

Report
Coding of open text responses for the 2019
Manchester City Council PSPO consultation

ZK Analytics &
NatCen Social Research

1. The context of the report

Manchester City Council implemented a consultation to understand the views of residents with regards to a city centre Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) to address a number of issues that are being reported to the Council and the police. After the issues were described to them, residents were asked a series of questions about their views on the particular behaviours and whether these had a detrimental impact on their quality of life. Open text boxes were provided to allow participants to provide examples of how each issue affected them.

In addition, for each issue, respondents were asked whether they think Manchester City Council should put the restrictions in place. Each question included an open text box inviting participants to provide other ways that they think the issue in question could be reduced.

In this consultation, there were twenty-three questions that gave respondents the opportunity of providing open-ended explanations. The purpose of this project was to code and classify respondents' open text answers into insightful categories.


This report contains the results of this coding pertaining to each of the twenty-three questions. When coding, based on the content of the text, each question was assigned to one or more categories. The following sections display graphs that illustrate the results. We present overall counts (numbers of suggestion offered) and percentages for each question overall. We also include the results split according to whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the proposed change.

2. Detrimental effects on the quality of life

2.1 Drinking alcohol in a public space

Has this (drinking alcohol in a non-licensed public space) had a detrimental effect on your quality of life? If yes, please tell us how you were affected.

Graph 1 – Responses split by how this behaviour has had a detrimental effect on respondents' quality of life



In *Section 3 - Alcohol*, members of the public were asked in a closed question whether or not 'drinking alcohol in a non-licensed public space' has had a detrimental effect on their quality of life. Those who answered 'Yes' were provided space to explain how this behaviour affected them. This resulted in 685 responses. Of these, 2% (16 responses) were **not codable or not relevant** (responses that were out of context, unintelligible or presented particular situations without actually addressing the issue under consultation).

Most notably:


- 31% (211 responses) mentioned **feeling unsafe**, and
- 11% (72 responses) said it **changed the behaviour of the respondent**.
- 7% (45 responses) mentioned the behaviour occurring in a **particular location**, a further 6% (41 responses) explained how it caused **noise disturbance**, and another 7% (45 responses) said it was **a nuisance or annoyance**.
- 5% (32 responses) explained how it was a **problem for women or children**, and
- 4% (29 responses) mentioned examples of **verbal abuse**.

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

In addition, as seen in Graph 1, there were other responses that were cited less frequently. These include responses mentioning that the behaviour occurred at a **particular time of day** (4%), suffering **physical harm** (4%), and increased **littering or mess** (4%).

Do you agree or disagree that this (drinking alcohol in a non-licensed space) should be included in a PSPO?

Graph 2 – Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed with the proposal



Overall, 685 responses were provided explaining how this behaviour affected quality of life. We now split responses by whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of this issue in the PSPO (question 7). However, 33 respondents who offered explanations of how this behaviour affected their quality of life selected 'neither agree nor disagree', 'don't know' or did not answer question 7. They were **removed from this analysis**.

Overall, 94% (610 responses) were provided by respondents who were in favour of the proposal.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Among the answers provided by respondents who agreed that 'drinking alcohol in a non-licensed public space' should be included in the PSPO:

- 32% (198 responses) explained how the respondent **felt unsafe**,
- 12% (71 responses) indicated that the problem **changed the behaviour of the respondent**,
- 7% (44 responses) reported a **particular location** where the behaviour occurs, and
- 6% (39 responses) cited **noise disturbance**.

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

As seen in Graph 2, there were additional answers that drew fewer responses such as the behaviour being a **nuisance or annoyance** (6%) or a **problem for women or children** (5%) or, as well as the occurrence of **verbal abuse** (4%), and the occurrence of the behaviour at a **particular time of day** (4%). A total of 1% of responses (6 responses) were **not codable**.

Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

Among the 42 responses provided by respondents who disagreed with the proposal, a total of 24% (10 responses) were **not codable**.

Additionally:

- 17% (7 responses) reported **feeling unsafe**, and
- 12% (5 responses) said the behaviour was a **nuisance or annoyance**.
- 7% (3 responses) reported the negative effect of the behaviour on **public transport**, and another 7% reported suffering **physical harm**.


Again, as seen in Graph 2 there were additional responses regarding the effect of the behaviour on the respondent's quality of life. These included describing the behaviour as **visually unsightly** (5%), receiving **verbal abuse** (5%), suffering **psychological harm** (5%), and reports of the behaviour occurring at a **particular time of day** (5%).

2.2 Commercial Waste - not putting waste in secure containers or sacks and allowing waste to spill onto a public place

Has this (not putting waste in secure containers or sacks and allowing waste to spill onto a public space) had a detrimental effect on your quality of life? If yes, please tell us how you were affected.

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

Graph 3 – Responses split by how this behaviour has had a detrimental effect on respondents' quality of life.



In *Section 4 - Commercial Waste*, members of the public were asked in a closed question whether or not 'not putting waste in secure containers or sacks and allowing waste to spill onto a public space' has had a detrimental effect on their quality of life. Those who answered 'Yes' were provided space to explain how this behaviour affected them. This resulted in 432 responses. Of these, 3% (12 responses) were **not codable or not relevant**.

Most notably:


- 18% (78 responses) said that **littering or mess** affected their quality of life,
- 13% (58 responses) said it was **visually unsightly** and another 13% (55 responses) mentioned the incidence of **vermin**.
- 10% (42 responses) mentioned unpleasant **smells**,
- 8% (35 responses) said it caused **obstruction on the street**, another
- 7% (32 responses) said it affected the **perceptions of the city**, and
- 7% (32 responses) said it created a **hygiene or sanitation issue**.

As seen in Graph 3, there were additional answers that drew fewer responses including answers that cited **particular locations**, respondents **changing their behaviour** in response to this, and **feeling unsafe**.

Graph 4 – Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed¹ with the proposal

¹ The graph displaying the result pertaining to respondents who disagreed with the PSPO includes counts instead of percentages. We only present counts when the sample size is below 31 responses.

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



Overall, 432 responses were provided explaining how this behaviour affected quality of life. We now split responses by whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of this issue in the PSPO (question 12). However, 48 respondents who offered explanations of how this behaviour affected their quality of life selected 'neither agree nor disagree', 'don't know' or did not answer question 12. They were **removed from this analysis**.

Overall, 96% (396 responses) were provided by respondents who were in favour of the proposal.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Among the answers provided by respondents who agreed that 'not putting waste in secure containers or sacks and allowing waste to spill onto a public space' should be included in the PSPO:

- 19% (74 responses) said **littering or mess** affected their quality of life,
- 13% (53 responses) mentioned its **visual unsightliness**, and another 13% (52 responses) mentioned the **vermin** it attracts.
- 10% (40 responses) cited the **smells** it causes, and
- 8% (33 responses) explained how it created **obstruction on the streets**.

As seen in Graph 4, other responses cited less frequently included changed **perceptions of the city** (7%), **hygiene or sanitation issues** (7%), **particular locations** (5%) where the behaviour occurs, and the respondent **changing their behaviour** as a result (4%). A total of 2% of responses were **not codable or not relevant**.

Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

Among respondents who disagreed with the proposal, 18 individuals provided answers regarding the effect of the behaviour on their quality of life.

Of these:

- 3 responses, mentioned how it changed the respondent's **perception of the city**.
- 2 responses said it was **visually unsightly**, another 2 said it attracted **vermin**, a further 2 said it **smells**, and another 2 gave **other** answers.
- 1 suggestion said it caused **psychological harm**, another one said it was an **obstruction on the street**, one said it caused **littering or mess**, and a final one said it **impacted on business**.


As shown in Graph 4, 3 responses were **not codable or not relevant**.

2.3 Commercial Waste – putting waste out for collection more than 2 hours before the agreed time

Has this (putting waste out for collection more than 2 hours before the agreed time) had a detrimental effect on your quality of life? If yes, please tell us how you were affected.

Graph 5 – Responses split by how this behaviour has had a detrimental effect on respondents' quality of life.

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



In *Section 5 - Commercial Waste*, members of the public were asked in a closed question whether or not 'putting waste out for collection more than 2 hours before the agreed time' has had a detrimental effect on their quality of life. Those who answered 'Yes' were provided space to explain how this behaviour affected them. This resulted in 223 responses. Of these, 4% (8 responses) were **not codable or not relevant**.

Most notably:


- 24% (53 responses) mentioned **littering and mess**,
- 14% (32 responses) said it was **visually unsightly**,
- 14% (31 responses) said it created an **obstruction on the streets**, and
- 11% (24 responses) said it attracted **vermin**.

As seen in Graph 5, there were other effects cited less frequently including **smells**, changed **perceptions of the city**, **hygiene or sanitation issues**, and **other** examples.

Graph 6 – Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed² with the proposal

² The graph displaying the result pertaining to respondents who disagreed with the PSPO includes counts instead of percentages. We only present counts when the sample size is below 31 responses.

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



Overall, 223 responses were provided explaining how this behaviour affected quality of life. We now split responses by whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of this issue in the PSPO (question 12). However, 12 respondents who offered explanations of how this behaviour affected their quality of life selected 'neither agree nor disagree', 'don't know' or did not answer question 12. They were **removed from this analysis**.

A total of 204 of the 211 suggestions were provided by members of the public who agree with the proposal.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Among the 204 responses provided by respondents who agreed that 'not putting waste in secure containers or sacks and allowing waste to spill onto a public space' should be included in the PSPO:

- 24% (49 responses) said **littering and mess** affected their quality of life,
- 14% (28 responses) said it was **visually unsightly**,
- 13% (27 responses) mentioned it was an **obstruction on the street**,
- 12% (24 responses) said it attracted **vermin**, and
- 10% (21 responses) said it **smells**.

As shown in Graph 6, there were other responses cited less frequently. These include the effect the behaviour has on **perceptions of the city** (8%), **hygiene and sanitation** (7%), **other** examples (2%), the occurrence of the behaviour in **particular locations** (2%), **feeling unsafe** (2%), and **changing the behaviour of the respondent** (1%). A further 3% of responses were **not codable**.

Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

Among respondents who disagreed with the proposal, 7 individuals provided answers regarding the effect of the behaviour on their quality of life.

Of these:

- 2 responses said this was **visually unsightly**,
- 2 responses explained how it was an **obstruction on the street**,
- 1 respondent said it affected their **perceptions of the city**, and
- 1 respondent **felt unsafe**.


One further response was **not codable or not relevant**.

2.4 Needles

Has this (disposing of hypodermic needles or syringes in public places) had a detrimental effect on your quality of life? If yes, please tell us how you were affected.

Graph 7 – Responses split by how this behaviour has affected respondents' quality of life

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



In *Section 6 - Needles*, members of the public were asked in a closed question whether or not 'disposing of hypodermic needles or syringes in public places' has had a detrimental effect on their quality of life. Those who answered 'Yes' were provided space to explain how this behaviour affected them. This resulted in 484 responses. Of these, 3% (14 responses) were **not codable or not relevant**.

Notably:

- 24% (118 suggestions) said that **seeing or personally having to dispose of discarded needles** affected their quality of life,
- 16% (76 suggestions) said the behaviour provoked **health and safety concerns**,
- 13% (62 suggestions) said it was a **problem for women or children**,
- 12% (59 suggestions) said it made the respondent **feel unsafe**, and
- 10% (48 suggestions) mentioned **witnessing drug taking** as having a detrimental effect on respondents' quality of life.


As shown in Graph 7, other responses that were cited less frequently included **other** examples (7%), the occurrence of the behaviour in **particular locations** (6%), and **visual unsightliness** (2%), among others.

Do you agree or disagree that this behaviour (disposing of hypodermic needles or syringes in public places) should be included in a PSPO?

Graph 8 – Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed³ with the proposal

³ The graph displaying the result pertaining to respondents who disagreed with the PSPO includes counts instead of percentages. We only present counts when the sample size is below 31 responses.

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



Overall, 484 responses were provided explaining how this behaviour affected quality of life. We now split responses by whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of this issue in the PSPO (question 22). However, 22 respondents who offered explanations of how this behaviour affected their quality of life selected 'neither agree nor disagree', 'don't know' or did not answer question 22. They were **removed from this analysis**.

Overall, 435 of the 462 responses were provided by individuals who agree with the proposal.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Among these 435 responses provided by respondents who agree with including 'disposing of hypodermic needles or syringes in public places' in the PSPO:

- 25% (109 responses) said that **seeing or personally having to dispose of discarded needles** affected their quality of life,
- 15% (65 responses) mentioned **health and safety concerns**,
- 13% (57 responses) said it was a **problem for women or children**, and another 13% (56 responses) said they **felt unsafe**.
- 10% (44 responses) cited **witnessing drug taking** as having a detrimental effect on their quality of life.

As shown in Graph 8, respondents cited other examples including **particular locations** where this occurs (6%), **visual unsightliness** (2%), and **perceptions of the city** (1%). A further 2% (9 responses) were **not codable or not relevant**.

Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

Among the 27 responses provided by respondents who disagreed that 'disposing of hypodermic needles or syringes in public places' should be included in a PSPO:

- 6 suggestions expressed **health and safety concerns**.
- 4 suggestions said **seeing or disposing of discarded needles** affected the respondent's quality of life, and another 4 said it was a **problem for women or children**.
- 2 suggestions said **witnessing drug taking** affected their quality of life, another 2 said it made them **feel unsafe**, and a further 2 said it occurred in **particular locations**.


As seen in Graph 8, there were additional responses cited by fewer respondents. These included **physical harm**, **other** examples, and **business impact**. Each example was cited once. A further 4 suggestions were **not codable or not relevant**.

2.5. Urinating in a public place

Has this (urinating in a public place) had a detrimental effect on your quality of life? If yes, please tell us how you were affected.

Graph 9 – Responses split by how this behaviour has affected respondents' quality of life

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



In *Section 7 - Urinating*, members of the public were asked in a closed question whether or not 'urinating in a public place' has had a detrimental effect on their quality of life. Those who answered 'Yes' were provided space to explain how this behaviour affected them. This resulted in 696 responses. Of these, 1% (9 responses) were **not codable or not relevant**.

Most notably:


- 35% (242 responses) said the **smells** affected the respondent's quality of life,
- 17% (115 responses) said that **witnessing urination is intimidating**,
- 8% (59 responses) mentioned **doorways, entrances or exits** as specific locations that were frequently affected, and a further 8% (57 responses) said that it was a **health hazard**.
- 5% (36 responses) said **avoiding mess on the streets** affected the quality of the respondent's life, and another
- 5% (36 responses) mentioned **other particular locations** that were affected.

As seen in Graph 9, there were a number of other responses cited less frequently. These include the effect of **changing the behaviour of the respondent** (5%), negative **perceptions of the city** (4%), **feeling unsafe** (2%) and **visual unsightliness** (2%).

Do you agree or disagree that this behaviour (urinating in a public place) should be included in a PSPO?

Graph 10 – Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed with the proposal

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



Overall, 696 responses were provided explaining how this behaviour affected quality of life. We now split responses by whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of this issue in the PSPO (question 27). However, 30 respondents who offered explanations of how this behaviour affected their quality of life selected 'neither agree nor disagree', 'don't know' or did not answer question 27. They were **removed from this analysis**.

Overall, 94% (623 of the 666 suggestions) were provided by respondents who were in favour of the proposal.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Of the suggestions provided by respondents who agreed that 'urinating in a public place' should be included in the PSPO:

- 36% (222 responses) said the **smells** affected the respondent's quality of life,
- 18% (110 responses) said **witnessing urination is intimidating**,
- 9% (54 responses) said it was a **health hazard**, and
- 8% (52 responses) mentioned **doorways, entrances and exits** as specific locations where the behaviour tends to occur.

As seen in Graph 10, respondents cited other ways this behaviour affected their quality of life that were mentioned less frequently. These include **avoiding mess on the streets** (5% of responses), **changing the behaviour of the respondent** (5% of responses), **other particular locations** (5% of responses), **perceptions of the city** (4% of responses), and **feeling unsafe** (2% of responses).

Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

Of the 43 suggestions provided by respondents who disagree with the inclusion of 'urinating in a public place' in the PSPO:

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

- 21% (9 responses) said the **smells** affected the respondent's quality of life,
- 21% (9 responses) said the respondent's quality of life was **affected by the lack of public toilets**,
- 7% (3 responses) mentioned that **witnessing urination is intimidating**, and another
- 7% (3 responses) said **doorways, entrances and exits** are specific locations that are affected.


Again, as seen in Graph 10, other effects of the behaviour cited less frequently include **a problem for women or children** (5%), **other** examples (5%), inciting a **health hazard** (5%), and **changing the behaviour of the respondent** (5%), among other examples. A total of 7% of responses were **not codable or not relevant**.

2.6 Defecating in a public place

Has this (defecating in a public place that is not a legitimate toilet) had a detrimental effect on your quality of life? If yes, please tell us how you were affected.

Graph 11 – Responses split by how this behaviour has affected respondents' quality of life

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



In *Section 8 - Defecating*, members of the public were asked in a closed question whether or not 'defecating in a public place that is not a legitimate toilet' has had a detrimental effect on their quality of life. Those who answered 'Yes' were provided space to explain how this behaviour affected them. This resulted in 447 responses. Of these, 5% (21 responses) were **not codable or not relevant**.

Most notably:


- 12% (53 responses) cited the behaviour as a **health hazard**,
- 11% (47 responses) said it **smells**,
- 10% (45 responses) mentioned having to **avoid mess on the streets**,
- 8% (35 responses) said that the behaviour occurred specifically in **doorways, car parks or stairwells**
- 7% (31 responses) said it was **a nuisance or annoyance**,
- 6% (26 responses) said it affected their **perceptions of the city**, and another 6% (26 suggestions) said it frequently occurred in **alleyways, passages and side streets**,
- 5% (24 suggestions) said it frequently occurred by the **canal, footpaths and parks**.

As seen in Graph 11, there were a number of other responses regarding how this behaviour effects quality of life that were mentioned less frequently. These include **witnessing people defecating** (4%), **visual unsightliness** (4%), **having to clean up waste** (4%), and **changing behaviour of the respondent** (4%), among other examples.

Do you agree or disagree that this (people defecating in a public place that is not a legitimate toilet) should be included in a PSPO?

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

Graph 12– Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed⁴ with the proposal



Overall, 447 responses were provided explaining how this behaviour affected quality of life. We now split responses by whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of this issue in the PSPO (question 32). However, 21 respondents who offered explanations of how this behaviour affected their quality of life selected 'neither agree nor disagree', 'don't know' or did not answer question 32. They were **removed from this analysis**.

Overall, 93% (396 of the 426 responses) were provided by respondents who were in favour of the proposal.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Of the responses provided by respondents who agreed that 'people defecating in a public place that is not a legitimate toilet' should be included in the PSPO:

- 12% (49 responses) said the behaviour was a **health hazard**,
- 11% (45 responses) cited having to **avoid mess on the streets**, and another 11% (44 suggestions) mentioned the effect of **smells**.
- 8% (33 responses) said the behaviour often occurred in **doorways, carparks or stairwells**, and
- 7% (26 responses) said it was a **nuisance or annoyance**.

As seen in Graph 12, respondents cited other ways this behaviour affected their quality of life that were mentioned less frequently. These include changing their **perceptions of the city** (6% of responses), the behaviour occurring in **alleyways, passages or side streets** (6% of responses), or **the canal, footpaths or parks** (5% of responses).

⁴ The graph displaying the result pertaining to respondents who disagreed with the PSPO includes counts instead of percentages. We only present counts when the sample size is below 30 responses.

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

Of the 30 suggestions provided by respondents who disagree with the inclusion of 'people defecating in a public place that is not a legitimate toilet' in the PSPO:

- 4 responses stated that the behaviour was a **nuisance or annoyance**,
- 2 responses said it was a **health hazard**, while another 2 responses said they **had not experienced the problem**. Another 2 responses highlighted how it **changed the behaviour of the respondent**.
- 2 responses said it occurred **outside or inside private buildings**, while another 2 responses said it occurred by the **canal, footpaths or parks**, and another 2 responses said it occurred in **alleyways, passages or side streets**.
- Other responses included: **witnessing people defecating; smells; pet waste, having to clean up waste**; observing this behaviour in **doorways, car parks and stairwells**.


As seen in Graph 12, 8 responses were **not codable or not relevant**.

2.7 Aggressive begging

Has this (people begging in an aggressive or intimidating way) had a detrimental effect on your quality of life? If yes, please tell us how you were affected.

Graph 13 – Responses split by how this behaviour has affected respondents' quality of life

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



In *Section 9 - Begging*, members of the public were asked in a closed question whether or not ‘people begging in an aggressive or intimidating way’ has had a detrimental effect on their quality of life. Those who answered ‘Yes’ were provided space to explain how this behaviour affected them. This resulted in 957 responses. Of these, 11% (103 responses) were **not codable or not relevant**.


Most notably:

- 41% (391 responses) mentioned **feeling unsafe** as a result of this behaviour,
- 15% (148 responses) said they **frequently see or interact with beggars**,
- 8% (75 responses) mentioned that the **respondent changed their behaviour**,
- 5% (52 responses) said their **perceptions of the city** were influenced by begging in an aggressive or intimidating way.

As seen in Graph 13, a number of other responses regarding the way in which people begging in an aggressive or intimidating way affects the quality of life of respondents were mentioned less frequently. These include being a **nuisance or annoyance** (5%), occurring **near cash machines** (3%), causing **psychological harm** (2%), occurring in **particular locations** of the city (2%), and **being a problem for women or children** (1).

Graph 14– Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed with the proposal

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



Overall, 957 responses were provided explaining how this behaviour affected quality of life. We now split responses by whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of this issue in the PSPO (question 37). However, 49 respondents who offered explanations of how this behaviour affected their quality of life selected 'neither agree nor disagree', 'don't know' or did not answer question 37. They were **removed from this analysis**.

Overall, 90% (818 of the 908 suggestions) were provided by respondents who were in favour of the proposal.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Of the 818 responses provided by respondents who agreed that 'people begging in an aggressive or intimidating way' should be included in the PSPO:

- 44% (363 suggestions) mentioned **feeling unsafe**,
- 17% (137 suggestions) said respondents **frequently saw or interacted with beggars**,
- 9% (71 suggestions) said respondents had to **change their behaviour**, and
- 6% (45 suggestions) said it affected their **perceptions of the city**.

As seen in Graph 14, respondents cited other ways this behaviour affected their quality of life that were mentioned less frequently. These include being **a nuisance or annoyance** (5% of responses), occurring **near cash machines** (4% of responses), or in **particular locations** of the city (2% of responses), among other examples. A total of 5% of responses were **not codable or not relevant**.

Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

Of the 90 suggestions provided by respondents who disagree with the inclusion of 'people begging in an aggressive or intimidating way' in the PSPO:

- 12% (11 responses) mentioned **feeling unsafe**, and
- 6% (5 responses) said it **changed their perceptions of the city**.


As seen in Graph 14, other less cited responses include respondents saying they **have not experienced the problem** (4%), respondents **frequently seeing or interacting with beggars** (4%), and the behaviour being a **nuisance or annoyance** (4%). A total of 62% (56 responses) were **not codable or not relevant** (this includes 42 responses that simply expressed concern for beggars).

2.8 Non-aggressive begging (currently not planned to be included in the PSPO)

Has this (begging in a non-aggressive or intimidating way) had a detrimental effect on your quality of life? If yes, please tell us how you were affected.

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

Graph 15 – Responses split by how this behaviour has affected respondents' quality of life



In *Section 10 - Begging*, members of the public were asked in a closed question whether or not 'people begging in a non-aggressive or intimidating way' has had a detrimental effect on their quality of life. Those who answered 'Yes' were provided space to explain how this behaviour affected them. This resulted in 598 responses. Of these, 20% (119 responses) were **not codable or not relevant**. These responses included mentions that expressed concern for beggars.

Most notably:


- 23% (136 responses) mentioned **feeling unsafe**,
- 18% (106 responses) said they **frequently see or interact with beggars**,
- 10% (60 responses) said the behaviour impacted their **perceptions of the city**.

In addition, as seen in Graph 15, there were some other responses that were cited less frequently including finding the behaviour a **nuisance or annoyance** (7%), **respondents changing their behaviour** as a result of the behaviour (5%), and seeing the behaviour by **cash machines, doorways or alleyways** (4%).

Do you agree or disagree that this (begging in a non-aggressive or intimidating way) should be included in a PSPO?

Graph 16– Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed with the proposal

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



Overall, 598 responses were provided explaining how this behaviour affected quality of life. We now split responses by whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of this issue in the PSPO (question 43). However, 40 respondents who offered explanations of how this behaviour affected their quality of life selected 'neither agree nor disagree', 'don't know' or did not answer question 43. They were **removed from this analysis**.

Overall, 82% (455) of the responses were provided by respondents who were in favour of the proposal.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Among the 455 responses provided by respondents who agreed that 'begging in a non-aggressive or intimidating way' should be included in the PSPO:

- 27% (123 responses) mentioned **feeling unsafe**,
- 19% (88 responses) said they **frequently saw or interacted with beggars**,
- 11% (52 responses) said the behaviour influenced the respondent's **perceptions of the city**, and
- 9% (40 responses) said it was a **nuisance or annoyance**.

As seen in Graph 16, some responses were mentioned less frequently. These include 6% responses that said the behaviour occurs in **particular locations** within the city, a further 6% that said the **respondent changed their behaviour** as a result of the behaviour, among other suggestions. A total of 8% (36 responses) were **not codable or not relevant**.

Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

Among the 103 responses provided by respondents who disagreed that 'begging in a non-aggressive or intimidating way' should be included in the PSPO:

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

- 69% (71 responses) mentioned were deemed **not codable or not relevant** (these included instances where the respondents expressed **concern for beggars**), and
- 9% (9 responses) said they **frequently saw or interacted with beggars**.


As seen again in Graph 16, a number of responses were mentioned less frequently. These include **perceptions of the city** that were impacted as a result of the behaviour, **feeling unsafe**, and **psychological harm**, among other responses.

2.9 Tents

Has this (putting up or occupying a tent, or other temporary structure) had a detrimental effect on your quality of life? If yes, please tell us how you were affected.

Graph 17 – Responses split by how this behaviour has affected respondents' quality of life

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



In *Section 11 – Tents*, members of the public were asked in a closed question whether or not ‘putting up or occupying a tent, or other temporary structure’ has had a detrimental effect on their quality of life. Those who answered ‘Yes’ were provided space to explain how this behaviour affected them. This resulted in 442 responses. Of these, 18% (78 responses) were **not codable or not relevant**.

Additionally:


- 13% (58 responses) mentioned the behaviour was **visually unsightly**,
- 10% (45 responses) said it encouraged **littering and mess**,
- 10% (43 responses) said the behaviour made the respondent **feel unsafe**,
- 8% (36 responses) said it posed **health and safety risks**,
- 8% (35 responses) explained how it had a negative effect on their **perceptions of the city**,
- 7% (30 responses) mentioned the behaviour caused **obstruction**, and
- 6% (25 responses) said it attracted **drug dealing or drug taking**.

As seen in Graph 17, some responses regarding the way in which the behaviour affected respondents’ quality of life were mentioned less frequently. These include the perpetuation of the behaviour **outside homes** (4%) and in **other particular locations** (3%), and the behaviour causing **respondents to change their behaviour** (4%).

Do you agree or disagree that this (putting up or occupying a tent, or other temporary structure) should be included in a PSPO?

Graph 18– Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed with the proposal

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



Overall, 442 responses were provided explaining how this behaviour affected quality of life. We now split responses by whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of this issue in the PSPO (question 47). However, 25 respondents who offered explanations of how this behaviour affected their quality of life selected 'neither agree nor disagree', 'don't know' or did not answer question 47. They were **removed from this analysis**.

Overall, 85% (353) of the responses were provided by respondents who were in favour of the proposal.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Among the 353 responses provided by respondents who agreed that this issue should be included in the PSPO:

- 14% (50 responses) said the behaviour affected their quality of life by being **visually unsightly**,
- 12% (42 responses) mentioned it did so by creating **littering or mess**,
- 11% (40 responses) said it made the respondent **feel unsafe**,
- 10% (35 responses) explained that it causes **health and safety risks**, and
- 9% (33 responses) said it affected **their perceptions of the city**.

As shown in Graph 18, other examples cited less frequently include the way in which these behaviours cause **obstructions** (8%), how they **attract drug dealing or drug taking** (6%), when they occur **outside homes** (5%), and when they **change the behaviour of respondents** (4%), among other responses.

Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

A total of 64 responses were given by respondents who disagreed with including the behaviour in the PSPO. Of these:

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

- 78% (50 responses) were **not codable or not relevant**,
- 6% (4 responses) explained that the behaviour caused **psychological harm**,
- 5% (3 responses) said it was **visually unsightly**, and
- 3% (2 responses) said it made the respondent **feel unsafe**.


As seen in Graph 18, the following responses were each mentioned in one response: changed **perceptions of the city** (2%), **health and safety risks** (2%), **changed behaviour of the respondent** (2%), how the behaviour **attracts drug dealing or drug taking**, and how it often occurs **in doorways** (2%).

2.10 Obstruction

Has this (obstructing an entrance, exit or stairway, or stopping streets being cleaned, or stopping people or vehicles passing) had a detrimental effect on your quality of life? If yes, please tell us how you were affected.

Graph 19 – Responses split by how this behaviour has affected respondents' quality of life

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



In *Section 12 - Obstruction*, members of the public were asked in a closed question whether or not ‘obstructing an entrance, exit or stairway, or stopping streets being cleaned, or stopping people or vehicles passing’ has had a detrimental effect on their quality of life. Those who answered ‘Yes’ were provided space to explain how this behaviour affected them. This resulted in 361 responses. Of these, 11% (39 responses) were **not codable or not relevant**.


Additionally:

- 21% (76 responses) explained how the behaviour occurred specifically in **doorways or on the pavement**,
- 11% (39 responses) said it made the respondent **feel unsafe**,
- 10% (37 responses) explained that **vehicles (parking), inconsiderate driving and roadworks** were obstructions that affected the respondents’ quality of life,
- 9% (31 responses) said obstructions caused **health and safety risks**, and
- 7% (26 responses) mentioned **littering and mess**.

As seen in Graph 19, other responses about how obstructions impacted the respondents’ quality of life include **business impact** (5%), changed **perceptions of the city** (4%), **changing behaviour of respondent** (4%), having to **walk around obstructions** (3%), and **visual unsightliness** (3%), among others.

Graph 20– Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed with the proposal

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



Overall, 361 responses were provided explaining how this behaviour affected quality of life. We now split responses by whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of this issue in the PSPO (question 52). However, 16 respondents who offered explanations of how this behaviour affected their quality of life selected 'neither agree nor disagree', 'don't know' or did not answer question 52. They were **removed from this analysis**.

Overall, 90% (312) of the responses were provided by respondents who were in favour of the proposal.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Among the 312 responses provided by those who agreed with the proposal:

- 22% (69 responses) said the behaviour occurred in **doorways and on pavements**,
- 12% (36 responses) said it made the respondent **feel unsafe**,
- 10% (32 responses) cited **vehicles, driving and roadworks**,
- 10% (31 responses) said it posed a **health and safety risk**, and
- 8% (26 responses) mentioned **littering and mess**.

As shown in Graph 20, other responses cited less frequently include among other examples, **business impact** (5%), changed **perceptions of the city** (4%), and **changing behaviour of the respondent** (4%).

Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

Among the 33 responses provided by recipients who disagreed with the proposal:

- 58% (19 responses) were **not codable or not relevant**, and
- 15% (5 responses) said the behaviour occurred in **doorways and pavements**.

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses


Again, Graph 20 shows that other responses cited less frequently include **vehicles, driving and roadworks** (6%), **psychological harm** (6%), and **walking around obstructions** (3%) and others.

3. Other ways in which a behaviour could be reduced

3.1 Drinking alcohol in a non-licensed space

If you think there are other ways that this behaviour (drinking alcohol in a non-licensed space) could be reduced, please say.

Graph 21 – Responses split by how the respondent thinks that this behaviour could be reduced



In the final open text question of *Section 3 - Alcohol*, members of the public were provided space to add other ways they think 'drinking alcohol in a non-licensed public space' can be reduced. This resulted in 721 suggestions. Of these, 14 respondents (2% of suggestions) said that they were **not sure** if there were other ways of changing this behaviour, and 5% (33 suggestions) were **not codable or irrelevant** (responses that were out of context, unintelligible or presented particular situations without actually addressing the issue under consultation).

Most notably:


- 20% (144 suggestions) mentioned the need for **improved public services**, and another
- 20% (141 suggestions) suggested more **support for individuals**.
- 15% (108 suggestions) stated the need for **more policing**, in addition to 6% (43 suggestions) made reference to **enforcement or fines**, while
- 10% (72 suggestions) said that public drinking should be **controlled or banned**, and
- 9% (64 suggestions) said that public drinking is **not a problem**.

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

As seen in Graph 21, there were a number of other suggestions provided including the need to **limit the impact of the PSPO**, and that the **issue is dealt with by existing laws**.

Do you agree or disagree that this (drinking alcohol in a non-licensed space) should be included in a PSPO?

Graph 22 – Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed with the proposal



Overall, 721 suggestions were provided as to how this behaviour could be improved. We now split suggestions by whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of this issue in the PSPO (question 7). However, 58 suggestions for improvements were provided by respondents who selected 'neither agree nor disagree', 'don't know' or did not answer question 7. They were **removed from this analysis**.

Overall, about two thirds (427) of the 663 suggestions were provided by respondents who were in favour of the proposal.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Among the suggestions provided by respondents who agreed that 'drinking alcohol in a non-licensed public space' should be included in the PSPO:

- 23% (99 suggestions) stated that **public services** should be improved,
- 22% (94 suggestions) stated that there should be **more policing**, and
- 15% (63 suggestions) stated that drinking in public should be **controlled or banned**.

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

As seen in Graph 22, there were additional suggestions that drew fewer responses such as more **support for individuals**, increased **enforcement or fines**, and that **public drinking is not a problem**. A total of 4% of responses (17 suggestions) were **not codable** or **not relevant**.

Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

With regard to those respondents who disagreed with the inclusion of alcohol in the PSPO:

- 38% (89 suggestions) stated that there should be **support for individuals**,
- 17% (40 suggestions) stated that **public drinking is not a problem**, and
- 14% (33 suggestions) stated that **public services should be improved**.


Again, as seen in Graph 22, there were suggestions that drew fewer responses such as the need to **limit the impact of the PSPO**, the belief that the **issue is dealt with by existing laws**, and the need for **other methods for behaviour change**. A total of 5% of responses (12 suggestions) were **not codable** or **not relevant**.

3.2 Commercial Waste - not putting waste in secure containers or sacks and allowing waste to spill onto a public place

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

If you think there are other ways that this behaviour (not putting waste in secure containers or sacks and allowing waste to spill onto a public place) could be reduced, please say.

Graph 23 – Responses split by how the respondent thinks that this behaviour could be reduced



In *Section 4 - Commercial Waste*, members of the public were provided the space to add other ways they think 'not putting waste in secure containers or sacks and allowing waste to spill onto a public place' can be reduced. This resulted in 377 suggestions.

Of these:


- 42% (159 suggestions) mentioned the need for more **enforcement or fines**,
- 25% (96 suggestions) suggested **improved public services**.
- 6% (21 suggestions) said that **environmentally friendly behaviours** should be encouraged, and
- 5% (18 suggestions) suggested **other methods for behaviour change**.

As seen in Graph 23, a further 6% (22 suggestions) said that the **issue is dealt with by existing laws**, 10% (37 suggestions) were **restating the problem**, and 6% (24 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant**.

Do you agree or disagree that this (not putting waste in secure containers or sacks and allowing waste to spill onto a public place) should be included in a PSPO?

Graph 24 – Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed with the proposal

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



Overall, 377 suggestions were provided as to how this behaviour could be improved. We now split suggestions by whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of this issue in the PSPO (question 12). However, 23 suggestions for improvements were provided by respondents who selected 'neither agree nor disagree', 'don't know' or did not answer question 12. They were **removed from this analysis**.

Overall, a large majority (88% of suggestions) were provided by respondents who were favourable to the proposal.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Among the suggestions given by respondents who agreed with the proposal:

- 45% (140 suggestions) mentioned **enforcement or fines** and
- 25% (78 suggestions) suggested **improving public services**.

As seen in Graph 24, there were additional suggestions mentioned by fewer respondents including encouraging **environmentally friendly behaviours** and **changing behaviours**. A total of 11% of suggestions **restated the problem** and 5% were **not codable or not relevant**, while 3% of respondents felt the **issue is dealt with by current laws**.

Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

Among 42 suggestions given by respondents who disagreed with the proposal:

- 38% (16 suggestions) suggested **improving public services** and
- 19% (8 suggestions) suggested **enforcement or fines**.

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

- 17% (7 suggestions) felt that the **issue is dealt with by current laws**.


Again, there were additional suggestions shown in Graph 24. A total of 7% (3 suggestions) **restated the problems** and 14% (6 suggestions) were **not codable**.

3.3 Commercial Waste – putting waste out for collection more than 2 hours before the agreed time

If you think there are other ways that this behaviour (putting waste out for collection more than 2 hours before the agreed time) could be reduced, please say.

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

Graph 25 – Responses split by how the respondent thinks that this behaviour could be reduced



In *Section 5 - Commercial Waste*, members of the public were provided space to suggest other ways of reducing the occurrence of businesses 'putting waste out for collection more than 2 hours before the agreed time'. This resulted in 197 suggestions, however 7% of these (13 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant** and 3% (6 suggestions) **restated the problem**. A further 3% (5 suggestions) said that a **PSPO is not feasible**. These included responses that pointed out that some businesses would not be able to comply with such a requirement if the 2 hour slot would be outside their business hours.

Additionally:


- 40% (79 suggestions) referred to increased **enforcement and fines**,
- 33% (65 suggestions) stated the need to **improve public services**, and
- 7% (13 suggestions) stated the **issue is dealt with by current laws**.

As seen in Graph 25, respondents supplied other suggestions that were more marginal including the need to encourage **more environmentally friendly behaviours** and to **change behaviour**.

Do you agree or disagree that this (putting waste out for collection more than 2 hours before the agreed time) should be included in a PSPO?

Graph 26 – Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed with the proposal

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



Overall, 197 suggestions were provided as to how this behaviour could be improved. We now split suggestions by whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of this issue in the PSPO (question 17). However, 24 suggestions for improvements were provided by respondents who selected 'neither agree nor disagree', 'don't know' or did not answer question 17. They were **removed from this analysis**.

Overall, a large majority (82%) of the 173 suggestions were provided by respondents who were favourable to the proposal.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Among respondents who agreed to putting waste out for collection more than 2 hours before the agreed time in the PSPO:

- 47% (67 respondents) suggested increased **enforcement and fines**, and
- 30% (43 respondents) stated the need to **improve public services**.

As seen in Graph 26, the additional suggestions that drew few responses include the need to **encourage environmentally friendly behaviours** and the need to **change behaviour** in general.

A further 5% of the text responses (7 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant**, a further 4% of responses (6 suggestions) **restated the problem**, while 1% (1 suggestion) said that **the PSPO is not feasible**.

Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

A total of 31 respondents disagreed with including putting waste out for collection more than 2 hours before the agreed time in the PSPO.

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

Of those who disagreed:

- 48% (15 respondents) stated the need to **improve public services**,
- 19% (6 respondents) suggested increased **enforcement and fines**


As seen in Graph 26, a total of 13% (4 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant**, another 13% (4 suggestions) stated that the **issue is dealt with by current laws**, while 6% (2 suggestions) said that the **PSPO is not feasible**.

3.4 Needles

If you think there are other ways that this behaviour (disposing of hypodermic needles or syringes in public places) could be reduced, please say.

Graph 27 – Responses split by how the respondent thinks that this behaviour could be reduced

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



In the final open text question of *Section 6 - Needles*, members of the public were provided space to add other ways they think 'disposing of hypodermic needles or syringes in public places' can be reduced. This resulted in 677 suggestions. Of these 1% (7 suggestions) said that **this is not a problem**, another 1% (8 suggestions) said that the **issue is dealt with by existing laws** and 1% (8 suggestions) **restated the problem**. A further 3% (21 suggestions) were **not codable or irrelevant**.


Additionally:

- 46% (311 suggestions) mentioned the need for more **support for individuals**,
- 22% (147 suggestions) suggested **improved public services**,
- 15% (103 suggestions) suggested **enforcement**, and
- 9% (62 suggestions) said **do not criminalise or fine** the behaviour
- 1% (10 suggestions) mentioned **other methods for behaviour change**.

Do you agree or disagree that this behaviour (disposing of hypodermic needles or syringes in public places) should be included in a PSPO?

Graph 28 – Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed with the proposal

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



Overall, 677 suggestions were provided as to how this behaviour could be improved. We now split suggestions by whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of this issue in the PSPO (question 22). However, 83 suggestions for improvements were provided by respondents who selected 'neither agree nor disagree', 'don't know' or did not answer question 22. They were **removed from this analysis**.

Overall, just over half (54%) of suggestions were provided by respondents who agreed with the proposal.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Among 319 suggestions provided by respondents who agreed that 'disposing of hypodermic needles or syringes in public places' should be included in the PSPO:

- 34% (110 suggestions) suggested **more support for individuals**,
- 30% (96 suggestions) mentioned increased **enforcement**, and
- 25% (80 suggestions) suggested the need for **improved public services**.

As seen in Graph 28, there were additional suggestions cited by fewer respondents. A total of 2% (6 suggestions) detailed the need for **other methods of behaviour change**

Meanwhile, a total of 5% (15 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant**, 2% (6 suggestions) **restated the problem**, 1% (3 suggestions) said that the behaviour **should not be criminalised**, and a further 1% (2 suggestions) explained that the **issue is dealt with by current laws**.

Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

Among 275 suggestions provided by respondents who disagreed that 'disposing of hypodermic needles or syringes in public places' should be included in a PSPO:

- 56% (156 suggestions) suggested more **support for individuals**,
- 19% (53 suggestions) suggested the need for more **improved public services**, and
- 19% (51 suggestions) said that the behaviour **should not be criminalised**.


As seen in Graph 28, there were also additional responses cited by fewer respondents. A total of 2% of responses (6 suggestions) suggested **enforcement**, while another 2% (5 suggestions) said that the **issue is dealt with by current laws**. A further 1% of suggestions (4 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant**. Three further suggestion were provided with one mention each.

3.5. Urinating in a public place

If you think there are other ways that this behaviour (urinating in a public place) could be reduced, please say.

Graph 29 – Responses split by how the respondent thinks that this behaviour could be reduced

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



In the final open text question of *Section 7 - Urinating*, members of the public were provided space to add other ways they think 'urinating in a public place' can be reduced. This resulted in 816 suggestions. Of these, 2% (20 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant**, 1% (7 suggestions) said that the respondent was **not sure**, and three suggestions **restated the problem**.

Most notably:


- 57% (467 suggestions) mentioned the need to **improve public services**, while
- 18% (146 suggestions) stated the need for **more enforcement or fines**, and
- 7% (57 suggestions) mentioned the need for more **support for individuals**.

As seen in Graph 29, there were a number of other suggestions that were cited less frequently. A total of 6% (47 suggestions) said that the behaviour should **not be criminalised or fined**, 4% (29 suggestions) suggested **private sector involvement** (e.g. venues allowing the use of their toilets for non customers) and 2% (16 suggestions) gave **other methods for behaviour change**. An additional 2% (17 suggestions) said that the **issue is dealt with by current laws**. Three suggestions said that the behaviour **is not a problem** and another three gave **other** responses.

Do you agree or disagree that this behaviour (urinating in a public place) should be included in a PSPO?

Graph 30 – Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed with the proposal

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



Overall, 816 suggestions were provided as to how this behaviour could be improved. We now split suggestions by whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of this issue in the PSPO (question 27). However, 75 suggestions for improvements were provided by respondents who selected 'neither agree nor disagree', 'don't know' or did not answer question 27. They were **removed from this analysis**.

Overall, about two thirds (471) of the 741 suggestions were provided by respondents who were favourable to the proposal.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Of the suggestions provided by respondents who agreed that 'urinating in a public place' should be included in the PSPO:

- 53% (248 suggestions) mentioned the need to **improve private services**,
- 30% (141 suggestions) suggested increased **enforcement or fines**, and
- 6% (27 suggestions) suggested increased **support for individuals**.

As seen in Graph 30, 2% (11 suggestions) suggested more **public sector involvement**, another 2% (11 suggestions) mentioned **other methods for behaviour change**, and 1% (4 suggestions) said that the behaviour should **not be criminalised or fined**.

Additionally, 3% (14 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant**, while 1% (6 suggestions) said that the respondent was **not sure or had nothing** to suggest, and another 1% (3 suggestions) provided **other** examples.

Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

Of the 270 suggestions that were given by respondents who disagreed with including the behaviour in the PSPO:

- 63% (169 suggestions) mentioned the need to **improve public services**,
- 13% (35 suggestions) stated that the behaviour should **not be criminalised or fined**, and
- 9% (25 suggestions) said that more **support for individuals** was needed.

As shown in Graph 30, there were additional suggestions mentioned less frequently such as the need for more **private sector involvement**, **other methods for behaviour change**, and increased **enforcement and fines**.


A total of 5% (14 suggestions) mentioned that the **issue is dealt with by current laws** and 1% (3 suggestions) said that the behaviour **is not a problem**. A further 2% (5 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant**.

3.6 Defecating in a public place

If you think there are other ways that this behaviour (defecating in a public place) could be reduced, please say.

Graph 31 – Responses split by how the respondent thinks that this behaviour could be reduced

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



In the final open text question of *Section 8 - Defecating*, members of the public were provided space to add other ways they think 'people defecating in a public place that is not a legitimate toilet' can be reduced. This resulted in 611 suggestions. Of these, 3% (20 suggestions were **not codable or not relevant**, 1% (4 suggestions) **restated the problem**, and 3 suggestions mentioned '**nothing**' or **not sure**.

Most notably:


- 57% (349 suggestions) recommended **improved public services**,
- 12% (74 suggestions) suggested more **support for individuals**,
- 12% (74 suggestions) suggested more **enforcement and fines**,
- 8% (51 suggestions) said that a **PSPO is not appropriate**, and
- 3% (16 suggestions) mentioned **private sector involvement**.

As seen in Graph 31, there were a number of other suggestions mentioned less frequently including **other methods for behaviour change** and **other**. A total of 1% (9 suggestions) said that this issue **is not a problem** and another 1% (5 suggestions) said that the **issue is dealt with by current laws**.

Do you agree or disagree that this (people defecating in a public place that is not a legitimate toilet) should be included in a PSPO?

Graph 32 – Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed with the proposal

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



Overall, 611 suggestions were provided as to how this behaviour could be improved. We now split suggestions by whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of this issue in the PSPO (question 32). However, 68 suggestions for improvements were provided by respondents who selected 'neither agree nor disagree', 'don't know' or did not answer question 32. They were **removed from this analysis**.

Overall, 59% of the 543 suggestions were provided by respondents who were in favor of the proposal.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Among the suggestions provided by respondents who agreed that 'people defecating in a public space that is not a legitimate toilet' should be included in the PSPO:

- 53% (169 suggestions) mentioned the need to **improve public services**,
- 21% (66 suggestions) suggested more **enforcement and fines**, and
- 13% (40 suggestions) recommended **more support for individuals**.

As seen in Graph 32, some suggestions were mentioned less frequently including more **private sector involvement** and **other methods for behaviour change**. A further 4% (14 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant** and 2% (7 suggestions) said that a **PSPO is not appropriate**.

Among the suggestions cited least, 1% (4 suggestions) said that **this is not a problem**, a further 1% (4 suggestions) **restated the problem**, and another 1% (2 suggestions) suggested **nothing or were not sure**.

Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

Among the 225 suggestions provided by respondents who disagreed with the proposal:

- 60% (135 suggestions) mentioned the need to **improve public services**,
- 16% (37 suggestions) said that a **PSPO is not acceptable**, and
- 12% (28 suggestions) suggested more **support for individuals**.


Again, as seen in Graph 32, some suggestions were mentioned less frequently including the need for **more private sector involvement** (3%) and more **enforcement and fines** (2%), while 2% (4 suggestions) said that the **issue is dealt with by current laws**, and 1% (3 suggestions) said that this is **not a problem**. 2% (5 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant**

3.7 Aggressive begging

If you think there are other ways that this behaviour (people begging in an aggressive or intimidating way) could be reduced, please say.

Graph 33 – Responses split by how the respondent thinks that this behaviour could be reduced

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



In the final open text question of *Section 9 - Begging*, members of the public were provided space to add other ways they think 'people begging in an aggressive or intimidating way' can be reduced. This resulted in 1144 suggestions referring to **begging in general** that are **not specific to aggressive begging**. Of these, 3% (36 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant**, and 4 respondents said that they were **not sure** if there were other ways of changing this behaviour. A further 2% (21 suggestions) said that **aggressive begging was not defined well**.

Most notably:

- 45% (520 suggestions) recommended providing **more support for individuals**,
- 17% (192 suggestions) said that the behaviour should **not be criminalised**,
- 8% (88 suggestions) recommended more **enforcement and fines**, in addition to 3% (39 suggestions) that made reference to more **policing**, and another 3% (39 suggestions) that suggested **criminalising, arresting or forced work** for beggars.
- 6% (69 suggestions) recommended **banning or removing all begging**.


As seen in Graph 33, there were a significant amount of other suggestions mentioned less frequently. These include 3% (39 suggestions) that provided **other methods for behaviour change**, 2% (26 suggestions) that said that there should only be **enforcement against aggression**, and 1% (10 suggestions) that gave **other** recommendations.

A further 3% (30 suggestions) said that this behaviour **is not a problem**, 2% (25 suggestions) said that the **issue is dealt with by existing laws** and 1% (6 suggestions) **restated the problem**.

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

Do you agree or disagree that this (people begging in an aggressive or intimidating way) should be included in a PSPO?

Graph 34 – Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed with the proposal



Overall, 1144 suggestions were provided as to how this behaviour could be improved. We now split suggestions by whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of this issue in the PSPO (question 37). However, 79 suggestions for improvements were provided by respondents who selected 'neither agree nor disagree', 'don't know' or did not answer question 37. They were **removed from this analysis**.

Overall, 54% of the 1065 suggestions were provided by respondents who were **not** in favour of the proposal.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Among the 490 suggestions provided by respondents who agreed that 'aggressive begging' should be included in the PSPO:

- 32% (157 suggestions) recommended **more support for individuals**,
- 15% (75 suggestions) recommended more **enforcement and fines**, in addition to
- 14% (68 suggestions) that recommended **banning or removing all begging**, 8% (38 suggestions) that recommended **criminalising, arresting or forcing work** on beggars, and a further 8% that suggested more **policing**.

As seen in Graph 34, there were additional suggestions cited less frequently including **other methods for behaviour change, enforcement only against**

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

aggression, and **other**, while 4% (18 suggestions) said **do not criminalise** the behaviour.

A further 5% (23 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant**, 1% (6 responses) **restated the problem**, 1% said that the **issue is dealt with by existing laws**, 1% stated that **aggressive begging is not defined well**, another 1% said that **this is not a problem**, and 1% suggested **nothing** or were **not sure**.

Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

With regard to the majority 575 suggestions provided by respondents who **disagreed** with the inclusion of 'begging' in the PSPO:

- 58% (332 suggestions) mentioned more **support for individuals**,
- 27% (158 suggestions) said **not to criminalise** begging, and
- 4% (22 suggestions) said that **this is not a problem**.

As seen in Graph 34, again, there were additional suggestions cited less frequently including **enforcement or fines**, **enforcement only against aggression**, **other methods for behaviour change** and **other**.

A total of 3% (17 suggestions) said that the **issue is dealt with by existing laws**, 2% (14 suggestions) stated that **aggressive begging is not defined well** and another 2% were **not codable or irrelevant**.

** It is important to note that when answering this question, respondents refer to begging in general.*


3.8 Non-aggressive begging (currently not planned to be included in the PSPO)

If you think there are other ways that this behaviour (begging in a non-aggressive or intimidating way) could be reduced, please say.

Graph 35 – Responses split by how the respondent thinks that this behaviour could be reduced

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

If you think there are other ways that this behaviour could be reduced, please say
"People begging in a non-aggressive or intimidating way (not included in the PSPO)"



In the final open text question of *Section 10 - Begging*, members of the public were provided space to add other ways they think 'begging in a non-aggressive or intimidating way' can be reduced. This resulted in 989 suggestions. Of these, 5% (45 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant**.

Most notably:

- 47% (467 suggestions) recommended more **support for individuals**,
- 16% (162 suggestions) said **do not criminalise** non-aggressive begging,
- 9% (87 suggestions) suggested **improved public services**, and
- 6% (56 suggestions) said that begging should be **banned or removed**, in addition to 5% (47 suggestions) that recommended more **enforcement and fines**, 3% (30 suggestions) that suggested **criminalising, arresting and forced work** as a solution to begging, and 2% (24 suggestions) that recommended **more begging**.


In addition, as seen in Graph 35, there were some other responses that were cited less frequently including **other methods for behaviour change**, and the suggestion to **change public policy**.

A further 1% (13 suggestions) said that **this is not a problem**, 8 suggestions said that the **issue is dealt with by existing laws**, and another 6 suggestions **restate the problem**.

Do you agree or disagree that this (begging in a non-aggressive or intimidating way) should be included in a PSPO?

Graph 36 – Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed with the proposal

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



Overall, 989 suggestions were provided as to how this behaviour could be improved. We now split suggestions by whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of this issue in the PSPO (question 43). However, 79 suggestions for improvements were provided by respondents who selected 'neither agree nor disagree', 'don't know' or did not answer question 43. They were **removed from this analysis**.

Overall, 66% (602) of the suggestions were provided by respondents who were **not** in favour of the proposal.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Among the 308 suggestions provided by respondents who agreed that 'begging in a non-aggressive or intimidating way' should be included in the PSPO:

- 33% (101 suggestions) recommended more **support for individuals**,
- 16% (50 suggestions) said to **ban or remove all begging**, and
- 14% (42 suggestions) suggested more **enforcement or fines** in addition to 9% (27 suggestions) that recommended **criminalising, arrest or forced work** as a solution to begging, and 7% (21 suggestions) that recommended more **policing**.

As seen in Graph 36, some suggestions were mentioned less frequently. A total of 6% (20 suggestions) mentioned **other methods for behaviour change** and 4% (12 suggestions) recommended **improving public services**, while a further 7% (22 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant**. A total of 2% (6 suggestions) said **not to criminalise** this behaviour.

Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

Among the 602 suggestions provided by respondents who disagreed that 'begging in a non-aggressive or intimidating way' should be included in the PSPO:

- 55% (330 suggestions) recommended **more support for individuals**,
- 24% (142 suggestions) said **not to criminalise** non-aggressive begging, and
- 12% (70 suggestions) said to **improve public services**.

As seen again in Graph 36, a number of suggestions were mentioned less frequently, including **other methods for behaviour change**, **enforcement or fines** and the need to **change public policy**.

A total of 3% (17 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant**, 2% (11 suggestions) said that **this is not a problem**, and 1% (6 suggestions) said that the **issue is dealt with by existing laws**.


More **policing** and **banning or removing all begging** were **not mentioned** by respondents who disagreed with the proposal.

3.9 Tents

If you think there are other ways that this behaviour (putting up or occupying a tent, or other temporary structure) could be reduced, please say.

Graph 37 – Responses split by how the respondent thinks that this behaviour could be reduced

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



In the final open text question of *Section 11 - Tents*, members of the public were provided space to add other ways they think 'putting up or occupying a tent, or other temporary structure' can be reduced. This resulted in 999 suggestions. Of these, 3% (29 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant**.

Most notably:


- 50% (501 suggestions) suggested **more support for individuals**, and
- 16% (164 suggestions) said **not to criminalise** the behaviour, while
- 9% (88 suggestions) recommended **removal and enforcement** in addition to 2% (15 suggestions) that recommended more **policing**.
- 7% (68 suggestions) mentioned the need to **improve public services**, and
- 5% (51 suggestions) recommended **providing land for tents**.

As seen in Graph 37, there were a number of other suggestions that were cited on fewer occasions including **other methods for behaviour change**, and the recommendation to **stop the provision of tents**. A further 4% (42 suggestions) **strongly disagreed** with the proposal, 2% (15 suggestions) said that **this is not an issue**, 3 suggestions **restated the problem**, another 3 suggestions said **nothing or not sure**, while 2 suggestions said the **issue is dealt with by current laws**.

Do you agree or disagree that this (putting up or occupying a tent, or other temporary structure) should be included in a PSPO?

Graph 38 – Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed with the proposal

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



Overall, 999 suggestions were provided as to how this behaviour could be improved. We now split suggestions by whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of this issue in the PSPO (question 47). However, 89 suggestions for improvements were provided by respondents who selected 'neither agree nor disagree', 'don't know' or did not answer question 47. They were **removed from this analysis**.

Overall, 73% of the 910 suggestions were provided by respondents who **disagreed** with the proposal.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Among the 244 suggestions provided by respondents who agreed that 'putting up or occupying a tent, or other temporary structure' should be included in a PSPO:

- 39% (92 suggestions) said there should be **more support for individuals**, while
- 33% (80 suggestions) recommended **removal and enforcement**, in addition to 6% (14 suggestions) that recommended **more policing**.
- 7% (17 suggestions) suggested **providing land for tents**.

As shown in Graph 38, the additional responses that were cited less frequently include **stop provision of tents**, **improve public services**, as well as suggesting to **not criminalise** the behaviour, and **other methods for behaviour change**.

A further 5% (12 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant**, 1% (3 suggestions) were **restating the problem**, 1% suggested **nothing or were not sure**, and another 1% said that **this is not an issue**.

Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

Of the 666 suggestions provided by respondents who disagreed that 'putting up or occupying a tent, or other temporary structure' should be included in the PSPO:

- 54% (358 suggestions) recommended more **support for individuals**,
- 23% (150 suggestions) said **do not criminalise the behaviour**,
- 8% (51 suggestions) suggested to **improve public services**, and
- 6% (41 suggestions) said the **respondent strongly disagrees** with the proposal.

Again, as shown in Graph 38, some suggestions were recommended less frequently. A total of 4% (26 suggestions) recommended **providing land for tents**, and 1% (8 suggestions) suggested **other methods for behaviour change**.

A total of 2% (15 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant**, and another 2% said that **this is not an issue**.


Removal and enforcement and more **policing** of the behaviour does not appear to have been suggested by respondents who **disagreed** with the proposal.

3.10 Obstructions

If you think there are other ways that this behaviour (obstructing an entrance, exit or stairway, or stopping streets being cleaned, or stopping people or vehicles passing) could be reduced, please say.

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

Graph 39 – Responses split by how the respondent thinks that this behaviour could be reduced



In the final open text question of *Section 12. Obstruction*, members of the public were provided space to add other ways they think ‘obstructing an entrance, exit or stairway, or stopping streets being cleaned, or stopping people or vehicles passing’ can be reduced. This resulted in 596 suggestions. Of these, 7% (39 suggestions) were **not codable or irrelevant**.

Most notably:


- 42% (253 suggestions) recommended **more support for individuals**,
- 16% (97 suggestions) said **do not criminalise** the behaviour,
- 10% (58 suggestions) said to recommended more **enforcement**, in addition to 3% (19 suggestions) that suggested more **policing**, and 1% (7 suggestions) mentioned that offenders should **be arrested**.
- 8% (46 suggestions) suggested **improving public services**.

As seen in Graph 39, there were a number of responses provided that were cited less frequently. A total of 4% (22 suggestions) recommended **removing obstructions**. A further 4% (21 suggestions) said the **respondent strongly disagrees** with the proposal, 2% (14 suggestions) said that **this is not a problem** and another 2% (13 suggestions) said that the **issue is dealt with by current laws**. Another 1% (7 suggestions) said that the **question is vague**.

Do you agree or disagree that this (obstructing an entrance, exit or stairway, or stopping streets being cleaned, or stopping people or vehicles passing) should be included in a PSPO.

Graph 40 – Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed with the proposal

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



Overall, 596 suggestions were provided as to how this behaviour could be improved. We now split suggestions by whether respondents agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of this issue in the PSPO (question 52). However, 69 suggestions for improvements were provided by respondents who selected 'neither agree nor disagree', 'don't know' or did not answer question 52. They were **removed from this analysis**.

Overall, 69% of the 527 suggestions were provided by respondents who **disagreed** with the proposal.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Among the 162 suggestions provided by respondents who agreed that 'obstructing an entrance, exit or stairway, or stopping streets being cleaned, or stopping people or vehicles passing' should be included in the PSPO:

- 25% (40 suggestions) stated that there should be more **enforcement** in addition to 10% (16 suggestions) that recommended more **policing** and 4% (6 suggestions) that recommended **criminalising or arresting offenders**.
- 23% (38 suggestions) recommended **more support for individuals**, and
- 13% (21 suggestions) said to **remove obstructions**.

As seen in Graph 40, there were additional suggestions that were cited less frequently. A total of 6% (9 suggestions) suggested the need to **improve public services**. A further 2% (4 suggestions) said **do not criminalise**, and another 2% said the **issue was dealt with by current laws**.

A total of 15% (25 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant**.

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses
Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

Among the 365 suggestions provided by respondents who disagreed with including 'obstructing an entrance, exit or stairway, or stopping streets being cleaned, or stopping people or vehicles passing' in the PSPO:

- 51% (186 suggestions) recommended **more support for individuals**,
- 22% (81 suggestions) said **do not criminalise** the behaviour,
- 8% (30 suggestions) suggested **improved public services**, and
- 5% (19 suggestions) said the **respondent strongly disagrees** with the proposal.

Again, as shown in Graph 40, there were additional responses that were cited less frequently. A total of 3% (11 suggestions) recommended more **enforcement** in addition to 1% (2 suggestions) that suggested more **policing**. A further 3% (12 suggestions) said that **this is not a problem**, 2% (7 suggestions) said the **issue is dealt with my current laws**, and another 2% (6 suggestions) said the **question is vague**.


A total of 3% (11 suggestions) of suggestions were **not codable or not relevant**.

3.11 Other requirements

*If you think there are any **other behaviours** that you think should be included in the PSPO please say.*

Graph 41 – Responses split by other behaviours that the respondent thinks is antisocial and should be included in the PSPO

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



In *Section 13 - Requirements*, members of the public were provided space to give an open text response regarding other behaviours that they think are antisocial and should be included in the PSPO. This resulted in 787 suggestions.

Of these:

- 19% (146 suggestions) recommended **including drugs and drug dealers**,
- 15% (117 suggestions) recommended including **harassment, aggression and violence**,
- 7% (58 suggestions) mentioned **street traders, preachers, buskers etc.**,
- 7% (53 suggestions) mentioned **abuse by Police or the Council**,
- 6% (46 suggestions) listed **fly tipping, littering or graffiti**,
- 5% (43 suggestions) mentioned **people gathering in large groups**, and
- 4% (31 suggestions) mentioned **noise**.

Additionally:

- 5% (38 suggestions) said **not to criminalise homelessness**
- 1% (7 suggestions) expressed **disagreement with the PSPO**.


Finally, a total of 10% (77 suggestions) said that the **issues are already dealt with by the PSPO**.

There were a number of other responses provided that were cited less frequently. These are detailed in Graph 41.

If you think that we have missed any requirements in the PSPO please say.

Graph 42 – Responses split by other requirements that the respondent thinks should be included in the PSPO

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



In this same section, members of the public were provided another space to give an open text response regarding any requirements they think have been missed in the PSPO. This resulted in 299 suggestions or comments. A total of 28% (84 suggestions) were **not codable or not relevant**.

Additionally:

- 31% (93 suggestions) provided a **suggestion on an area in the PSPO**,
- 16% (49 suggestions) said they **do not agree with the PSPO**, and
- 6% (18 suggestions) said **support should be offered to the homeless**.


There were a number of other responses provided again, that were cited less frequently, details in Graph 42.

3.12 Further comments

3.12.1 If you have any further comments about the introduction of a PSPO please say.

Graph 43 – Responses split by further comments

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses



In the final open text question, members of the public were provided space to add any additional comments they might have about the proposal. This resulted in 851 suggestions.

Of these, responses concerned **with homeless or vulnerable people** total to about 48% (393 suggestions). They include:

- 22% (188 suggestions) that say the **PSPO is criminalising the vulnerable**,
- 12% (99 suggestions) that mention the need to **provide support for those in need**,
- 8% (65 suggestions) that say the **PSPO should not target the vulnerable or the homeless**,
- 5% (41 suggestions) that recommend more **support for homeless**, and

A further 19% (163 suggestions) concerned with the **scope and enforcement of the PSPO** include:

- 6% (51 suggestions) that mention the **problem will move outside the area**,
- 4% (31 suggestions) that say the **PSPO exclusion area is not wide enough**,
- 3% (25 suggestions) that mention the **potential for misuse of powers**,
- 2% (18 suggestions) that mention the **need for a broader strategy**,
- 1% (12 suggestions) that say **enforcement must be careful**,
- 1% (8 suggestions) that recommend **including other behaviours** in the PSPO, and
- 1% (6 suggestions) that suggest **including non-aggressive begging**.
- 1% (6 suggestions) that mention **logistical concerns about the PSPO**, and
- 1% (6 suggestions) that mention **financial concerns about the PSPO**.

Other comments include:

- 8% (68 suggestions) that made a **negative statement against the PSPO**,
- 6% (52 suggestions) that **agree with the PSPO**,


Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

- 5% (40 suggestions) that **comment about enforcement**,
- 4% (31 suggestions) that mention **other issues**,
- 4% (30 suggestions) that recommend **enforcing existing laws**,
- 3% (26 suggestions) that are **not codable or not relevant**,
- 3% (23 suggestions) that recommend **implementing the PSPO as soon as possible**,
- 2% (13 suggestions) that **agree on the commercial aspects**,
- 1% (12 suggestions) that say **Manchester is in a bad state**,

3.12.2 Do you think the council should introduce a PSPO in Manchester city centre including the proposed prohibitions and requirement?

Agreement versus disagreement

Graph 44 – Responses split by whether agreed or disagreed with the proposal



Looking at respondents who agreed (said 'Yes' or 'Yes, with changes') versus disagreed (said 'No') with the introduction of a PSPO, between them they provided 814 suggestions as open text responses regarding additional comments they had about the PSPO. A further 37 respondents provided a suggestion but selected 'don't know' or did not answer question 58. They were **removed from this analysis**.

Overall, 52% (423) of the 813 suggestions were provided by respondents who **disagreed** with the introduction of a PSPO.

Results for those who **agreed** with the proposal:

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

Among the 391 comments made by respondents who said 'Yes' or 'Yes, with changes' to the introduction of a PSPO:

- 13% (51 suggestions) **agree with the PSPO**,
- 9% (35 suggestions) recommend **providing support for those in need**,
- 9% (35 suggestions) **comment about enforcement**,
- 8% (30 suggestions) say the **PSPO exclusion area is not wide enough**, and
- 8% (30 suggestions) say the **PSPO should not target the vulnerable**, in addition to 7% that say that the **PSPO is criminalising the vulnerable**.

As shown in Graph 44, other comments were cited less frequently.

Results for those who **disagreed** with the proposal:

Among the 423 comments made by respondents who said 'No' to the introduction of a PSPO:

- 36% (151 suggestions) said the **PSPO is criminalising the vulnerable**,
- 15% (63 suggestions) recommended **providing support for those in need**,
- 15% (62 suggestions) made a **negative statement against the PSPO**,
- 8% (33 suggestions) ask that the **PSPO not target the vulnerable/homeless**,
- 7% (28 suggestions) said the **problem will move outside the area**, and
- 6% (27 suggestions) suggested more **support for the homeless**.

Again, as shown in Graph 44, other comments were cited less frequently.

Full agreement versus conditional agreement


Looking only at members of the public who fully agreed (said 'Yes') or conditionally agreed (said 'Yes, with changes') with the introduction of a PSPO, 391 suggestions were provided as open text responses containing additional comments they had about the introduction of a PSPO.

Overall, 200 of the 391 suggestions were provided by members of the public who said 'Yes' to the proposal.

Graph 45 – Responses split by whether fully agreed or conditionally agreed with the proposal

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

If you have any further comments about the introduction of a PSPO please say
Agree fully versus agree conditionally



Results for those who **agreed fully** to the proposal:

Among the suggestions and comments provided by respondents who said 'Yes' to the introduction of a PSPO:

- 20% (40 suggestions) said they **agreed with the PSPO**,
- 14 (28 suggestions) made a **comment about enforcement**,
- 10% (21 suggestions) said the **PSPO exclusion area is not wide enough**, and
- 10% (21 suggestions) requested the **implementation of the PSPO as soon as possible**.

As seen in Graph 45, other suggestions were mentioned less frequently.

Results for those who **agreed conditionally** to the proposal:

Among the 191 suggestions and comments provided by respondents who said 'Yes, with changes':

- 15% (28 suggestions) ask that the **homeless and vulnerable not be targeted**.
- 14% (27 suggestions) recommended **providing support for those in need**,
- 14% (27 suggestions) said the **PSPO is criminalising the vulnerable**,
- 6% (12 suggestions) said the **problem will move outside the area**, and
- 6% (11 suggestions) **agree with the PSPO**.

Again, other suggestions that were cited less frequently can be seen in Graph 45.

4. Conclusions

4.1 Effects on quality of life

- Overall, the results show that a significant proportion of members of the public who said that the individual behaviours detrimentally affect their quality of life also agree with enforcing against each one of the individual behaviours listed in the consultation.
- It appears that the single behaviour with a detrimental effect that is mentioned by the *highest* number of members of the public is 'people begging in an aggressive or intimidating way.' The majority of these respondents report 'feeling unsafe' as a result of this behaviour.
- Particular locations are mentioned most frequently by respondents detrimentally affected by three behaviours; 'urinating in a public place', 'defecating in a public place that is not a legitimate toilet' and 'obstructing an entrance, exit or stairway, or stopping streets being cleaned, or stopping people or vehicles passing'. These include, but are not limited to, doorways, pavements, entrances and exits.

4.2 Other ways through which the behaviour can be decreased

- A significant proportion of members of the public mention (in response to various questions) the provision of 'more support to individuals' as a solution to the individual behaviours being discussed. 'Improvement to public services' and 'enforcement' were the second and third most-cited alternative suggestions respectively.
- The results show that members of the public who provided suggestions agree with enforcing against the majority of the individual behaviours listed in the consultation. They do *not* agree with enforcing against people begging in an aggressive way, people begging in a non-aggressive way, putting up or occupying a tent, *or* obstructing an entrance, exit or stairway.
- There appears to be a somewhat clear distinction between the commercial aspects included and those aspects that are perceived to be primarily linked with the homeless. This is perhaps why a significant proportion of the respondents perceive the proposal for the PSPO to be set up to target vulnerable groups.
- Among members of the public who agreed with enforcing against individual behaviours, 'support for individuals', 'improvement of public services', and 'enforcement' were cited most frequently as alternative solutions. Among members of the public who *dis*agreed with enforcing against individual behaviours, 'support for individuals', 'improvement of public services' and 'do

Appendix 5 Open Analysis of Open Text Responses

not criminalise this behaviour' were cited most frequently as alternative solutions.

- Overall however, a small majority of members of the public who provided further comments about the introduction of a PSPO do *not* think the council should introduce a PSPO in Manchester city centre. As mentioned before, the majority of these respondents mention (as an additional comment) that the 'PSPO is criminalising the vulnerable'.