

Cabinet
22 September 2026
Public Space Protection Order Renewal –
Nuisance Vehicles

Portfolio Holder: Councillor Alex Paterson, Portfolio Holder for Community Safety, Highways and Enforcement

Report from: Adam Bryan, Director of Place

Author: Neil Howlett, Community Safety Partnership Manager

Summary

Public Spaces Protection Orders ('PSPOs') were introduced by section 59 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (this section came into force on 20 October 2014). PSPOs are an order created in relation to areas within the local authority's jurisdiction, where activities are taking place that are, or are likely to be, detrimental to the local community's quality of life. PSPOs impose conditions or restrictions on people within that area. A Breach of a PSPO is an offence punishable by a fixed penalty notice and/or prosecution in the Magistrates Court.

This report covers the outcomes of the public consultations carried out seeking views on the introduction of a Medway wide PSPO to address anti-social behaviour (ASB) from vehicles.

The report was previously considered by the Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 13 August 2026, the minutes of which are set out at section 9 of this report.

1. Recommendations

- 1.1. The Cabinet is recommended to note the comments and the recommendation to Cabinet, of the Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee, as set out in section 9 of the report.
- 1.2. The Cabinet is asked to recommend to Full Council, to approve the renewal of the Medway wide Public Space Protection Order to tackle nuisance vehicles and any variations, in accordance with s59 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.
- 1.2. The Cabinet is asked to note that the renewal of the Public Space Protection Order should help to continue to significantly reduce incidents of vehicle

related anti-social behaviour across Medway over the long-term and improve the quality of life for residents, visitors and local businesses.

2. Suggested reasons for decisions

- 2.1 The extension of the PSPOs should help to significantly reduce incidents of relevant anti-social behaviour (ASB) in the areas over the long-term and improve the quality of life for residents, visitors and local businesses.

3. Budget and policy Framework

- 3.1 The approval to renew the Medway wide PSPO to tackle nuisance vehicles and any variations, in accordance with s59 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, is a matter for full Council to decide.

4. Background

- 4.1 One of the key powers of interest to the Council, partners and the community is the Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO). PSPOs are designed to deal with a particular nuisance or problem in an area by placing conditions on the use of the area and for those that do not comply.
- 4.2 On 20 October 2014, the Government implemented most of the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014 ("the Act"). The purpose of the Act is to give local authorities and others more effective powers to tackle anti-social behaviour (ASB), providing better protection for victims and communities.
- 4.3 Amongst these tools and powers are PSPOs, which are designed to control the use of public spaces. It is for each individual Council to determine what behaviour(s) they want to make the subject of a PSPO.
- 4.4 PSPOs provide Councils with a flexible power to implement local restrictions to address a range of anti-social behaviour issues in public places in order to prevent future problems. An Order should help to significantly reduce incidents of relevant ASB in the area over the long-term and improve the quality of life for residents, visitors and local businesses.
- 4.5 Local authorities can make an order as long as two conditions are met:

First condition:

- activities carried out in a public space within the local authority's area have had a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality; or
- it is likely that activities will be carried out in a public place within the area that will have such an effect.

Second condition:

The effect or likely effect of the activities:

- is, or is likely to be, of a persistent or continuing nature;
 - is, or is likely to be, such as to make activities unreasonable; and
 - justifies the restrictions imposed by the notice.
- 4.6 A number of Local Authorities across England and Wales have introduced Public Spaces Protection Orders. However, one of the key challenges has come from human rights campaigners who argue that these types of controls impact disproportionately on protected rights. These include Article 8 - the right to a private and family life, Article 10 - the right to freedom of expression and Article 11 – the freedom of assembly and association.
- 4.7 Any prohibition or requirement must be reasonable in order to prevent the detrimental effect from occurring or reoccurring or must reduce the detrimental effect or reduce the risk of its occurrence, reoccurrence or continuance.
- 4.8 PSPOs can be made for a maximum of three years. The legislation provides that they can be extended at the end of the period, (if the authority is satisfied on reasonable grounds that it is necessary for various reasons), but only for a further period of up to three years. However, orders can be extended more than once. Local authorities can increase or reduce the restricted area of an existing order, amend or remove a prohibition or requirement, or add a new prohibition or requirement. They can also discharge an order, but further consultation must take place for varying or discharging orders.
- 4.9 Before making the order, the local authority must notify potentially affected people of the proposed order, inform those persons of how they can see a copy of the proposed order, notify them of how long they have to make representation, and consider any representations made.
- 4.10 Any interested person can challenge the validity of a Public Space Protection Order in the High Court, but the challenge must be made within six weeks of the making of the Order. An ‘interested person’ means an individual who lives in the restricted area or who regularly works in or visits that area.
- 4.11 As a Council, we are determined to tackle ASB, the tools and powers contained within the Act have helped us to develop our joint work alongside Kent Police. Over the past 18 months the council has seen an increase in complaints related to nuisance vehicles, on the road and off road. This has precipitated consideration of the powers currently available to police and the council to address the issues that these vehicles cause.
- 4.12 Kent Police continue to receive repeated complaints from residents, visitors and local businesses across Medway about unreasonable ASB from nuisance vehicles, both on road and off road. This includes but is not limited to:
- Hoath Way, Gillingham.
 - Hempstead Valley.
 - Ratcliffe Highway, Isle of Grain.
 - Strood Retail Park.

- Ito Way, Gillingham.
 - Strood.
 - Lower Rainham Road.
 - Rochester High Street.
 - A228 Halling.
- 4.13 Complaints show that reported ASB has a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those living in or using certain areas, reducing their ability to feel safe in, use or enjoy public spaces.
- 4.14 This PSPO will continue to seek to control the anti-social use of motor vehicles, some of these behaviours include, but not limited to:
- Speeding.
 - Off road.
 - Driving in convoy.
 - Racing.
 - Performing stunts.
 - Sounding horns (as to cause public nuisance).
 - Revving engines.
 - Wheel spins.
 - Playing music (as to cause public nuisance).
 - Creating significant public nuisance.
 - Engaging in any other activity that a reasonable person would consider to be “car cruising”.
- 4.15 Kent Police are increasingly using their powers conferred in Section 59 of the Police and Reform Act 2002 to address the issue in the form of careless or inconsiderate driving. These powers allow an officer to seize and remove a vehicle that he or she believes is being driven inconsiderately or carelessly and is causing, or is likely to cause, alarm, distress or annoyance to members of the public. However, the police cannot seize a vehicle under this provision without first warning the driver that the vehicle will be seized if the driving persists. There are also practical challenges to seizure of vehicles, as Police will have to plan additional resources to do this, which isn’t always available. The powers relating to S.59 have recently changed and we are still awaiting direction from the College of Policing.
- 4.16 Intelligence over the years has identified hotspot areas where this behaviour is most prevalent with a notable increase in activity over the Spring and Summer months. Enforcement is carried out by Kent Police and Medway Council who have issued a total of 234 Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) since the PSPO was introduced. The work done by the Community Safety Team and the Special Constabulary really drives this area of business.
- 4.17 Kent Police confirmed that the PSPO is an essential partnership tool in targeting nuisance vehicles. Across all wards in Medway, nuisance vehicles is within the top three priorities set by the public, joint patrolling and enforcement is underpinned by the ability to issue FPNs to those who disturb the community of Medway.

- 4.18 Partner operations will continue be planned at the joint weekly tasking meeting with Kent Police to respond to any emerging hotspots. The PSPO will also provide improved powers to the police to intervene in a more timely and effective manner. The level of activity will be delivered within available resources.
- 4.19 This report sets out the rationale for renewing the existing Medway-wide PSPO in relation to nuisance vehicles. This order would cover the whole of Medway.

5. Options

- 5.1 We have consulted upon renewing the PSPO which covers all of Medway whose driving habits create a nuisance to the local community and environment, affecting the quality of life of both residents and those working in Medway.
- 5.2 Historically local authorities could designate by order, a Designated Public Place Order (DPPO) in any public place within their area if they were satisfied that nuisance, annoyance or disorder was taking place. The first were introduced in Rochester in 2003, followed by Chatham, Gillingham and Strood and addressed the anti-social consumption of alcohol. These were commonly known as 'Alcohol Control Zones'. These automatically became PSPOs in 2017 under the Act.
- 5.3 Home Office statutory guidance (see appendix 1) states that before extending (as well as introducing, varying or discharging a PSPO) there are requirements under the Act regarding consultation. Local authorities are obliged to consult with the local chief officer of police; the police and crime commissioner; owners or occupiers of land within the affected area where reasonably practicable, and appropriate community representatives. Any parish or community councils (for example PACTs) that are in the proposed area covered by the PSPO must be notified.
- 5.4 Any Order must identify and publicise (e.g., on social media and through the provision of public signage in the designated areas) the public space as a 'restricted area' and must prohibit specified activities being carried out in the restricted area (prohibitions) or require specified things to be done by persons carrying out specific activities in that area (requirements), or both.
- 5.5 The orders have the power to fine people up to £500 – failure to comply could lead to arrest.
- 5.6 Kent Police will continue to patrol and respond to incidents as part of their community response. However, the Council have delegated powers to the Community Safety Team that already work in Medway which enables them to enforce the new PSPO.

- 5.7 Signs are already located in designated areas to signify that there is a PSPO in operation.
- 5.8 It is proposed that the PSPO will be refreshed for 15 October 2026 subject to Council approval.

6. Advice and analysis

- 6.1 PSPOs have been an agenda item at the Strategic Executive Group of the Community Safety Partnership, which is chaired by the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Enforcement, as well as representation from the responsible authorities, Kent Police, Kent Fire and Rescue Service, The Probation Service and the Integrated Care Board. The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, although not a responsible authority is also represented.
- 6.2 A Diversity Impact Assessment (DIA) will not be required as this report does not recommend any policy/service change.

7. Risk management

- 7.1 There are reputational, environmental, economic and legal risks to the Council for not pro-actively pursuing an extension of our existing PSPOs.

Risk	Description	Action to avoid or mitigate risk	Risk rating
We do not consult	Risk of legal challenge	Ensure full consultation is carried out as per guidance	D2
We do not enforce	ASB returns to the areas controlled and extends areas which incorporate new housing developments. Reputational risk. Increased pressure on service complaints	Ensure Medway Council Officers are supported by Senior Management and by Kent Police.	D2

For risk rating, please refer to the following table:

Likelihood	Impact:
A Very likely	1 Critical
B Likely	2 Major
C Unlikely	3 Moderate
D Rare	4 Minor

8. Consultation

- 8.1 In accordance with legislative requirements, a six-week consultation process relating to the potential use of a PSPO for such purposes was carried out. The

details of the consultation were published on the council's website in accordance with the legal guidance under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. The consultation was shared through the council's website. The consultation questionnaires were sent directly to all Members to raise awareness in all respective wards. The Police and Crime Commissioner and Borough Commander for Kent Police in Medway was consulted and endorsed the scope of the PSPO proposed by the Council.

- 8.2 Prohibitive behaviour from drivers or passengers of a vehicle in Medway, including but not limited to: wolf-whistling, catcalling, sexualised comments or sounds, gestures of a sexual or intimidating nature where that behaviour is likely to cause harassment, alarm, or distress to any person in the public space was considered for this renewal, however advice from the Medway Commander for Kent Police and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner is that these issues are now covered by Section 4b of the Public Order Act 1986. This legislation carries an increased sentencing powers of up to two years and is specifically aimed at preventing sex-based harassment in public places.
- 8.3 Cycles, scooters, e-bikes and e-scooters in pedestrianised/public areas where riding is likely to cause harassment, alarm, distress, nuisance, or risk to the safety of others - the Medway Commander for Kent Police and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner advised that they have and remain vocal opponents of illegal e-bikes and e-scooters and wholeheartedly support any action to prevent the use of these vehicles. They did however have concerns about the proposed enforcement using a PSPO. The use of these two forms of transport is also covered by primary legislation which, where permitted includes the power by police to seize these vehicles.
- 8.4 To advertise the consultation, a link to the consultation was put on the Council's website, this was also advertised on social media from the Public Protection social media accounts.
- 8.5 There was 875 respondents to the consultation. A wide broad section of age ranges responded with an even split of male/female responses. The headlines are:
 - 86% of respondents agree that there is need for the Nuisance Vehicle PSPO across Medway.
 - 90% of respondents agreeing that the PSPO should continue to cover the whole of Medway.
 - 92% of respondents either strongly agreeing or agreeing that the PSPO should be renewed.
 - 96% of respondents live in Medway.

9. Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

9.1 The report was considered by the Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 13 August 2026, the minutes of which are set out below.

9.2 **Discussion:**

The Strategic Head of Public Protection introduced the report which covered the outcomes of the public consultations carried out seeking views on the introduction of a midway wide Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) to address anti-social behaviour (ASB) from vehicles.

In response to questions the Strategic Head of Public Protection advised that as well as the Council's team of three it was a partnership with Kent Police and the work was mainly carried out by Special Constables who were volunteers. More resources would mean more could be done. Looking ahead, local government reorganisation could provide opportunities for a more coordinated approach across a wider geographical area.

With regard to locations such as Strood Retail Park, multiple tickets had been issued there. However, this was not about penalising reasonable behaviour, and the PSPO only applied when behaviour became detrimental to others. It was noted that most incidents were correctly reported directly to the Police. Only the Police had the right to stop people. Regarding electric bicycles, off-road motorcycles and other motorised vehicles being used irresponsibly in public spaces, some of these activities constituted criminal offences and therefore fell primarily within police enforcement powers rather than the scope of the PSPO. The Strategic Head of Public Protection advised that he would review information provided on the Council's website regarding nuisance bikes and vehicle-related antisocial behaviour. It was noted that, if the PSPO was renewed, signage would be refreshed across Medway and would include information on how residents could report concerns.

In terms of ANPR cameras, it was difficult to address the issue through cameras alone. Initially it might seem to achieve success, but the activity would simply move elsewhere, as Dartford had recently experienced, as much of the behaviour was mobile and transient. It was noted that fixed penalty notice payment rates were high.

Decision:

- a) The Committee agreed to recommend to Cabinet, to recommend to full Council, to approve the renewal of the midway wide public space protection order to tackle nuisance vehicles and any variations, in accordance with s59 of the anti-social behaviour, crime and policing act 2014.

- b) The Committee noted that the renewal of the public space protection order should help to continue to significantly reduce incidents of vehicle related anti-social behaviour across midway over the long-term and improve the quality of life for residents, visitors and local businesses.
- c) The Committee requested information on the percentage of fixed penalty notices that had been paid and the number of vehicles seized, and further details about a speed camera briefing.
- d) The Committee requested that the Cabinet consider allocating further resources to strengthen future enforcement activity.

10. Strategic Head of Public Protection Comments

- 10.1. With regards to the recommendation to Cabinet to consider allocating further resources to strengthen future enforcement activity, the request for additional resources will be considered as part of the Council's Medium Term Financial Planning process.

11. Climate change implications

- 11.1 There are neither positive nor negative climate change/carbon emission implications arising from the report.

12. Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) implications

- 12.1 Following the announcement of the pause on the 7 September 2026 officers will monitor the on-going situation and will consider any relevant impacts as they arise.

13 Financial implications

- 13.1 There is potential to generate some income from fines and prosecutions but there is no baseline to project this annually at this stage.

14. Legal implications

- 14.1 Under section 59 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (the Act), a local authority may make a PSPO in the areas where a particular nuisance or problem occurs which is detrimental to local community's quality of life. In order to issue a PSPO, the council must be satisfied on reasonable grounds that the two statutory conditions set out in s59 (2) and s59 (3) are met and that the restrictions are reasonable and proportionate.
- 14.2 Section 59 (2) of the 2014 Act states that the first condition is that:
 - (a) activities carried on in a public place within the authority's area have had a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality; or

- (b) it is likely that activities will be carried on in a public place within that area and that they will have such an effect.
- 14.3 Section 59(3) of the 2014 Act states that the second condition is that the effect, or likely effect, of the activities –
 - (a) is, or is likely to be, of a persistent or continuing nature;
 - (b) is, or is likely to be, such as to make the activities unreasonable; and
 - (c) justifies the restrictions imposed by the notice.
- 14.4 Section 59(5) of the 2014 Act provides that the only prohibitions or requirements that may be imposed are ones that are reasonable for the specified objectives of the PSPO that are:
 - (a) to prevent the “detrimental effect” referred to in section 59(2) of the 2014 Act from continuing, occurring, or recurring; or
 - (b) to reduce that detrimental effect or to reduce the risk of its continuance, occurrence, or recurrence.
- 14.5 The Home Office statutory guidance for frontline professionals (The Home Office Guidance) (pg. 48) states; “these orders can restrict what people can do and how they behave in public spaces. It is important that the restrictions imposed are focussed on specific behaviours and are proportionate to the detrimental effect that the behaviour is causing or can cause, and are necessary to prevent it from continuing, occurring, or recurring”.
- 14.6 Before deciding to make the PSPO, the council must comply with certain statutory requirements relating to publication, consultation, notification, and information in respect of the proposed PSPO in the relevant areas. In addition, the council will need to evidence that it has given regard to statutory guidance issued by the Secretary of State.
- 14.7 PSPOs, or their variation, may be challenged within six weeks of being made by way of an application to the High Court. The Court may suspend the operation of the PSPO or any of the prohibitions imposed by it until the determination of the proceedings. Should the Court be satisfied the council erred and the applicant has been substantially prejudiced by that failure, it may quash the Order or any of the prohibitions imposed by it.
- 14.8 Breach of a PSPO is a criminal offence, subject to a fixed penalty or prosecution and a fine.
- 14.9 Once approved, the PSPO must be published on the council website and notices erected publicising the fact that the PSPO has been made and its effect.

14.10 When considering the Human Rights Act the council must balance the rights and freedoms of individuals, in relation to the proposed restrictions imposed, against the needs of the wider community.

Lead officer contact

Neil Howlett, Community Safety Partnership Manager

Tel - 01634 331183

Email – neil.howlett@medway.gov.uk

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Statutory Guidance, The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014

Background papers

None