

Consultation on tackling drinking-related antisocial behaviour in public spaces

Consultation Report

Report Date: July 2021

Report author:

Florence Obinna

Consultation and Engagement Manager

Co-author:

David Besbrode

Research/Data Analyst

Contact

Hackney Consultation Team
on 020 8356 3343 or
consultation@Hackney.gov.uk



Contents

Introduction, Background, Consultation & Engagement Approach	3 -4
Executive summary	5 - 6
Overview of results	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondent profile 	7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How concerned are you about anti-social behaviour resulting from street drinking (i.e. drinking in public places) 	8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you witnessed anti-social behaviour that you believe was a result of street drinking (i.e. drinking in public places) in Hackney over the last year? 	9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If YES, how often have you witnessed this in the last year? 	9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What types of anti-social behaviour have you witnessed? (tick all that apply) 	10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the anti-social behaviour you have witnessed had a persistent or continuing detrimental effect on your quality of life? 	10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How concerned are you about anti-social behaviour in and around London Fields? 	12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you think the anti-social behaviour is connected to street drinking (namely alcohol consumption in public spaces)? 	14
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you support the proposed PSPO, which allows authorised police and council officers to confiscate alcohol from those that are engaged in anti-social behaviour? 	16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you support the proposed PSPO, which includes the ban on alcohol consumption in London Fields park? 	20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • About you 	25
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusion 	28 - 29

Introduction:

The report presents a summary of the responses received from the consultation on the Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) to tackle anti-social behaviour related to drinking in public spaces.

The consultation was live for 6 weeks from 24 May to 4 July 2021.

1,527 responses to the questionnaire were received during the consultation period and this report provides a summary of the feedback received.

Background/ context:

In 2010, a borough-wide Designated Public Place Order (DPPO) was introduced in Hackney. The purpose of the DPPO was to ensure that the consumption of alcohol in a public place did not cause disorder, nuisance or annoyance to members of the public. This DPPO automatically transitioned into a Public Space Protection Order in 2014 on 20 October 2017.

As PSPOs can only last for a maximum period of three years the transitioned PSPO expired in October 2020.

New public space protection order

The Council is now proposing to introduce a new PSPO, which would give the police and authorised officers of the Council borough- wide authority to confiscate alcohol from a minority of drinkers whose excessive drinking causes problems for others in public spaces.

To tackle long-standing anti-social behaviour and to help ensure it remains a place for everyone, the Council is also proposing to introduce a new PSPO which will include a ban on drinking alcohol in London Fields park.

Previous consultation and engagement:

The Council undertook a consultation exercise in September and October 2020 to gauge support on having a PSPO in place, it asked whether residents were concerned about ASB associated with street drinking, whether they had witnessed and how often they witnessed this behaviour and the type of behaviour witnessed that had occurred. The Council also asked if the current (transitioned) PSPO had a negative impact on people and the effectiveness of the PSPO. The consultation lasted for six weeks from 15th September 2020 to 30th October 2020. For further information on the consultation feedback, please refer to the [consultation report](#).

We also carried out a targeted engagement exercise called the “London Fields Conversation”, from September to November last year. The targeted engagement exercise sought to understand the ASB issues local residents have experienced in and around the park and how they thought those ASB issues should be addressed. For further information about the conversation please refer to the [consultation report](#) .

Consultation & Engagement Approach

The consultation summary explaining the purpose of the consultation and online questionnaire was included on the Council's online consultation platform, citizen space:

<https://consultation.hackney.gov.uk/> and <https://hackney.gov.uk/alcohol-asb>

Consultees were able to request paper copies of the consultation pack (summary, questionnaire by calling the switchboard and a member of the Enforcement team posted a copy of the consultation pack to them.

We used a variety of channels across the borough to promote the consultation, which included:

- Promoting the consultation in the Council's free publication Hackney Life, in the [May edition \(page 17\)](#). Hackney Life is published 8 times a year and copies are distributed to all households and businesses in the borough. It is also available through self-service points across the borough.
- An A4 leaflet distributed to **6,539** households and businesses in the London Fields Ward in the same week that the consultation launched. Given that the proposal includes a ban on the consumption of alcohol in London Fields, this ensured that all residents and businesses near London Fields park were aware of the proposals.
- **More than 7,500** letters were also sent to landowners in the borough, encouraging them to respond to the consultation.
- Information in the Council Parks' e-newsletter, which are sent to parks user groups across the borough.
- Signposted the consultation to the London Fields User Group, ensuring that members were aware of the consultation and could take part.
- Promoting the consultation through the Hackney Council for Voluntary Sector e-bulletin sent out to community, voluntary and faith groups in the borough.
- Promoting the consultation to residents' groups and TRAs via the Resident Participation Team email bulletin.
- Promoting the consultation to the Council's online citizens' panel, Hackney Matters
- London Fields Primary School and Gayhurst Primary School being informed about the consultation through emails sent to the Headteachers.
- To ensure that young people were aware of the consultation, the consultation was signposted to contacts in Young Hackney, Hackney Quest and the coordinator of the Young Future's Commission.
- Emails were sent to the Metropolitan Police borough commander for Hackney and neighbouring boroughs Islington, Haringey, Tower Hamlets, City and Waltham Forest.
- Targeted social media promotion of the consultation through Facebook, Twitter and Instagram

Executive summary

The executive summary on page 4 to 5 provides a synopsis of the 1,527 responses to the consultation questionnaire.

The consultation was live for 6 weeks from 24 May to 4 July 2021.

Respondent profile:

- The majority of respondents stated that they were “a Hackney resident” (85%). All others accounted for a very small proportion of respondents.
- More than half of the respondents were from the “E8” postcode area (52%). This was followed by smaller respondent profiles from across the other postcode areas “N16” (9%), “E2” (8%) and “E9”, “N1” and “E5” (7% respectively).

Summary feedback:

Boroughwide PSPO

- More than half of the respondents (56%) indicated that they were “not concerned” about anti-social behaviour resulting from street drinking . However, 31% indicated that they were “concerned”, with 13% ambivalent about the issue, indicating that there were “neither concerned nor unconcerned”
 - Of the proportion of residents that identified themselves as living in “E8”, (787), nearly 4 in every 10 respondents (37%) indicated that they were concerned about antisocial behaviour resulting from street drinking.
- More than 60% of respondents stated that they hadn’t witnessed anti-social behaviour as a result of street drinking over the last year, whilst 40% of respondents stated that they had witnessed it.
 - Of those who’d stated that they’d witnessed alcohol related ASB in public spaces: . 38% stated that they’d witnessed anti-social behaviour related to street drinking in public spaces, “more than 10 times”, 24% “1 - 2 times”, 21% “3 - 4 times” and 17% “5 - 10” times, over the last year.
- When asked to indicate the types of antisocial behaviour they’ve witnessed, the types of ASB most often cited were: litter (25%), public urination (23%), noise (22%) and verbal abuse (14%). The other types of ASB garnered slightly lower levels of responses.
 - Half of the respondents indicated that the ASB they’d witnessed had a persistent and detrimental impact on their quality of life, whilst 42% of the respondents indicated that it hadn’t had a persistent or continuing detrimental impact on their quality of life.
 - A higher proportion of older respondents felt that the antisocial behaviour they’d witnessed had a persistent or continuing detrimental effect on their quality of life. 62% of respondents aged 45 to 54, 66% of respondents aged 55 to 64 and 61% of respondents aged 65 to 74.
- The same percentage of respondents **supported (48%) and opposed (48%) the proposal which allows authorised and council officers to confiscate alcohol** from those that are engaged in antisocial behaviour, whilst 3% chose “don’t know”.

- A higher proportion of older respondents support the proposed PSPO, which allows authorised police and council officers to confiscate alcohol from those that are engaged in anti-social behaviour. 75% of those aged 65 - 74, 63% aged 55 to 64 and 66% of respondents aged 45 to 54. In contrast a higher proportion of the younger cohort were against the proposal, 72% aged 18 - 24 and 64% aged 25 - 34.


London Fields proposed alcohol ban

- Nearly six in every ten respondents, 59%, indicated that they weren't concerned about anti-social behaviour in and around London Fields, whilst 29% stated that they were concerned, with 12% neither concerned nor unconcerned.
 - Of the proportion of residents that identified themselves as living in "E8", 66% were concerned about antisocial behaviour in and around London Fields, whilst 47% weren't concerned and 44% were ambivalent about the issue, choosing "neither concerned nor unconcerned"
 - A higher proportion of "male" respondents were unconcerned about ASB in and around London Fields, 64%, compared to 55% of "female" respondents.
 - A higher proportion of older respondents were concerned about the ASB they'd witnessed in and around London Fields. 60% of respondents aged 65 to 74, 59% of respondents aged 55 to 64.
- Of the respondents who were concerned about ASB, 82%, indicated that the anti-social behaviour they'd witnessed was connected to street drinking (namely alcohol consumption in public spaces).
- **77%** of the respondents **didn't support the proposal to ban the consumption of alcohol in London Fields park**, whilst 20% were supportive of the proposal
- More than 80% of male respondents (81%), oppose the proposal to ban the consumption of alcohol in London Fields park, compared to 73% of female respondents oppose the proposal.
- A higher proportion of **younger respondents are against the proposal** to ban the consumption of alcohol in London Fields (72%), 25-34 (64%). In contrast the **older cohort were more supportive** of the proposal, 65-74 (75%), 55 - 64 (63%) and 45 - 54 (66%).

Overview of results


Respondent profile:

Are you: (Base 1582)




The majority of respondents stated that they were “a Hackney resident” (85%). All others accounted for a very small proportion of respondents.

Where do you live or where is your business located? (this information will help us to better understand the views of Hackney residents and businesses) (Base: 1502)




More than half of the respondents were from the “E8” postcode area (52%). This was followed by smaller respondent profiles from across the other postcode areas “N16” (9%), “E2” (8%) and “E9”, “N1” and “E5” (7% respectively).

How concerned are you about anti-social behaviour resulting from street drinking (i.e. drinking in public places)? (Base 1527)



More than half of the respondents (56%) indicated that they were “not concerned” about anti-social behaviour resulting from street drinking . However, 31% indicated that they were “concerned”, with 13% ambivalent about the issue, indicating that there were “neither concerned nor unconcerned”

"How concerned are you about anti-social behaviour resulting from street drinking (i.e. drinking in public places)?" vs Postcode (Base 1502)




We analysed this question by looking at the postcodes provided by the respondents.

The London Fields ward contains postcodes beginning with E8, thus the responses that identified an “E8” postcode is indicative of residents within the London Fields ward.


Of the proportion of residents that identified themselves as living in “E8”, (787), more than 50% weren’t concerned about antisocial behaviour resulting from street drinking, whilst 37% indicated that they were concerned.

Have you witnessed anti-social behaviour that you believe was a result of street drinking (i.e. drinking in public places) in Hackney over the last year? (Base 1527)



More than 60% of respondents stated that they hadn’t witnessed anti-social behaviour as a result of street drinking over the last year, whilst 40% of respondents stated that they had witnessed it.


If YES, how often have you witnessed this in the last year? (Base 614)



Respondents to the previous question who’d stated that they’d witnessed alcohol related ASB in public spaces were asked to indicate how often they’d witnessed it over the last year. 38% of the


respondents stated that they'd witnessed anti-social behaviour related to street drinking in public spaces, "more than 10 times", 24% "1 - 2 times", 21% "3 - 4 times" and 17% "5 - 10" times, over the last year.

**What types of anti-social behaviour have you witnessed? (tick all that apply)
Base (2214)**



When asked to indicate the types of antisocial behaviour they've witnessed, the types of ASB most often cited were: litter (25%), public urination (23%), noise (22%) and verbal abuse (14%). The other types of ASB garnered slightly lower levels of responses.


Has the anti-social behaviour you have witnessed had a persistent or continuing detrimental effect on your quality of life? (Base 608)



Half of the respondents indicated that the ASB they'd witnessed had a persistent and detrimental impact on their quality of life, whilst 42% of the respondents indicated that it hadn't had a persistent or continuing detrimental impact on their quality of life.

Analysis by Gender


"Has the anti-social behaviour you have witnessed had a persistent or continuing detrimental effect on your quality of life?" vs Gender (583)



As the graph above shows, a higher proportion of the respondents who identified as “female” stated that the antisocial behaviour they'd witnessed had a persistent or continuing detrimental effect on their quality of life. 54% of female respondents in comparison to 46% of male respondents.

Analysis by Age


"Has the anti-social behaviour you have witnessed had a persistent or continuing detrimental effect on your quality of life?" vs Age Group (Base 592)



A higher proportion of older respondents felt that the antisocial behaviour they'd witnessed had a persistent or continuing detrimental effect on their quality of life.


62% of respondents aged 45 to 54, 66% of respondents aged 55 to 64 and 61% of respondents aged 65 to 74.

Analysis by Disability status



63% of the respondents with a disability felt that the ASB they'd witnessed had a detrimental impact on their quality of life. However this has to be treated with caution due to the smaller sample size (40 respondents).


How concerned are you about anti-social behaviour in and around London Fields? (Base 1523)



Nearly six in every ten respondents, 59%, indicated that they weren't concerned about anti-social behaviour in and around London Fields, whilst 29% stated that they were concerned, with 12% neither concerned nor unconcerned.

Analysis by postcode

"How concerned are you about anti-social behaviour in and around London Fields?" vs Postcode (Base 1498)




The London Fields ward contains postcodes beginning with E8, thus the responses that identified an “E8” postcode is indicative of residents within the London Fields ward.

Of the proportion of residents that identified themselves as living in “E8”, 37% were concerned about antisocial behaviour in and around London Fields, whilst 53% weren’t concerned and 10% were ambivalent about the issue, choosing “neither concerned nor unconcerned”

Are you a Hackney resident analysis

"How concerned are you about anti-social behaviour in and around London Fields?" vs "Are you a:" - HACKNEY RESIDENT ONLY (Base 1340)




Legend: (407) Concerned (red), (151) Neither concerned nor unconcerned (orange), (782) Not concerned (green)

We analysed this question by looking at those that indicated they were residents. 58% indicated that they weren’t concerned about ASB in and around London Fields.

Analysis by Gender


"How concerned are you about anti-social behaviour in and around London Fields?" vs Gender (1465)



A higher proportion of “male” respondents were unconcerned about ASB in and around London Fields, 64%, compared to 55% of “female” respondents.

Analysis by age


"How concerned are you about anti-social behaviour in and around London Fields?" vs Age group (Base 1493)



As the graph shows, a higher proportion of older respondents were concerned about the ASB they’d witnessed in and around London Fields. 60% of respondents aged 65 to 74, 59% of respondents aged 55 to 64. Please note that the 75 - 84 age group hasn’t been referenced due to the very small sample size.


Do you think the anti-social behaviour is connected to street drinking (namely alcohol consumption in public spaces)?(Base 448)

Respondents that answered “very concerned” or “concerned” to the previous question were asked whether they thought the anti-social behaviour is connected to street drinking (namely alcohol consumption in public spaces).



82% of the respondents indicated that the anti-social behaviour they'd witnessed was connected to street drinking (namely alcohol consumption in public spaces).


Do you support the proposed PSPO, which allows authorised police and council officers to confiscate alcohol from those that are engaged in anti-social behaviour? (Base 1521)



As the graph shows, the same percentage of respondents supported and opposed the proposal which allows authorised and council officers to confiscate alcohol from those that are engaged in antisocial behaviour. 3% of respondents stated “don't know” to this question.

Analysis by gender


"Do you support - Powers that allow authorised police and council officers to confiscate alcohol from those that are engaged in anti-social behaviour?" vs Gender (Base 1465)



As the graph shows, a slightly higher proportion of female respondents (50%), support the proposal that allows authorised council or police officers to confiscate alcohol from those engaged in ASB, compared to 47% that don't support the proposal. In contrast, a slightly higher proportion of male respondents (50%), don't support the proposal that allows authorised council or police officers to confiscate alcohol from those engaged in ASB, whilst 48% support the proposal.

Analysis by age


"Do you support - Powers that allow authorised police and council officers to confiscate alcohol from those that are engaged in anti-social behaviour?" vs Age group (Base 1491)



As the graph shows, a higher proportion of older respondents support the proposed PSPO, which allows authorised police and council officers to confiscate alcohol from those that are engaged in anti-social behaviour. 75% of those aged 65 - 74, 63% aged 55 to 64 and 66% of respondents aged 45 to 54. In contrast a higher proportion of the younger cohort were against the proposal, 72% aged 18 - 24 and 64% aged 25 - 34.

Disability analysis


"Do you support - Powers that allow authorised police and council officers to confiscate alcohol from those that are engaged in anti-social behaviour?" vs Disability (Base 1465)



52% of the respondents with a disability support the proposed PSPO, which allows authorised police and council officers to confiscate alcohol from those that are engaged in anti-social behaviour, compared to 44% that don't.

Ethnicity analysis


"Do you support - Powers that allow authorised police and council officers to confiscate alcohol from those that are engaged in anti-social behaviour?" vs Ethnicity (Base 1446)



As the graph above shows, there is a similar level of support and opposition to the proposal to allow authorised police and council officers to confiscate alcohol from those that are engaged in anti-social behaviour, (50%), across the different ethnicity groups.

Analysis by religion


"Do you support - Powers that allow authorised police and council officers to confiscate alcohol from those that are engaged in anti-social behaviour?" vs Religion (Base 1371)



There is a greater level of support for the proposal amongst respondents who identified as: Buddhist (59%), Christian (50%) and Charedi - 50% (however this should be treated with caution due to the very small sample size).


Analysis by sexual orientation

"Do you support - Powers that allow authorised police and council officers to confiscate alcohol from those that are engaged in anti-social behaviour?" vs Sexual orientation (Base 1317)



53% of heterosexual respondents support the proposal, in comparison to 45% that don't. However, there is a significant level of opposition to the proposal by "bisexual", "Gayman" and "lesbian/ Gay women".


Do you support the proposed PSPO, which includes the ban on alcohol consumption in London Fields park? (Base 1516)



77% of the respondents indicated that they didn't support the proposal to ban the consumption of alcohol in London Fields park, whilst 20% were supportive of the proposal

Analysis by gender


"Do you support - Ban on the consumption of alcohol in London Fields park, which means that it will be illegal to drink alcohol whilst in the park?" vs Gender (Base 1460)



As the graph shows, more than 80% of male respondents (82%), oppose the proposal to ban the consumption of alcohol in London Fields park and 73% of female respondents oppose the proposal.

Analysis by age


"Do you support - Ban on the consumption of alcohol in London Fields park, which means that it will be illegal to drink alcohol whilst in the park?" vs Age group (Base 1486)



A higher proportion of **younger respondents are against the proposal** to ban the consumption of alcohol in London Fields (72%), 25-34 (64%). In contrast the **older cohort were more supportive** of the proposal, 65-74 (75%), 55 - 64 (63%) and 45 - 54 (66%).

Analysis by disability


"Do you support - Ban on the consumption of alcohol in London Fields park, which means that it will be illegal to drink alcohol whilst in the park?" vs Disability (Base 1460)



As the graph shows, respondents were generally against the proposal irrespective of their disability status.

Analysis by Ethnicity


"Do you support - Ban on the consumption of alcohol in London Fields park, which means that it will be illegal to drink alcohol whilst in the park?" vs Ethnicity (Base 1442)



There is opposition to the proposal to ban the consumption of alcohol in London Fields park across the different ethnicity groups. However, there is a slightly lower level of opposition from Black and Black British residents, but this should be treated with caution due to the small sample size.

Analysis by religion


"Do you support - Ban on the consumption of alcohol in London Fields park, which means that it will be illegal to drink alcohol whilst in the park?" vs Religion (Base 1371)



As the graph shows, there is significant opposition to the proposal by respondents of different religious persuasions, the highest amongst 83% of those with “secular beliefs” and 82% with “Atheist/ no religious beliefs”. There is support from “Charedi” respondents, but this should be treated with caution due to the very small sample size.

Analysis by sexual orientation

"Has the anti-social behaviour you have witnessed had a persistent or continuing detrimental effect on your quality of life?" vs Sexual orientation (Base 1309)




As the graph shows, the majority of respondents, irrespective of their sexual orientation, were opposed to the proposal to ban the consumption of alcohol in London Fields.

Have you got any comments on the Council's current approach for dealing with anti-social behaviour associated with drinking in public spaces?

Key theme	Count
Penalises responsible drinkers and everyday users/locals (e.g. Families and friends having picnics)/people who do not have outdoor spaces	244
Against the alcohol ban in London Fields/ Not witnessed very much ASB/majority of park users aren't the problem/ groups who are the problem/enforce current rules/ will impact the homeless street drinkers who don't cause ASB	207
London Fields alcohol ban is extreme and draconian/Bad for local community/ infringement on civil liberties/penalising those without gardens/ Giving more powers to police likely to lead to minority groups being disproportionately targeted/disproportionate impact on the young and those from deprived backgrounds without access to gardens	180
Provide more toilets/bins/ toilets closing early/ situation improved with new toilets opening/ toilets closed during strict lockdown in early 2020 caused the problems	151
More police/council officers/wardens presence/ Enforce existing PSPO powers - confiscating alcohol rather than outright ban	120
Support the proposed alcohol ban/ More needs to be done to stop the ASB in and around the London Fields Park and neighbouring streets	100
Other problem hotspots not being dealt with/will move problem to other areas e.g. Haggerston Park, Hackney Downs	74
Antisocial behaviour exacerbated due to covid lockdown - no toilets open - pubs, bars, restaurants closed, so local off licenses was the only place to get alcohol/ Do to lockdown parks were the places people were encouraged to meet others	43
Against - impact on local business	27
	19
Broadway Market/ Off licences - big part of the problem	
Problems in LF a direct result of licensing/NTE policy - too many licensed premises opening in a residential area	9
Shorter testing period than 3 years	7
Pub in the park/Cat & Mutton - Using park as additional outdoor space/ Pubs selling take away alcohol during lockdown in 2020 whilst with toilets closed	7
Problems can be addressed through education, comms and signage	7
Other issues that need to be addressed in the park - muggings, drugs, gang crime, etc	7
other areas of the borough need to also be considered for this kind of ban	5

About you


Gender (Base 1468)



53% of the respondents were male and 47% female. This is broadly similar to the borough profile, where 50% of residents are male and 50% female ¹


Age group (Base 1496)

¹ [Source: ONS 2017 Mid-Year Estimates, ONS, June 2018](#)




As the graph shows, the highest percentage of respondents were in the 25-34 age group (41%), followed by 35-44 (29%),

Disability (Base 1469)




The majority of respondents indicated that they did not have a disability (94%), with just 6% indicating that they did.

Ethnicity (Base 1451)




The majority of respondents stated that they were of “White or White British” ethnicity (81%). All others accounted for a much smaller percentage.

Religion (Base 1376)



The majority of respondents stated that they were “Atheist/no religious belief” (73%) followed by “Christian” (17%) with all others accounting for a much smaller percentage.

Sexual orientation (Base 1317)



As the graph shows, the majority of respondents stated that they were “heterosexual” (77%). All others accounted for a much smaller percentage.

Conclusion

More than 1,520 respondents took part in this consultation, for 6 weeks from 24 May to 4 July. The majority of respondents were Hackney residents (85%), with more than half from the “E8” postcode area.

More than half of the respondents (56%) were “not concerned” about anti-social behaviour resulting from street drinking . However, 31% indicated that they were “concerned”, with 13% ambivalent about the issue, indicating that there were “neither concerned nor unconcerned”

More than 60% of the respondents stated that they hadn’t witnessed anti-social behaviour as a result of street drinking over the last year, whilst 40% of respondents stated that they had witnessed it. Of those that had witnessed ASB, the types of ASB most often cited were: litter (25%), public urination (23%), noise (22%) and verbal abuse (14%). f respondents aged 55 to 64 and 61% of respondents aged 65 to 74.

Boroughwide PSPO

The same percentage of respondents **supported (48%)and opposed (48%) the proposal which allows authorised and council officers to confiscate alcohol** from those that are engaged in antisocial behaviour, whilst 3% chose “don’t know”. There is greater support from the older cohort, with a higher proportion of the younger cohort against the boroughwide PSPO.

London Fields park - proposed alcohol consumption ban

Nearly six in every ten respondents, 59%, **weren’t concerned** about anti-social behaviour in and around London Fields, whilst 29% stated that they were concerned, with 12% neither concerned nor unconcerned. Of the proportion of residents that identified themselves as living in “E8”,66% were concerned about antisocial behaviour in and around London Fields, whilst 47% weren’t concerned and 44% were ambivalent about the issue, choosing “neither concerned nor unconcerned” A higher proportion of older respondents were concerned about the ASB they’d witnessed in and around London Fields. 60% of respondents aged 65 to 74, 59% of respondents aged 55 to 64.

77% of the respondents didn’t support the proposal to ban the consumption of alcohol in London Fields park, whilst 20% were supportive of the proposal A higher proportion of **younger respondents are against the proposal** to ban the consumption of alcohol in London Fields (72%), 25-34 (64%). In contrast the **older cohort were more supportive** of the proposal, 65-74 (75%), 55 - 64 (63%) and 45 - 54 (66%).

Respondents had the opportunity to provide comments on the Council’s current approach for dealing with anti-social behaviour associated with drinking in public spaces. More than 800 responses were received to this question, the majority of which related to the proposed ban on the consumption of alcohol in London Fields park.

The majority of respondents felt that a blanket ban on alcohol consumption in London Fields park is unfair as it penalises those that are behaving appropriately and simply socialising with their friends and family. They also alluded to the fact that the proposed ban would have a disproportionate impact on those without gardens, in effect those from lower socio-economic backgrounds and young adults.

Respondents acknowledge that there are instances of ASB in London Fields park, however the proposed alcohol ban is seen as too draconian an approach to deal with it. Residents made suggestions such as provision of more bins and toilet facilities, helping to deal with the issue whilst allowing the public to enjoy the park.

Some respondents alluded to the fact that the ASB problem was exacerbated due to the strict lockdown which meant that restaurants and pubs were closed, hence more people used the park to socialise and drink with friends. Respondents felt that the situation improved as more people started socialising in bars, pubs and restaurants as they reopened.