



Dacorum Borough Council

Proposal to introduce a Public Space Protection Order for Hemel Hempstead Town Centre

**Opinion Research Services
November 2017**

Proposal 1: No person shall refuse to stop drinking alcohol or hand over any containers (sealed or unsealed) which are believed to contain alcohol, when required to do so by an authorised officer

Please provide details of these behaviours and the impact and effect these behaviours have had on you	% of respondents who made comment
People drinking/drunks hanging around	67%
Feel intimidated/abusive/aggressive behaviour from people in area	50%
People shouting/swearing	24%
I avoid going to certain areas/town	23%
It is not nice for children to see this in our area	17%
Groups/gangs of people hanging around/loitering	14%
I don't feel safe/scared to go out in my area	11%
Problems with litter/rubbish everywhere	9%
People around area begging	7%
Problems with homeless people/rough sleepers	6%
People around the area fighting	5%
Deters visitors from the area/gives the place a bad image	5%
I don't go out at night/when dark	4%
Problems with youth	4%
Problems relating to drugs e.g. smoking cannabis in public etc.	4%
Public urination/defecation is a problem/disgusting smell/unhygienic	4%
<i>Other</i>	14%

(Base: 303)

67% of those responding to this question mentioned that they had witnessed drinking or drunks hanging around. Examples include:

People drinking strong alcohol in large groups in the water gardens. Alcohol cans and bottles left in Gadebridge park.

Several individuals drinking alcohol together at market square and obviously drunk - very off-putting when walking past and going shopping

50% said they feel intimidated or have experienced abusive/aggressive behaviour from people in area. Examples include:

Daytime street drinking and begging in these areas is intimidating and antisocial

Less so on myself but more on children. The atmosphere always seems a little tense.

Additional comments	% of respondents who made comment
Drinking in public is an issue/people causing public disturbance e.g. littering, being aggressive/rude	15%
Agree with proposal 1	12%
Do not have a problem with drunks/drinking in the area	10%
Should not be a blanket proposal/should only apply to those behaving anti-socially	10%
Will be hard to reinforce/don't believe it will be enforced	7%
Should ban alcohol consumption in public areas/town centre	6%
Police need to be dealing with ASB/laws are already in place to deal with these issues	6%
Disagree with proposal 1	5%
No reason to drink in public places/there are plenty of drinking establishments around	5%
Public drinking should be allowed/not against the law/still a free country	5%
Alcoholics/people drinking on the street need to be helped/shown compassion instead of being punished	5%
Should apply to more areas/across the whole borough	5%
Should not apply to sealed containers	4%
Should not target the homeless/will unfairly target homeless people	3%
Should not apply to those who have purchased alcohol to take home	2%
Will result in additional aggression towards the police/authorised offices/will put officers in a dangerous situation	2%
Better regulate shops selling alcohol/make these shops more responsible	1%
<i>Other</i>	29%

(Base: 253)

15% stated they felt that drinking in public is an issue/or that there were people causing public disturbance e.g. littering, being aggressive/rude. Examples include:

I think that the market in the main shopping centre area attracts these people who sit and drink all day in the town centre

Drunks in the water gardens and homeless people with cans alongside them anywhere within the area designated the town centre should be moved on

12% additionally expressed general agreement with the Proposal 1. Examples include:

This proposal is a good idea but will need to be purely based on any person(s) that is perhaps causing a nuisance due to the consumption of alcohol within the area and will therefore have to be assessed by the authorities on a case-by-case basis.

It is a reasonable proposal and hopefully will address the drink related issues in the mapped area

However, 10% stated they do not have a problem with drunks/drinking in the area, and a further 10% said it should not be a blanket proposal/should only apply to those behaving anti-socially. Examples include:

If someone is behaving completely fine but has sealed or unsealed alcohol on them, no one should be able to take this off of them purely because of the area that they are in.

The proposal mentions sealed containers, which leaves it open for abuse by authority members to be overly harsh on members of the public. Also large areas of the town already have a fine system in place and police are more than qualified to move people along if needed.

Proposal 2: No person shall spit (including discharge of chewing gum), urinate or defecate in a public place

Please provide details of these behaviours and the impact and effect these behaviours have had on you	% of respondents who made comment
Spitting is disgusting/unhygienic/spreads diseases/people should be fined for spitting	43%
Chewing gum is a problem/chewing gum on pavement/standing in chewing gum	37%
Public urination/defecation is a problem/disgusting smell/unhygienic	28%
Disgusting/unhygienic/unpleasant/unacceptable/matter of common decency etc.	25%
Avoid certain areas/town centre	6%
Need to provide more/better public toilets	4%
Expensive to clean streets/remove chewing gum	3%
These behaviours are already illegal	3%
Agree with proposal 2	1%
Children copy these behaviours/think that they are acceptable	1%
<i>Other</i>	7%

(Base: 355)

43% said that spitting is disgusting/unhygienic/spreads diseases/or stated that people should be fined for spitting. Examples include:

It's just generally unpleasant, obviously! There's far too much of it going on, and those doing it aren't always careful about where it lands.

I've trod in chewing gum my daughter has or on my pushchair on many occasions. People are also always spitting in public in the town and it is disgusting too see and spreads diseases especially when you have a small child who falls over and could fall in it. People always urinate in the town mainly men, because there are no public toilets anymore that also smells especially the alley next to the full house

Chavs and drunks spitting is filthy, and should be enforced with on the spot fines.

37% agreed chewing gum is a problem/commented on chewing gum on pavement or having stood in chewing gum. Examples include:

I've trod in chewing gum my daughter has or on my pushchair on many occasions.

Chewing gum is now under seats, under tables and on the pavements. I have sat in discarded chewing gum and it is very frustrating and can be difficult to remove from garments.

Additional comments	% of respondents who made comment
Disgusting/unhygienic/unpleasant/unacceptable/matter of common decency etc.	21%
Need to provide more/better public toilets	16%
Agree with proposal 2	12%
Police need to be dealing with these issues/laws are already in place to deal with these issues	11%
Spitting is disgusting/unhygienic/spreads diseases/people should be fined for spitting	8%
Will be hard to reinforce/don't believe it will be enforced	8%
Have not encountered these issues	8%
Public urination/defecation is a problem/disgusting smell/unhygienic	6%
Chewing gum is a problem/chewing gum on pavement/standing in chewing gum	6%
Should not be a blanket proposal/may be due to a medical issue so should not be punished/embarrassed for this	4%
Need to provide more bins/places to dispose of chewing gum	4%
Should apply to more areas/across the whole borough	3%
Disagree with proposal 2	2%
<i>Other</i>	27%

(Base: 206)

21% made comments that the behaviours mentioned in the proposal are disgusting/unhygienic/unpleasant/unacceptable/a matter of common decency etc. Examples include:

It's basic common decency not to do these things.

16% expressed a need to provide more/better public toilets. Examples include:

Providing good quality public toilets, specific chewing gum and fag butt bins will combat this issue more effectively.

More lamp posts for people to stick their unwanted gum and to possibly re-open the old bus station public toilets to allow people to have facilities - the 2 new ones in Marlowes are pretty disgusting and locked at certain times.

Proposal 3: No person shall sleep in any public place which is:

- open to the air
- within a car park
- within a vehicle
- within a no-fixed structure including caravans and tents

Without the prior permission of the owner or occupier of the land

Please provide details of these behaviours and the impact and effect these behaviours have had on you	% of respondents who made comment
Problems with people sleeping rough in doorways e.g. KFC, WHSmith etc.	32%
Problems with people being threatening/intimidating/aggressive	24%
Problems with people begging	23%
Sadness that this exists/need to help/rehouse these people	22%
Dislike seeing rough sleepers on street/should be removed	22%
Problems with litter/rubbish left by people/making the area dirty/unhygienic	16%
Problems with people sleeping in car parks/making car park unsafe/also putting themselves at risk from cars	16%
Deters visitors from the area/gives the place a bad image	10%
Makes area look like an eyesore/unkept	10%
I avoid going to certain areas/town	8%
Rough sleepers should be made aware of the DENS organisation	7%
Don't know how genuine some homeless people are/some are frauds	7%
It is not nice for children to see this in our area	6%
Homeless people drinking/consuming alcohol	5%
Homeless people/rough sleepers using drugs	3%
Agree with proposal 3	2%
<i>Other</i>	14%

(Base: 311)

32% said they had experienced people sleeping rough in doorways e.g. KFC, WHSmith etc. Examples include:

Find it very uninviting when these individuals - or couples - are "camped" outside shops/premises - not only at night!!

It's distressing to see. People need help and advice to get a home. Just banning it won't work

24% said they had problems with people being threatening/intimidating/aggressive. Examples include:

It makes the town look dirty and threatening.

People sleeping rough in the town centre especially in shop fronts is bad for the person sleeping, unsightly and sometimes threatening to passers-by, bad for shop business and a bad impression of our town.

23% had experienced problems with people begging. Examples include:

Being asked for money outside of a shop that I have just purchased from makes me feel very uncomfortable. Especially when that person is drinking or smoking

Additional comments	% of respondents who made comment
DBC should be doing more/need to help/rehouse these people	43%
Homeless people are people too/should be offered support/not criminalised	29%
Proposals are just moving the problem to another area which isn't the solution	16%
Disagree with proposal 3	13%
Dislike seeing rough sleepers on street/should be removed	10%
Homelessness is a reflection of a broken system/how we deal with them is a reflection of our society	10%
The proposal is based on perception/therefore open to interpretation/what if people are just taking a nap/proposals need to be clearer/people should be allowed to nap in their car	10%
Where are these people supposed to go/they are homeless/have nowhere to go	10%
Agree with proposal 3	9%
This is not a big problem/haven't been affected by this issue	6%
Rough sleepers should be made aware of the DENS organisation	5%
Problems relating to travellers/they need to be moved/how does this proposal cover travellers?	3%
Problems with people sleeping in car parks/making car park unsafe/also putting themselves at risk from cars	2%
Problems with people sleeping rough in doorways e.g. KFC, WHSmith etc.	2%
<i>Other</i>	20%

(Base: 326)

43% of additional comments suggested Dacorum Borough Council should be doing more/need to help/rehouse homeless people. Examples include:

I think rough sleeping is often caused by poor services for people that are mentally unwell and also not enough low cost/social housing for people.

If Dacorum Borough Council feels that the number of rough sleepers in the town centre has become too high, why not help by upping their funding to local homeless charities instead? After all, their funding has halved in the last 7 years.

29% made comments to the effect of 'homeless people are people too', or stated they should be offered support/not criminalised. Examples include:

If you enforce this where do they go? Will housing and accommodation be provided for all of these people? It is disgusting that people in Dacorum are forced to sleep rough and they should not be punished but helped.

16% stated that the proposal would just move the problem to another area which isn't the solution. Examples include:

Plans put in place to find alternative space for these people to sleep otherwise you just move the problem to somewhere else

Proposal 4: No person shall sit on the ground in a public place, street, highway or passage in a manner to be perceived that they are inviting people to give them money.

Please provide details of these behaviours and the impact and effect these behaviours have had on you	% of respondents who made comment
Beggars can be threatening/intimidating/aggressive	48%
Beggars are too persistent/pestering	37%
Dislike seeing beggars on street/should be removed	36%
It is a major issue/these people need help/DBC should help rehouse them	12%
Beggars have a negative impact on town centre/tourism/visitors to town	12%
I avoid going to certain areas/town	9%
Don't know how genuine some homeless people are/some are frauds	9%
I don't feel safe/scared to go out in my area due to beggars	6%
People using charity/children/dogs for sympathy is not acceptable	5%
Agree with proposal 4	4%
Beggars are causing ASB in town	3%
Chuggers are problem/chuggers should be included under the order	3%
Beggars are causing mess/rubbish	2%
Busking should not be included in the order/busking adds atmosphere to town centre	2%
Problems with buskers/street performers	1%
The Big Issue/other proactive measures should be encouraged	<1%
<i>Other</i>	5%

(Base: 294)

Almost half of comments (48%) mentioned that beggars can be threatening/intimidating/aggressive. Examples include:

People sometimes asking for money, sitting on pavement or sometimes approaching you when out shopping which is alarming and intimidating

Can be intimidating if you are away from other members of the public.

37% felt that beggars are too persistent or pestering. Examples include:

Yes regular occurrence when trying to walk along the Marlowes.

It is impossible to use certain areas without being pestered

A similar proportion (36%) stated that they dislike seeing beggars on the street or believe they should be removed:

Always being asked if I have any change, sometimes even rude comments back when said no - should be removed, makes the town look uninviting.

I feel that in this age we must remove these people that beg and try to make you feel guilty for not helping.

Additional comments	% of respondents who made comment
Dislike seeing beggars on street/should be removed	24%
Beggars/homeless are a reflection of a broken system/how we deal with them is a reflection of our society/DBC should be doing more	24%
Beggars are people too/should be offered support/not criminalised	23%
Disagree with proposal 4	13%
Agree with proposal 4	11%
The order should only cover beggars that are pestering people	9%
Beggars sitting aren't the problem/beggars accosting and following you are	8%
The proposal is based on perception/therefore open to interpretation	8%
Proposals are just moving the problem to another area which isn't the solution	7%
Busking should not be included in the order/busking adds atmosphere to town centre	6%
Chuggers are problem/chuggers should be included under the order	6%
The Big Issue/other proactive measures should be encouraged	2%
<i>Other</i>	12%

(Base: 213)

24% made additional comments about disliking seeing beggars on the street/saying they should be removed.

The people asking for money can be intimidating and have upset my children when we are trying to get on with our shopping

The same proportion (24%) felt that beggars/homeless people are a reflection of a broken system/ how we deal with them is a reflection of our society/DBC should be doing more.

...begging is just a symptom of a hard-up society. Again, criminalising it will not help. And how would Buddhist monks and other alms-seekers be affected by this? Giving is good for you.

People beg for a reason. Although some may not need to do this, the majority do. The Conservative run Dacorum Borough Council needs to ask themselves why and address that, not hide the problem (as with rough sleeping) Please put pressure on your Tory colleagues in Central Government and Herts County Council to implement policies that will alleviate the problem not hide it.

23% of comments were that beggars are people too/should be offered support/not be criminalised

This would make begging OK as long as the beggar is standing up - just like those collecting for charity. Another example of criminalising something which is not a crime.

Stop criminalising homeless people

Proposal 5: No person shall cycle or skateboard

Please provide details of these behaviours and the impact and effect these behaviours have had on you	% of respondents who made comment
Danger/risk of injury if hit by cyclists or skateboarder especially elderly/young	55%
Cyclist/skaters should not be allowed into the pedestrianised areas	44%
Aggressive/intimidating/abusive/inconsiderate behaviour	35%
Myself/someone I know has almost been knocked over by a cyclist or skateboarder	25%
They perform stunts, jumps, tricks with no regard for pedestrians/road users/themselves	18%
Cyclists/skateboarders travelling too fast/speeding down street	18%
Cyclists/skateboarders expect you to give way to them	13%
Agree with proposal 5	11%
Too worried/dangerous to go into town	6%
Police presence would discourage this behaviour	5%
There are already bikes/skate parks e.g. XC, Gadebridge Park.	5%
Myself/someone I know has been injured by a cyclist or skateboarder	4%
More provision should be put in place for cyclists/skateboarders	4%
<i>Other</i>	9%

(Base: 428)

55% said there was danger/risk of injury if hit by cyclists or skateboarder especially elderly/young

I have four children, and trying to keep them all together and safe in town is tricky at the best of times, without inconsiderate cyclists and boarders crashing into them or near misses as has happened on occasion.

Particularly young cyclists are a danger to pedestrians, again particularly elderly people and the area should be protected from cycling or skateboarding where there is a designated area in Gadebridge Park for this activity.

44% made similar comments that cyclists should not be allowed in pedestrianised areas.

People cycle through Marlow's at dangerous speeds with no regard for pedestrians and young children.

Additional comments	% of respondents who made comment
Disagree with proposal 5	19%
More provision should be put in place for cyclists/skateboarders	18%
Aggressive/intimidating/abusive/inconsiderate behaviour	13%
Cyclist/skaters should not be allowed into the pedestrianised areas	13%
Policies already in place to deal with cyclists/skateboarders/protection orders need to be enforced	12%
Cycling/skateboarding should be encouraged as it is good exercise	11%
Safe cyclists/skateboarders shouldn't be punished/blanket ban is inappropriate/only target those who are reckless/break the law	10%
Agree with proposal 5	7%
Don't have a problem with bikes/skateboards/not experienced any issues	7%
Proposals will make it more dangerous for cyclists/force cyclists down dangerous alternative routes i.e. Leighton Buzzard Road	7%
Police should be dealing with this/police presence would discourage this behaviour	6%
Cycling/skateboarding is a good hobby/fun activity for children	6%
Danger/risk of injury if hit by cyclists or skateboarder especially elderly/young	5%
There are already bikes/skate parks e.g. XC, Gadebridge Park.	5%
Skateboards/bikes are good for the environment/less pollution than cars	5%
Cyclists/skateboarders travelling to fast/speeding down street	4%
Skateboards/bikes should be seized/fined if inappropriately used	3%
They perform stunts, jumps, tricks with no regard for pedestrians/road users	2%
Skateboarders aren't the problem/don't mind people skateboarding/cyclists are the problem	2%
Cyclist/skaters should be allowed into the pedestrianised areas	2%
Myself/someone I know has almost been knocked over by a cyclist or skateboarder	1%
Myself/someone I know has been injured by a cyclist or skateboarder	1%
Cyclists/skateboarders expect you to give way to them	1%
Too worried/dangerous to go into town	1%
Redevelopment of the town has encouraged this behaviour	1%
Map is unclear/proposed area in map covers both pedestrian/non pedestrianised zones	1%
<i>Other</i>	20%

(Base: 288)

Most commonly, respondents expressed general disagreement with proposal 5 (19%).

Cycling and skateboarding are exercise and should be encouraged.

I think it is ok to cycle in these areas providing the speed is slow and people around are aware of cyclist and skaters approach and in any case laws already exist for these activities.

People cycling to a place of work or home etc. should not be banned

A similar proportion (18%) suggested that there should be more provision for cyclists and skateboarders.

Please provide a skate park closer to the town centre but away from residents.

I'd rather cyclists/skateboarders shared the paths with pedestrians than risk their lives on the roads. More pedestrian/cycle/skateboard only paths please. All of these should have priority over cars in the area proposed.

STATS19 data on <https://bikedata.cyclestreets.net/collisions/#17/51.75016/-0.47158/opencyclemap> shows pedestrian injuries where the police attended. There were 9 incidents involving buses and 16 incidents involving cars and taxis. Together, these modes injured 31 pedestrians. There was one injury caused by a cyclist. Whatever anti-social behaviour is caused by cyclists, far more is caused by buses and cars. The PSPO should ban buses and cars from the town centre, and allow cycles.

Proposal 6: No person shall feed birds/wildfowl within the Water Gardens area

Please provide details of these behaviours and the impact and effect these behaviours have had on you	% of respondents who made comment
Bird mess is everywhere/unhygienic/unpleasant/slippy	50%
Bread is not good for birds/make people more aware of this/more education/signage on this available	29%
Canada Geese are a menace/destroying river banks	23%
Litter/rubbish/pollution from bread/bread packets	17%
Problems with vermin/pests caused by mess/rubbish	17%
Problems relating to pigeons/too many pigeons/pigeons should be culled	10%
Everyone loves feeding bird/wildfowl/children have grown up feeding birds/families favourite past time	6%
Make sure appropriate bird feed is available/vending machines in park/shops nearby selling appropriate feed	3%
Agree with proposal 6	1%
<i>Other</i>	16%

(Base: 140)

Half of respondents who gave comments (50%) stated that bird mess is everywhere/unhygienic/unpleasant/slippy

The proliferation of birds in such a confined location, tends to lead to areas that are unpleasant and slippery underfoot

29% said that bread is not good for the birds, or suggested people needed to be made aware of this/more education/asked to increased signage on this.

Most people feeding the waterbirds use bread. This is damaging to the birds and the environment. People should be educated to only feed the birds with appropriate seed mixes. Educational signs re the effects of "Angel Wing" and on the water quality from using bread should be clearly visible along the whole stretch of water.

23% of responses were concerned that Canada Geese are a menace/destroying river banks

...only that it encourages the Canada Geese which destroy the grass.

Some birds, especially geese, have degraded the riverbank in recent years. This has made the area unattractive, dangerous (slip hazard) and unhygienic. Birds are able to feed themselves and do not benefit from being fed.

The Canada geese are a menace encouraged by the duck feeders. The ducks are being displaced by the geese which are not an indigenous species and should be culled.

Additional comments	% of respondents who made comment
Bread is not good for birds/make people more aware of this/more education/signage on this available	38%
Everyone loves feeding bird/wildfowl/children have grown up feeding birds/families favourite pastime	32%
Make sure appropriate bird feed is available/vending machines in park/shops nearby selling appropriate feed/use money made by this to reinvest in park	28%
Disagree with proposal 6	23%
Canada Geese are a menace/destroying river banks	6%
Agree with proposal 6	5%
This order will be hard to enforce/would you be fining young children or parents/would need enforcements officers	5%
Litter/rubbish/pollution from bread/bread packets	4%
Water Gardens has been rejuvenated/don't want to see it being destroyed/plenty of money has been spent to make Water Gardens look nice	4%
Problems relating to pigeons/too many pigeons/pigeons should be culled	3%
Bird mess is everywhere/unhygienic/unpleasant/slippy	2%
Problems with vermin/pests caused by mess/rubbish	2%
There should be a specific area designated for feeding birds/wildfowl	2%
<i>Other</i>	17%

(Base: 292)

The most common comments (38%) were about bread not being good for birds/saying that people should be more aware of this/that there should be more education, or that signage on this should be available.

Persons should be allowed to feed any wild animals where safe in a public space. Council activity should be focused more effectively on educating people not to feed birds bread, but instead feed peas, nuts. Also encourage people to feed species effectively, e.g. feed ducks and swans not pigeons. Council activity could also encourage better habitats and food sources for hedgehogs, wood mice, bees, butterflies and other endangered species. Council could set up feeding stations for these species that public could contribute to in an effective and educational way.

Similarly, many comments (32%) suggested that feeding birds/wildfowl was a widely loved activity, or that children and families have grown up feeding birds as a pastime.

Feeding the birds has always been the thing to do with young children. If the feeding of bread is causing problems, why not have specific feeding times and let the public buy the feed (not expensive) from the person monitoring feeding time? That way you are making money to help support the birds, it's not too expensive for the public to buy and feeding is controlled. Children

also learn the lesson of looking after wildlife and the preservation of the surrounding grass land through not feeding stale bread, cake etc.

One comment suggested an alternative to control the bird population:

As a student when home from university in the holidays I worked for the New Towns Commission from the depot in the water gardens and as well as keeping the river clean, at least once a year we created a cage by the bridge by the police station and starting at the lake herded them upstream into the cage where they were caught and safely put in cages taken to Tring reservoirs and humanely released there, this certainly controlled numbers. Is this still done annually? It was mainly mallard ducks from memory and controlled the numbers; of course they weren't all removed.

Are we missing anything?

What else you would like to see included in a PSPO?	% of respondents who made comment
Problems with people being aggressive/intimidating/antisocial	18%
Problems with littering Inc. people dropping cigarette butts	17%
Problems with people shouting/swearing	13%
Problems relating to charity workers e.g. too many chuggers in the area/too persistent etc.	13%
Problems with traffic issues e.g. speeding/inconsiderate drivers etc.	12%
Problems with loud noises/music being played too loudly	11%
Problems with groups of people hanging around/loitering Inc. teenagers	8%
Problems with people smoking/vaping in public areas	8%
Lack of police patrols in area/need more PCSO/police on the beat	6%
Problems with people drinking/being drunk in public	5%
Problems relating to drugs e.g. smoking cannabis in public etc.	4%
Problems with parking e.g. parking on pavements/inconsiderately etc.	4%
Problems with uncontrolled dogs/dogs need to be on a lead	4%
Problems with people not wearing appropriate clothing e.g. men walking around without a t-shirt on.	2%
<i>Other</i>	30%

(Base: 248)

18% of respondents suggested that there were general problems with people being aggressive, intimidating or antisocial:

Large groups of young people/adults shouting flooding into various shops. Shouting amongst groups of people in an aggressive or anti-social way.

Others expressed concern with littering, often specifically dropped cigarette butts (17%):

General littering and particularly throwing used cigarette butts, often still alight, which smokers don't appear to regard as litter.

Dropping cigarette butts. Can this be included with the spitting chewing gum?

13% said they'd experienced problems with shouting/swearing:

Large groups of youths shouting

Abusive and offending language. I do not like the "F" word shouted by groups of mainly youngsters particularly around young children of impressionable age

The same proportion (13%) said there were problems relating to charity workers e.g. too many chuggers in the area/too persistent etc.:

Charity collectors specifically target women with children who they know will agree to anything to get rid of them as the children become fractious at waiting around.

Charity collectors who earn money from it and lead people to believe all the money goes to the charities. Usually there are groups trying to get you to sign a dd. I just want to be able to walk along the street without being asked to stop and hand over money.

People with clipboards approaching passers-by's to sign up for charities. They are sometimes very persistent and annoying.

Are you completing this survey as...?

Are you completing this survey as...?	% of respondents who made comment
Local resident who lives outside the shaded area shown on the map	62%
Local resident who lives in the shaded area shown on the map	13%
Visitor to the shaded area shown on the map (e.g. tourist, business, shopper)	12%
Person who works in the shaded area shown on the map	6%
Employed by the Council, Police or any other agency with an interest	3%
Local business owner/manager	1%
Representative of a local community or voluntary group	1%
Land owner within the proposed restricted area	<1%
Local Councillor (Town, County, Parish)	<1%
<i>Other</i>	2%

(Base: 869)