

Epsom and Ewell Council Approves Public Spaces Protection Order for Borough-Wide Expansion

6 March 2025



The Epsom and Ewell Borough Council’s Crime and Disorder Committee has voted to recommend the adoption of a borough-wide Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) following a public consultation that showed overwhelming community support.

The new PSPO, which will now be referred to Full Council for final approval, aims to tackle anti-social behaviour (ASB) by prohibiting a range of activities, including harassment, intimidation, verbal abuse, and alcohol consumption in public spaces after a warning from an authorised officer. The order also bans wearing face coverings, such as balaclavas, with the intent to commit ASB or crime, a measure police say will help deter group-related intimidation.

At the meeting, Public Protection Manager Oliver Nelson introduced the officers’ report, highlighting the strong public backing for the PSPO. He noted that 92% of respondents supported extending the order for three years, and 83% backed its expansion across the entire borough. “The consultation has given us a clear steer from residents,” he said. “We’ve slightly refined the prohibitions based on feedback, ensuring the PSPO is proportionate and enforceable.”

Police representatives, including Acting Inspector Tommy Pearson and Chief Inspector Kelly Clifton-Sinclair, attended the meeting in support of the proposal.

Lib Dem Councillor **James Lawrence** (College) expressed his support, citing the consultation results as key to his decision. “Over 200 people responded to the consultation, with 92% of respondents supporting an extension to the PSPO and 83% supporting it covering the entire borough. My fellow Lib Dem councillors and I are happy to uphold public opinion on this and support the PSPO as proposed,” he said.

However, some concerns were raised over the demographic spread of consultation responses. Councillor **Christine Howells** (RA Nonsuch) noted that only 2% of respondents were under the age of 24, questioning whether younger voices had been fully heard. In response, Committee Chair Councillor **Shanice Goldman (RA Nonsuch)** acknowledged the difficulty in securing wider engagement but highlighted outreach efforts to schools, faith groups, and youth charities, including Buddy Up, a mentoring programme for young people.

Councillor **Tony Froud** (RA Stoneleigh) sought clarification on the geographical scope of the PSPO, asking whether it applied to specific areas or the entire borough. Cllr Goldman confirmed that the order would be borough-wide, expanding upon previous PSPOs that only covered certain locations. “It’s about making sure enforcement is not limited to certain hotspots,” she explained.

The Committee also unanimously agreed to recommend a £100 fixed penalty for breaches (reduced to £80 if paid within 10 days). The PSPO will now go to Full Council for formal adoption, where it is expected to pass with broad support.

If approved, the borough-wide PSPO will be in place for three years, subject to review. Council officers have committed to a public awareness campaign, including new signage and social media outreach, to ensure residents are informed about the restrictions.

Sam Jones – Reporter

Image credits: Google and Tobias “ToMar” Maier Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0

Guildford Students protest against PSPOs

Surrey students have come out against a council’s draft rules about public spaces, saying they could be “detrimental” to local students. Under the proposed new rules, students could be banned from being in a group of two or more people in the town centre which could “cause harassment, alarm or distress” to other people.

Guildford town centre has public space protection orders (PSPO) aimed at tackling persistent anti-social behaviour affecting others. Introduced in 2022, the rules are now up for review. Boundaries for the PSPO cover the town centre, Stoke Park and some neighbouring residential roads, the Mount (residential area and green open space), including Black Cat Alley.

But students at the University of Surrey have attacked the draft regulations as “vague” and have said that they can be

“misinterpreted” in a way that can be harmful to students in Guildford.

Leading the cause, the Student Union’s President Liam White said in a statement: “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.”

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 for repeated breaches.

He argued the PSPO is not phrased in a way which prevents groups acting disorderly but instead relies purely on a member of the public claiming to be distressed or alarmed. Mr White claimed this is “unreasonable” to potentially penalise members of the public, including students, in the town centre.

A spokesperson for Guildford Borough Council said: “We appreciate everyone who has taken time to respond to the Town Centre Public Spaces Protection Order consultation. These were draft proposals and the purpose of the consultation was to encourage feedback.

“In response to our partners and consultees, including the Student Union, we have adapted the proposed restrictions. The revised draft restrictions will be presented to the Executive on 27 March 2025 for consideration.”

Other key concerns raised included how “rowdy and inconsiderate behaviour” could be defined by someone’s clothing. The draft proposals state: “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”.

The Student Union said 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,” members said.

Students also criticised the proposed public space rules against the “anti-social” use of bicycles, skateboards and scooters in pedestrian areas. They said some of Guildford’s community is already “resistant” to the Beryl Bikes scheme and extending the PSPO will “disincentivise people from using sustainable travel”.

Emily Dalton