

## London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham Record of Cabinet Member Decision

**The call-in has expired and the Decision below can be implemented**

- Draft Decision List published on: 9 February 2026
- Confirmed Decision List published on: 12 February 2026

1. **TITLE:** **Decision on the introduction of a public space protection order to tackle anti-social behaviour**
2. **DECISION MADE BY:** Cabinet Member for Social Inclusion and Community Safety
3. **DECISION:**

That the Cabinet Member for Social Inclusion and Community Safety:

- Approves the introduction of a new ASB PSPO across the borough.
- Delegates authority to sign the PSPO to the Assistant Director of Community Safety, Resilience and CCTV.

4. **REASON FOR DECISION:**

1. As illustrated below it was a small minority of respondents who voted that disagreed or didn't know whether the restrictions should be introduced –
  - Professional begging – 6.3% disagreed
  - Aggressive and/or persistent begging – 6.3% disagreed
  - Congregating in groups of 2 or more and causing ASB – 10.1% disagreed
  - Congregating in groups of 2 or more and causing ASB – no person should remain in the specified area or return for a period of 24 hours – 8.6% disagreed
  - Wearing a face covering in an attempt to conceal someone's identity – 8.0% disagreed
2. The council is proposing that the PSPO is introduced, following the results of a public consultation, legal advice and wider research exercises conducted.
3. If the PSPO is introduced, comprehensive training for all staff responsible for issuing warnings and fines would be administered, in line with a clear enforcement policy.

5. **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED:**

***RECOMMENDED Option 1- To introduce the anti-social behaviour PSPO, including the restrictions on the following, professional begging, aggressive and/or persistent begging, congregating in groups of 2 or more and causing ASB ,and wearing a face covering to conceal someone's identity and cause ASB. This includes the amendment that has been made to the wording of the face covering***

**prohibition - *This is the recommended option.***

4. The consultation shows that a large proportion of residents are in support of the introduction of the measures and that the proposed prohibitions are having a significant impact on a frequent basis.
5. The data and consultation responses also demonstrates that the restrictions are having a large impact on the ability of people to enjoy public spaces in Hammersmith & Fulham.
6. As discussed above there are some concerns that enforcement may be challenging due to the subjective nature of what constitutes harassment alarm and distress, and the need for police support to enforce the restrictions. It is felt that these restrictions can be overcome through substantial training for enforcement officers and partnership working with the police.
7. The amendment that has been made to the prohibition around face covering makes it more manageable for enforcement officers and removes concerns around legitimate use of face coverings.

***Option 2 – the proposed measures are introduced but only in the evening or in certain locations. This is not the recommend option.***

8. The consultation responses showed that the behaviours make people particularly fearful in the evenings, when it is dark. Certain areas of the borough were also frequently referred to where these behaviours are a particular concern so the restrictions could be area and time specific.
9. However, this is not the recommended option as it would make enforcement more difficult due to seasonal changes. Area specific locations is not recommended as it is likely to push the ASB to other areas in the borough. As shown in **Appendix 2**, there is a good spread of responses to the consultation from across the borough.

***Option 3 – to only introduce restrictions in relation to face coverings and congregating groups – This is not the recommended option.***

10. Concerns were raised in the consultation regarding whether issuing fines was the most suitable way to tackle the issue with begging in the borough, with concerns over whether there were enough support services in the borough. Respondents felt that aggressive and/or professional begging were less of an issue in public spaces (68%) than congregating groups and face coverings (80%). However this is not the recommend option as 68% is still a high proportion that think it is an issue and over 80% of all respondents thought that all the prohibitions should be introduced.
11. For this reason, this is not the recommendation and instead the enforcement plan will ensure that officers are aware of the support services available to those begging and ensure that the offer of support is given before enforcement action is taken.
12. The restrictions will only apply when there is evidence that is aggressive and/or persistent begging or that it is professional in nature.

***Option 4 – Do nothing – do not introduce the measures proposed. This not the recommend option.***

13. As discussed above alternative legislation could be used to tackle these behaviours however many of these are within the crime and policing bill which has not passed through parliament. The feedback from the consultation shows that something needs to be done now to tackle these behaviours. For this reason this is not the recommend option.

**6. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND DISPENSATIONS GRANTED:**

None.

Date of Decision
09 February 2026