

Appendix 5

Proposal to amend and extend Guildford's town centre Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO)

2. About you

1. In what capacity are you completing this survey?					
Answer Choices				Response Percent	Response Total
1	Resident			69.35%	43
2	Student			0.00%	0
3	Work in Guildford			11.29%	7
4	Visitor to Guildford			3.23%	2
5	Business owner			1.61%	1
6	Organisation / agency / charity			12.90%	8
7	Other			1.61%	1
				answered	62
				skipped	0

3. Extra information about you

2. You selected 'other' for the person completing the survey. Please provide more detail.					
Answer Choices				Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question			100.00%	1
1	17/02/2025 4:18 PM ID: 264827014	As a resident, police personnel and Street Angel.			
				answered	1
				skipped	61

4. Extending Guildford town centre's PSPO

3. We are proposing to extend the PSPO to include Black Cat Alley at the bottom of Farnham Road in Guildford. You can see the boundaries marked in red on the the proposed Boundary map on our website.Are you happy with the proposals to extend the PSPO to these areas?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	72.58%	45
2	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	17.74%	11
3	Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	9.68%	6

3. We are proposing to extend the PSPO to include Black Cat Alley at the bottom of Farnham Road in Guildford. You can see the boundaries marked in red on the the proposed Boundary map on our website.Are you happy with the proposals to extend the PSPO to these areas?

answered	62
skipped	0

Please provide any comments (optional) (18)

1	14/02/2025 2:08 PM ID: 264623516	The more areas we cover the better
2	14/02/2025 3:42 PM ID: 264641915	Very welcome. The alleyway can be a handy spot for drug dealing.
3	14/02/2025 4:19 PM ID: 264647899	I suggest extending this a further 20m to include the entrance to the Farnham Road Car park on Wodeland avenue. This is where a lot of the trouble seems to originate from.
4	14/02/2025 7:57 PM ID: 264677475	I would also like Shalford Park included
5	14/02/2025 8:32 PM ID: 264679020	Although the behavioural expectations seem reasonable to adhere to everywhere in the uk!
6	15/02/2025 11:03 AM ID: 264708313	This seems totally unnecessary. I have lived, as a single woman, now 71, in Testard Rd for over 35 years and have never encountered any problems with antisocial behaviour in this area. Until I retired 3.5 years ago, I often used it returning from work at the University, frequently after 8.30 pm even in the dark of winter. I use it regularly daytimes throughout the week and weekends, and even now have no hesitation in using it to return home in the evenings (e.g. last Friday evening returning from a concert at GLive, at about 10 pm, or returning after dinner or theatre/opera in London, at times up to midnight. There is clearly the occasional episode of graffiti daubing on the wall of the house nearest the Farnham Rd, but this happens in even more public places in the town centre with greater frequency. None of the conversations I have had with neighbours has revealed concerns with the area. If some people do feel unsafe using it, a) they have the easy alternative of walking up the Farnham Rd to Wherwell Rd, to access e.g. Testard Rd, Wodeland Avenue, Mareschal Rd, the Mount .. b) perhaps improving the lighting in the alley and ensuring that it was both functioning at all times and also not obscured by overhanging vegetation would be a more sensible way to proceed.
7	15/02/2025 11:09 AM ID: 264709892	We live in Testard Road and have witnessed drug taking, transactions and antisocial behaviour in Black Cat Alley. Black Cat Alley is very dark and despite being close to houses is not overlooked by houses and is intimidating particularly for women on their own: not helped by the rape nearby in the small alley connecting the Mount to Mareschal Road.
8	15/02/2025 4:09 PM ID: 264723623	Totally unreasonable overreach of council powers
9	18/02/2025 11:53 PM ID: 264929472	Please also extend it to cover Guildford Park Road near and behind the kebab shop and in the private car parking space. Too many people smoke weed, urinate and park vehicles on private property technically.
10	19/02/2025 3:48 PM ID: 265001919	The area cover most of Guildford and appears excessive to go to the A25. Can the areas be more focused?
11	19/02/2025 8:06 PM ID: 265047829	No the area is too big. There is no justification for this.
12	20/02/2025 6:19 AM ID: 265074930	This alley is dark and users are not easily visible. It is therefore attractive to those wishing to engage in anti social behaviour. In particular there was a sexual assault near by and the area is frequented by people who appear to be dealing drugs, often loitering at the top of the alley. Extending the PSPO may address these issues if resources are provided to enforce the PSPO and make it effective.
13	20/02/2025 9:39 AM ID: 265089258	Yes, but it's a question of how the PSPO is monitored and enforced. I was in Robert Dyas a couple of weeks ago when I heard a man asking where the air-fryers were. Having been told, he picked one up and walked straight out of the shop. Street drinkers gather in the open space adjacent to the Odeon cinema and Bedford Road. Police patrol but don't seem to intervene. In any case there are too few police patrolling on foot and I suspect some of the drinkers have mental health problems so the police may not be the right people to resolve the issue.
14	20/02/2025 11:04 AM ID: 265102791	Noone polices these places, Community Police never seen

3. We are proposing to extend the PSPO to include Black Cat Alley at the bottom of Farnham Road in Guildford. You can see the boundaries marked in red on the the proposed Boundary map on our website.Are you happy with the proposals to extend the PSPO to these areas?

15	20/02/2025 3:33 PM ID: 265127316	I am not familiar with that area so have no views on if it should or should not be included. I would say that from the map it could be considered a good traffic free, active travel route towards the station which may be impacted if cycling becomes prohibited in this area.
16	22/02/2025 1:05 PM ID: 265256905	The Council do NOTHING to help existing anti-social noise that happens away from the high street. Student parties, annoying neighbours with no respect for those that enjoy peace in their own homes. Filling in noise sheets is not effective. We need support and fast actions to start penalising anti-social neighbours.
17	22/02/2025 11:54 PM ID: 265296771	I have no problem with the PSPO in general, not the extension, but the prescriptive nature of '2 people' bring together is ridiculous! We're all with someone in town - you can't criminalise people meeting friends. This so criminalises any kind of peaceful protest, which is anti-democratic. People have the right to peacefully and respectfully assemble. I get that you want to stop County Lines etc which is totally necessary. But use anti-drug law for that. Don't throw hard fought for rights to assemble out. Make the PSPO any Suspected drug possession or whatever, not 2 people meeting in town. It's not ok to take away our rights to get together when we want.
18	24/02/2025 11:31 PM ID: 265437196	It would be sensible to include the lower part of Wodeland Avenue also where drug transactions seem to occur

5. Adding extra restrictions to Guildford town centre's PSPO

4. Are you happy to add wearing a piece of clothing with the intent to obscure or hide his/her identity for the purposes of committing crime and/or anti-social behaviour to the PSPO?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	<input type="text"/>	72.58%	45
2	No	<input type="text"/>	20.97%	13
3	Don't know	<input type="text"/>	6.45%	4
			answered	62
			skipped	0

5. Are you happy to add dangerous or anti-social use of vehicles, including bicycles, skateboards or scooters in pedestrianised areas to the PSPO?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	<input type="text"/>	77.42%	48
2	No	<input type="text"/>	19.35%	12
3	Don't know	<input type="text"/>	3.23%	2
			answered	62
			skipped	0

6. Are you happy to add 'joining or remaining in a group of two or more people which is acting in a manner that is likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to any person' to the PSPO?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	<input type="text"/>	62.90%	39
2	No	<input type="text"/>	29.03%	18
3	Don't know	<input type="text"/>	8.06%	5
			answered	62
			skipped	0

7. Are you happy to add 'marking, or likely to mark, any surface with any form of unauthorised graffiti' to the PSPO?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	<input type="text"/>	85.48%	53
2	No	<input type="text"/>	11.29%	7
3	Don't know	<input type="text"/>	3.23%	2
			answered	62
			skipped	0

8. Add any reasons for your answers in this section. (optional):

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question		100.00%	27
1	14/02/2025 1:58 PM ID: 264623163	points 3 and 5 are perhaps harder to determine		
2	14/02/2025 2:08 PM ID: 264623516	<p>On question 5: the description: "which is acting in a manner that is likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to any person" is too broad to be policed well. What causes alarm to one person may be innocent to another for a whole variety of reasons. A pair of football fans singing loudly about their football team winning might cause distress to supporters of an opposing team, but may be entirely reasonable behaviour. A simpler statement: "which is at risk of causing direct harassment or aggravation to others" might do better.</p> <p>On question 3: "wearing a piece of clothing with the intent to obscure or hide his/her identity for the purposes of committing crime and/or anti-social behaviour to the PSPO?" I think needs to be more specific. The issue of wearing a hoody or coat or scarf and putting the hood up to protect from rain / keep warm in winter could be misconstrued. Similarly, some people necessarily hide their identity when walking around (I have met victims of sexual assault who seek to hide their faces, those recent facial surgery, those just wearing a covid mask who all need to cover their faces / hide identity. What exactly are you saying, and might this do better?: "the covering of the face to deliberately hide their identity when committing a crime and/or anti-social behaviour"?</p>		
3	14/02/2025 4:19 PM ID: 264647899	I came across a group of 5-6 young males urinating the the Black Cat Alley last week in broad daylight it can be very intimidating and due to the steep incline as you are walking up the hill you often can't see what is ahead of you until you are in the middle of a situation.		
4	14/02/2025 8:32 PM ID: 264679020	Item 5, understand reasoning but maybe law abiding people working together to undertake citizens arrest might be deemed as causing 'distress' to shop lifters etc. Maybe say 'likely to cause..... unjustifiable distress		
5	15/02/2025 9:49 AM ID: 264705861	Regarding the antisocial use of vehicles/bikes/scooters etc, you need to include e-bikes in this. This also needs a clampdown/more policing. The number of delivery riders for Deliveroo or just eat, on e-bikes, riding in the dark with no lights, going the wrong way down one way streets, riding on the wrong side of the road, riding on pavements, riding through red traffic lights, is astonishing. They are a law unto themselves and don't seem to have any respect for others or the Highway Code. There is one who sees fit to park his bike in the entrance to the coop next to g live, obstructing the doorway. Totally fed up as a pedestrian and a driver of seeing the appalling standard of these people on e-bikes. Also applies to e-scooters in this area.		
6	15/02/2025 11:03 AM ID: 264708313	Much of this seems rather over the top. With respect to graffiti, surely there are adequate laws (or bylaws) already in existence to enable action against offenders on this? And much of the rest seems to be very 'subjective' ... esp. Q5. In Q3, who makes the judgement on 'intent' and how?		
7	15/02/2025 11:09 AM ID: 264709892	There is graffiti on the houses in Black Cat Alley. Where there is drug taking or transactions, the individual obscure their identity.		
8	15/02/2025 12:18 PM ID: 264713048	In winter it is entirely appropriate to wear clothing that obscures identify to remain warm		
9	17/02/2025 8:21 AM ID: 264787230	If these changes are to happen then this needs to be enforced not like it has done over the years with current PSPO's		
10	18/02/2025 1:35 PM ID: 264884376	<p>As someone dealing with ASB issues in Guildford on a regular basis, I can say these proposed new restrictions would definitely help directl address the issues we currently have in the town centre.</p> <p>Having groups of youths, often young men, going around in groups wearing balaclavas or hats and hoods designed to be pulled down over the face with built in eye holes or lenses can be very intimidating to people.</p> <p>The point on use of vehicles is also desperately needed. Everyday we have cyclists, especially delivery riders on electrically powered bikes, riding the wrong way against traffic, through red lights and pedestrian crossings and generally being a hazard to those around them with their dangerous and inconsiderate behaviour.</p>		
			answered	27
			skipped	35

8. Add any reasons for your answers in this section. (optional):

		<p>Lastly, graffiti has definitely become more of a concern in recent times. Every time we get graffiti removed around the town it comes back almost immediately.</p>	
11	19/02/2025 1:10 PM ID: 264982709	<p>It is clear there is a considerable degree of antisocial parking in Guildford from the public, delivery drivers and licensed vehicles (both vehicles licensed by GBC and other Authorities). For example the BBC article about delivery drivers parking: https://www-bbc-co-uk.cdn.ampproject.org/c/s/www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c870nl9dqego.amp and number of complaints about taxis parking around the station. These concerns are only likely to heighten due to restrictions and redevelopment works.</p> <p>As such, the PSPO also needs to include parking offences and there should be an increase in compliance resource and enforcement to respond.</p>	
12	19/02/2025 3:48 PM ID: 265001919	<p>The inclusion of the dangerous use of skateboards, bicycles and scooters is clearly excessive.</p> <p>Of there are problems with electric motorbikes or electric scooters then powers exist for the police to stop these people.</p> <p>Can you consider if it is proportional to add bicycles, scooters and skateboards.</p> <p>As you include stole park on your map and most of the town centre you are potentially criminalising the use of bicycles / scooters by children.</p> <p>Other councils have done this with overly vague and wide ranging PSPO orders. I don't want to see Guildford doing the same.</p> <p>Can you provide evidence of dangerous cycling or scooter use that justifies their inclusion?</p>	
13	19/02/2025 7:34 PM ID: 265044359	Vandalism is an offence and offenders should be charged	
14	19/02/2025 8:06 PM ID: 265047829	It's impossible to cycle through Guildford , cycling must be taken out of this description. We have terrible traffic and those of us who tries to alleviate on two wheels should be supported. It's outrageous leave cyclists alone.	
15	19/02/2025 8:47 PM ID: 265051052	Why target bicycles, scooters and skateboards by naming them? You don't say buses, trucks, four by fours, saloon cars ... to identify vehicles so why identify environmentally friendly active travel methods individually??	
16	19/02/2025 9:00 PM ID: 265052334	<p>Active travel should be encouraged, and a definition of "dangerous" is required to ensure that people simply wheeling a bike through the town are not caught by this.</p> <p>I do not consider a group of 2 people to be threatening, and think the group size should be increased to "4 or more" to avoid unnecessary impact on young people out with their friends.</p>	
17	20/02/2025 9:39 AM ID: 265089258	<p>Q3 The appearance of masked individuals is alarming. They must know that so what is their justification for being masked?</p> <p>Q4 This will affect many delivery drivers/riders and quite rightly so. They're becoming a menace.</p> <p>Q5 I take it this will include groups of school age children in the town centre.</p> <p>Q6 Yes. The area underneath the bridge and the subway through from there to Friary Street are pretty much a disaster now as is the subway from the station to the eastern side of Bridge Street. Graffiti isn't "edgy" it's criminal damage. Whichever council is responsible should clear it up.</p>	
18	20/02/2025 11:04 AM ID: 265102791	<p>No-one stops either cyclists or scooters on pavements.</p> <p>Rarely seen Rangers just chat to each other, sidestepping above, avpiding aggressive so-called homeless who have been overheard talking about the house they own in London</p>	
19	20/02/2025 2:33 PM ID: 265127648	These all seem incredibly subjective. How does a police officer/ PSPO/ council officer decide the purpose of someone else's clothing? Or whether someone is likely to cause harassment or to mark a surface? What would enable them to make these decisions? Publicly available guidelines should be available of these restrictions are to be put into place. Anti-social use of bicycles, skateboards etc also needs defining - is simply riding anti-social, or is there a speed or manner in which riding becomes anti-social. Does it depend on the time of day, how busy the area is, the age of the rider? The wording is all far too woolly as it stands.	
20	20/02/2025 3:33 PM ID: 265127316	The added clause of intent should be sufficient to protect against people being subjected to fashion police who don't like their headwear but I still worry that this will be used to target groups in society without the being any evidence of	
		answered	27
		skipped	35

8. Add any reasons for your answers in this section. (optional):

		<p>wrongdoing.</p> <p>Including bicycle use had been proven to be misused elsewhere because what is considered dangerous or antisocial is subjective. The town centre is already a hostile environment for active travel and the inclusion of this on the tow path and routes into town and the station will only compound the issue. Without evidence that there is a significant problem from bicycles in town this is just going to damage the LCWIP.</p> <p>Some people are scared by groups of people, the way the 3rd point is worded would mean that you could no longer walk into town as a group of people. It's overly restrictive and unnecessary. If groups are harassing someone then that activity should be the benchmark, not the number of people in a group.</p> <p>"Likely to mark" again this could mean anyone carrying paint supplies was at risk of being deemed "likely to mark", this would inevitably be based on stereotyping. The use of intent would be better here as the onus to prove intent is on the prosecutor.</p>	
21	20/02/2025 4:00 PM ID: 265138448	<p>Most of these definitions are things that otherwise law abiding citizens may do but are criminalised. Covering your face because it's cold, walking with a group of friends, or riding a bike on the pavement because the road is too dangerous. It seems things are entirely based on the perceptions of others, whether that's your intent or not and seems that it could be open to abuse and discrimination.</p>	
22	22/02/2025 1:05 PM ID: 265256905	<p>I've been reporting issues for 18 months and Guildford council only work 9-5.30</p> <p>Everything happens later in evening/night.</p>	
23	22/02/2025 10:01 PM ID: 265294251	<p>1) wearing a piece of clothing with the intent to obscure or hide his/her identity for the purposes of committing crime and/or anti-social behaviour. Both the intent and the purpose seem very difficult for an officer to prove on the spot. I don't see how this would be practical.</p> <p>2) dangerous or anti-social use of vehicles, including bicycles, skateboards or scooters in pedestrianised areas: I can see how this might be useful if it is applied specifically to dangerous or anti-social riding, with clear guidelines for officers. However, I am very concerned about similar PSPOs in other areas where people have been fined £100 on the spot simply for cycling slowly in a pedestrianised area (https://www.gazette-news.co.uk/news/24398283.council-bosses-apologise-62-cyclists-fined-colchester/). Guildford can be difficult to cycle around because of the busy traffic, and I would like to be reassured that people will not be penalised for cycling considerably through pedestrianised areas to try and keep safe. 99% of pedestrian injuries are caused by collisions with motor vehicles, so enforcement should be proportionate and prioritise the greatest source of danger.</p> <p>3) joining or remaining in a group of two or more people which is acting in a manner that is likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to any person: This causes me the most concern as it is incredibly vaguely worded, and open to interpretation by individual officers. Would a group of teenagers potentially be fined for hanging about on a street corner or in a park, because it might make someone feel nervous? Or two homeless people sat together begging, because it might cause someone distress? I think this should only apply to behaviour which is actually causing harassment, alarm or distress, not 'likely to'.</p>	
24	22/02/2025 11:54 PM ID: 265296771	<p>Again, you can't criminalise people getting together in town. 2 or more people meeting is not ok as part of this. LIKELY (not even actually causing) distress to ANY person? That's so broad and so vague it could apply to almost almost any bunch of teens.</p> <p>You can't throw out hard won rights to assemble without better cause. It's not as if there's a massive problem in the town.</p>	
25	23/02/2025 12:46 PM ID: 265319898	<p>I do not think a group can be 2 people. I am concerned that this could be used more widely where group of young people are simply hanging out and jerks is other residents feel they do not want that. They may be noisy by the nature of being young, having fun with friends. I am concerned this could be misused to force eg peaceful demonstrations to be affected.</p>	
26	25/02/2025 7:36 AM ID: 265445859	<p>I am concerned about the misuse and wording of "joining or remaining in a group of two or more people" to prevent decent young people from congregating in a way that is not a harassment but is undesirable to the police.</p>	
27	25/02/2025 3:49 PM ID: 265492588	<p>As students of the University of Surrey, and as residents of Guildford, we are keen to see our public spaces kept safe. However the proposed additions to the Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) by Guildford Borough Council (GBC) are concerningly vague, and can be misinterpreted in a way that can be detrimental to local students accessing the affected areas (town centre, Stoke Park, and the Mount). Under a PSPO, individuals deemed to be breaching the order can be asked to change their behaviour by police officers, PCSOs, or GBC compliance officers. Fines and written warnings can be given to repeated breaches.</p>	
		answered	27
		skipped	35

8. Add any reasons for your answers in this section. (optional):

		<p>As Students' Union President and a leading voice for our 17,000 students I believe it's vital that changes to public spaces consider the perspective of our student community. The first proposed addition adds "wearing a piece of clothing with the intent to obscure or hide his/her identity for the purposes of committing crime and/or anti-social behaviour" as a restriction. A challenge with each of these proposed extensions is the term "intent", and the broad remit it gives for enforcement of the order. This is particularly concerning for members of the community who wear clothing that covers their face or hair for religious purposes. We question how appropriate it is to be enforcing restrictions on clothing, rather than other indicators of anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>The second restriction details the use of "dangerous or anti-social use of vehicles, including bicycles, skateboards or scooters in pedestrianised areas". Many students shared with me their concerns about where the line is drawn on "anti-social" use of vehicles, given some of Guildford community's resistance to the Beryl Bike scheme. The fear is that Guildford's infrastructure for safe bike travel is already limited (take the University to town centre route, for example), and that such an extension to the PSPO can disincentive people from using sustainable travel opportunities. It would be worth clarifying how this order will relate to GBC's sustainable travel plans.</p> <p>The final restriction to comment on about "joining or remaining in a group of 2 or more people which is acting in a manner that is likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to any person". Once again, we are concerned by the overly conditional phrasing of "acting in a manner that is likely to cause" and the vague nature of "distress". This feels like an extremely broad scope to enforce, given that members of the public may potentially be "distressed" when encountering young adults socialising in public, even if it is not disorderly or anti-social. This extension is not phrased in a way that prevents groups acting disorderly – it instead relies purely on a member of the public claiming to be distressed or alarmed, which is an unreasonable ground to potentially penalise members of the public for. This is especially true for our student community who utilise the social spaces offered by town centre.</p> <p>These measures are unspecific in their wording, allowing them an extremely broad remit that could lead to inappropriate enforcement. Our students would like to see the aims of these extensions clarified, and specific to the antisocial behaviours that they are trying to mitigate.</p>				
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>answered</td> <td>27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>skipped</td> <td>35</td> </tr> </table>	answered	27	skipped	35
answered	27					
skipped	35					

6. Removing illegal highs from Guildford town centre's PSPO

9. Are you happy with the proposals to remove legal highs from the PSPO?				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	<input type="text"/>	37.10%	23
2	No	<input type="text"/>	29.03%	18
3	Don't know	<input type="text"/>	33.87%	21
			answered	62
			skipped	0
What is the reason for your answer (optional): (15)				
1	14/02/2025 11:17 AM ID: 264572063	Absolutely not, legal highs are a problem which causes ASB in vast amounts. If you drop this from the PSPO then it will give people the idea that this is ok.		
2	14/02/2025 2:08 PM ID: 264623516	They are a danger to those who witness it, and behaviour is not predictable.		
3	14/02/2025 3:01 PM ID: 264634676	I don't know what that means		
4	14/02/2025 4:45 PM ID: 264652973	Why is this being proposed? I cannot readily see a reason for this to be removed.		
5	14/02/2025 8:32 PM ID: 264679020	Any such substances that are associated with antisocial behaviour /litter /unhelpful for young people should be strongly discouraged		
6	18/02/2025 1:35 PM ID: 264884376	<p>Although the substances themselves may be legal, it has been the case in my experience that those using legal highs in public, such as Nitrous Oxide, will also then be reported as involved in other anti social activity.</p> <p>It should remain possible for an authorised person, such as a PCSO, to request people to stop using legal highs under the PSPO when the situation calls for it. The same as the authority to request to stop drinking alcohol under the PSPO.</p>		
7	18/02/2025 11:53 PM ID: 264929472	Can it be done at home not in public please		
8	19/02/2025 1:51 PM ID: 264986422	As long as the illegal highs are remaining in		
9	19/02/2025 8:47 PM ID: 265051052	Removing this encourages "legal drug taking" in public. Come on!!		
10	19/02/2025 9:00 PM ID: 265052334	The section heading and question text are inconsistent. I cannot answer since I do not know what you are asking.		
11	20/02/2025 6:19 AM ID: 265074930	Legal Highs should not be removed. There is no good reason for legal highs to be consumed in public. Legal highs can be a gateway into unlawful drugs and should be discouraged in public.		
12	20/02/2025 9:39 AM ID: 265089258	If people want to indulge themselves in legal highs they can do so at home. Why should these drugs be treated any differently from alcohol?		
13	20/02/2025 2:33 PM ID: 265127648	I don't have enough knowledge of these substances or their potential issues to have an informed opinion.		
14	20/02/2025 3:33 PM ID: 265127316	They are legal, why should we dictate they can't be used in our town. At most we should cover them on the same way as alcohol, if asked then please stop so the powers can be used if they are causing issues.		
15	25/02/2025 3:49 PM ID: 265492588	This does not appear on the PSPO. The title of this says "removing illegal highs from Guildford town centre's PSPO" but your question contradicts this by saying "removing illegal highs from Guildford town centre's PSPO".		

7. Support for proposal to amend and extend Guildford town centre's PSPO

10. Do you support amending and extending the PSPO for a further three years?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	<input type="text"/>	82.26%	51
2	No	<input type="text"/>	17.74%	11

10. Do you support amending and extending the PSPO for a further three years?

answered	62
skipped	0

What is the reason for your answer (optional): (19)

1	14/02/2025 11:17 AM ID: 264572063	<p>I support extending the PSPO on the basis that it is policed correctly. At the moment, it is not!</p> <p>These powers were added by Guildford Borough Council to support the Police with Anti-Social behavior in Guildford Town Centre and the surrounding area.</p> <p>Focusing on the following, these are the issues within the area.</p> <p>Street drinkers are still active in the town centre and public spaces that are designated PSPO areas which is causing people with good intentions to not attend those areas.</p> <p>Graffiti is at an all time high in the town.</p> <p>Littering during the week is still an issue.</p> <p>Begging from organised groups in Guildford Town is still a major issue.</p> <p>Reporting of these incidents is confusing, long winded and seems to not be dealt with.</p> <p>CIC groups allowed to roam about under the guise of charities, selling periodical tat, harassing members of the public without fear of reprisals.</p> <p>If the PSPO is to exist, it MUST be Policed and managed properly with clear guidelines and means of reporting both for professional organisations and the general public.</p> <p>Signage is either not broad enough or non existent. Offenders are not dealt with straight away, it should be a maximum of 2 strikes.</p> <p>How is this going to be Policed? There needs to be a GBC enforcement Officer in Guildford Town Centre on a regular basis.</p> <p>This should not be a tick-box exercise.</p>
2	14/02/2025 8:32 PM ID: 264679020	<p>Around Waitrose sometimes it can be quite unpleasant with large groups hanging around shouting and swearing, and I realise that service users need somewhere to go but it is a shame they can't behave more considerately.</p>
3	15/02/2025 8:55 AM ID: 264704057	<p>I strongly support to keep it until there is a tangible difference in behaviour. It also should be extended to other areas for example the pedestrian tunnel under the A3 which goes between the university and Southway. It concentrates antisocial and dangerous behaviour - offensive graffiti and littering/dog fouling, underage people drinking alcohol, and drug dealing.</p>
4	15/02/2025 9:49 AM ID: 264705861	<p>As a resident in the town centre who has in recent years been directly affected by antisocial behaviour outside Trinity Gate (primarily by the resident town drunks), including litter, noise at all hours of the day and night, people urinating on the street, people fighting, people passed out on the floor or bench, late night revellers making their way home noisily, I think it's very important to continue the current PSPO. It could benefit from additional patrols and enforcement especially at night and on weekends.</p>
5	15/02/2025 11:03 AM ID: 264708313	<p>Extend the existing PSPO for 3 years may be OK, but I am not convinced of the need for the amendments both in terms of geographical areas and in terms of 'behaviours'</p> <p>As far as I am concerned the biggest issues I have had in Guildford in the past relate to Bridge Street/Onslow St with its clubs with drunken (and drug-affected) customers spilling out on the (fairly narrow) pavements, being sick on the footpath and blocking major pedestrian routes out of the town centre (e.g. to station, University, residential area on other side of railway line) by just standing around, and even spilling into the roadway on a busy traffic system. (This is even when there is no malicious intent, just rather loud and uncontrolled behaviour.) Why GBC ever thought that licensing the venues in these locations was sensible is anyone's guess. Maybe more monitoring of these areas - presumably under the existing PSPO? - would be a better use of resources?</p>
6	15/02/2025 11:09 AM ID: 264709892	<p>It is needed and needs to be enforced on Black Cat Alley. It's too important a pedestrian access not to be made safe.</p>
7	15/02/2025 4:09 PM ID: 264723623	<p>Public spaces are ment for gathering people together</p>
8	18/02/2025 11:53 PM ID: 264929472	<p>Please extend to our area too.</p>
9	19/02/2025 1:51 PM ID: 264986422	<p>Hopefully will help with anti social behaviour in the areas.</p>

10. Do you support amending and extending the PSPO for a further three years?

		However, please could the signs highlighting this be renewed and made bigger and the public informed of this as a lot of people do not know about it.
10	19/02/2025 3:48 PM ID: 265001919	A wider consultation and explanation as to the powers being given to council employees is needed before extending
11	19/02/2025 8:06 PM ID: 265047829	Three years is too long these things should be considered every 12 months.
12	20/02/2025 9:39 AM ID: 265089258	I wish I knew just how beneficial the current PSPO has been. I don't but think it can only be a good idea.
13	20/02/2025 11:04 AM ID: 265102791	This seems little point.
14	20/02/2025 2:33 PM ID: 265127648	If it helps make the town centre safer, it seems like a good idea as long as it is clear what is and is not considered anti-social. If the rules aren't clear, it should be extended.
15	20/02/2025 3:33 PM ID: 265127316	I am tempted to select no as I think harassment should be covered by existing laws. I do however think that reducing drinking in public has been good for Guildford. The inclusion of the "when asked" caveat here means that those who are enjoying our outdoor spaces responsibly can continue to do so.
16	22/02/2025 1:05 PM ID: 265256905	I've seen no difference in what is existing today
17	22/02/2025 10:01 PM ID: 265294251	I disagree with the additions, as outlined in previous answer.
18	22/02/2025 11:54 PM ID: 265296771	Change it so we have the right to assemble please. We need to right to peacefully protest.
19	25/02/2025 10:10 AM ID: 265464412	Referrals that are being completed by our work place are not being taken on by GBC and we see no results so staff have stopped issuing the breaches as it is not effective