

**DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting of the Council for the hearing of deputations from members of the public. Each deputation may be heard for a maximum of five minutes following which one Member of the Council, nominated by the Mayor, may speak in response. It shall then be moved by the Mayor and voted on without discussion that the deputation be thanked for attending and its subject matter noted.

Notification of one Deputation has been received. The spokesperson is entitled to speak for 5 minutes.

**(a) Deputation concerning Public Space Protection Orders from the Friends, Families and Travellers Group**

Supported by: Gaz Fisher, Max Tansley, Gordon Reid, Angela Barnett, Zackery Hornby

## **Deputation to the Policy & Resources Committee, BHCC, June 2016**

We are presenting this deputation as Travellers regarding BHCCs proposal to consider the use of Public Space Protection Orders to stop our communities encamping in the many suggested locations across the City. We are aware this decision lies with the Policy & Resources Committee so we are presenting this to you ahead of the consultation report.

As we understand it, PSPOs have come from the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. The definition of what's deemed to be 'anti-social behaviour' in this Act has been lowered to incorporate 'nuisance and annoyance' that has a 'detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality'. By proposing to use PSPOs against Travellers BHCC is trying to do is say is that the mere presence of us Travellers is deemed as a 'nuisance' or 'annoyance' and therefore we are conducting anti-social behaviour. Are you aware of how that sounds, and how that makes our community feel?

If other local residents, from the housed population, are complaining about being annoyed by us or say we're a 'nuisance' and you are acting on that then you are just pandering to their prejudices and discriminatory views.

We feel PSPOs are a very reactionary measure which will have a disproportionate impact on our already marginalised communities. We don't feel that you would treat other marginalised community like this – would BHCC introduce a policy to attack the culture of for example the Pakistani community, or the Gay community?

We have been living as part of the 'Brighton community' for generations. Does Brighton celebrate its diverse community? If so why don't you feel we are part of that rich diversity?

There are already sufficient eviction powers in place to deal with unauthorised encampments, why do you need to introduce further powers? Surely the solution is to allow longer stopping times in suitable locations or even building more authorised sites which our community can live on. We would then pay rent and council tax.

We feel this is in breach of our human rights and we are prepared to challenge this in the courts. Other leading human rights groups, such as the Equality and Human Rights Commission, Liberty, and Friends, Families and Travellers are involved in this issue as it is such a draconian use of powers to target a marginalised group.

We urge you not to introduce PSPOs to target Travellers and look at a meaningful way to increase site provision and longer stopping times in suitable locations.

Gaz Fisher, Max Tansley, Gordon Reid, Angela Barnett, Zackery Hornby

**Supporting information, Traveller deputation to Policy & Resources  
Committee, June 2016**

We are concerned that the current proposal is to use PSPOs on 12 locations but it is completely viable this will increase – this will bring us to a situation where you are effectively barring a whole community of people from our City. We feel further provision is the answer – not barring our communities.

How will we as a community be able to engage with BHCC when we are increasingly feeling under attack.

We are also concerned about the mechanics of the use of PSPOs. For example, what happens if we cannot comply with a PSPO and then get fined, if an individual cannot pay a fine relating to a PSPO then that person will have a court summons - where would a court summons go, as we don't have a permanent address this would be sent to a c/o address which we don't have regular access to. Ultimately this could mean that individuals could lose their liberty and home within the space of 24 hours. You are effectively criminalising us for our lifestyle.

We would also like to point out that the harder it is for us find suitable places to park the harder it is to go to work and take our children to school etc.

Apparently the purpose of a PSPO is to stop individuals or groups committing anti-social behaviour – our lifestyle is not anti-social. In fact the European Court of Human Rights (in the Connors case), ruled that there was a positive obligation for the UK Government to act so as to facilitate the Gypsy way of life.

There has been a constant persecution of Gypsies and Travellers and as a progressive society and as a local authority you are supposed to have better regard to more marginalised communities such as ours.

