Coventry College and schools so they will hang about there.

What about areas outside the proposed one? People need to feel safe wherever they live or move through. Any proposals to extend this to be city wide? If not why not?

I am concerned that if they move on they go somewhere else and the problem is just moved on to another area rather than being resolved.

It should be extended to more areas.

As above, the piecemeal approach of doing lots of little PSPOs is not working. Evidence shows that to target ASB you need to tackle larger geographical areas otherwise the issues will move elsewhere. You only have to look at Broadgate to see how it (hasn't) worked there.

Could this be extended in to Stoke Aldermoor as we have antisocial behaviour and some knife crime

St Michael's Ward is not the only concerning area or locality in which risk is increasing. Possible city wide pilot approach for consistency and safety throughout the city, rather than just moving on from area to another.

I believe it will move the problem not deal with it.

More areas need covering

It is a very large area and I am concerned about police resources to manage and implement the PSPO

Area could be city wide

PSPO were never intended to be used for an entire ward and there is no evidence that the anti-social behaviour or detrimental behaviour is taking place on every street and public open space in designated area and the proposed area cannot be objectively justified.

Yes, but these gangs will just move to other areas. Need tougher implementation of carrying weapons and carry out arrests as it is an offence and not use an excuse that prisons are full.

This is a dispersal which will cause issues in other areas - it should be city wide

Should be widely covering the whole of COVENTRY. Similar issues are occurring in cheylesmore and styvechale

Order is not needed and oppressive as it breaches civil rights

Demographic Data – please note not all respondents left data

Age	Number of respondents
Under 16	0
16-24	2
25-34	8
35-44	25
45-54	34
55-64	24
65-74	10
75-84	2
85+	0

Answer Choices	Number
Male	34
Female	68
Non Binary	0
Prefer not to say	3

Answer Choices	Number of responses
White (Home nations)	86
White Irish	2
Any other White Background	3
Any other mixed/multiple background	1
Asian Indian	9
Asian Pakistani	1
Any other Asian background	1
Any other ethnic group	3
Prefer not to say	3

