

Economic Note	Number: HO EN 1058		
Title of regulatory proposal	Crime and Policing Bill - Public order provisions		
Lead Department/Agency	Home Office		
Expected date of implementation	1 July 2026		
Origin	Domestic		
Date	24 February 2026		
Lead Departmental Contact	CrimeandPolicingBillTeam@homeoffice.gov.uk		
Departmental Assessment	GREEN		
Rationale for intervention, objectives and intended effects			
Changing protest tactics involving residential harassment, protests outside the homes of public office holders, intimidatory protests near places of worship, and repeated protests causing serious community disruption cannot always be effectively managed using existing police powers. These measures strengthen police powers to manage protests and improve effectiveness by allowing Gold and Silver commanders to impose conditions.			
Policy options (including alternatives to regulation)			
Option 0 ‘Do-nothing’: Make no legislative changes.			
Option 1: Make the following changes 1) Introduce a new offence to criminalise protests outside public office holder’s homes where this relates to their role and 2) expand sections 42 and 42A of the Criminal Justice and Policing Act 2001 to cover protests over past events. 3) Amend the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 to amend the ‘no-return’ period for unauthorised encampments to a period of three months. Amend the Public Order Act 1986 to make the following changes: 4) conditions on protests near places of worship; 5) police to consider cumulative impact of repeat protests; 6) allow Gold and Silver commanders to impose conditions on protests. This is the government’s preferred option.			
Costs and benefit summary			
The only monetised costs are costs of familiarisation of police officers to the legislation. There are non-monetised criminal justice system (CJS) costs. There is a non-monetised benefit of deterrence and improved clarity and efficiency for policing. Given there are no monetised benefits the Net Present Social Value is negative in all scenarios.			
Risks			
The main risk to the analysis is that CJS impacts could not be monetised. Any significant changes to protest behaviour could lead to an increase in the number of prosecutions which will increase the court and legal aid costs of this policy.			
Total Cost (£m PV)	Transition Cost (£m Constant)	Cost to Business (£m PV)	
1.86	1.86	0	
Total Benefit (£m PV)	NPSV (£m PV)	BNPV (£m PV)	EANDCB (£m PV)
0	-1.86	0	0
Price Base Year	PV Base Year	Appraisal period (Years)	Transition period (Years)
2025/26	2026/27	10	1
Departmental sign-off (SCS):		Lizzy Gummer, SRO, Head of Police Powers Unit	Date: 24/02/26
Chief Economist sign-off:		Tim Laken	Date: 12/05/26
Better Regulation Unit sign-off:		Emma Kirk	Date: 13/05/26

Evidence Base

A. Policy objectives and intended effects

1. This Economic Note covers the following proposed measures

Amending Sections 42 and 42A of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 and Introducing a New Offence for Protests Targeting the Homes of Public Office Holders in the Crime and Policing Bill

2. Sections 42¹ and 42A² of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 (CJPA 2001) provide the power for the police to direct persons away from the vicinity of a resident's home where their presence amounts to harassment, alarm or distress. However, this is only where the harassment relates to future actions or decisions. In practice, the existing legislation has created uncertainty, as police cannot use this power to intervene if the intimidation concerns something that has already happened, for example, in the case of a public office holder, a vote an MP has cast or a decision already taken by a council leader. This gap has limited police ability to act consistently when people experience targeted harassment at their homes, something reported by both the police, and from victims. This has real world consequences, where in some cases MPs and other elected representatives have been left with loud and intimidatory protests outside their homes. The measures do not apply to protests which focus on past actions – for example, if individuals were to protest outside an MP's house today to complain about how the MP had already voted, this dispersal power and offence would not apply. Expanding the police powers will provide a uniform approach and greater reassurance for those facing targeted residential harassment.
3. The amendment removes this distinction between past and future events, giving police the same powers in both situations and ensuring they can intervene whenever a person's presence outside a home amount to harassment, alarm, or distress. This legislation applies regardless of whether the resident is a public office holder, and extending it provides greater protection for the public.
4. The Crime and Policing Bill will also create a new offence that prohibits targeted protest outside a public office holder's private home when the intention is to influence them or make representations about their role. This measure's policy intent is to make clear that protest activity outside the home of a public office holder's home is de facto intimidatory if the protest is about their role as a public office holder. The government view is that there is an unequivocal need for protection at the home of public office holders. The policy objective is not just to provide a feeling of safety to elected representatives, but to do so for their families as well. Public office holders must be able to represent their constituents without fear or favour, this principle is foundational to the resilience of the public office holder, and to democracy itself, and the new measures will enshrine protection for such activity to continue.
5. Government's view is that there are other places where more appropriate protest can be carried out, such as at the constituency office or local town halls. The offence provides the police with a clear legal basis to prevent and disrupt behaviour that can create safety risks for public office holders, their families, and neighbours, and ensures these individuals are not exposed to pressures that could deter them from entering or remaining in public service.
6. To safeguard democratic participation by public office holders, these provisions are mostly targeted at protecting them, as their homes have increasingly been the focus of targeted protest activity – this is a trend observed from a variety of sources, including police reporting

¹ Section 42, Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 – <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2001/16/section/42>

² Section 42A, Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 – <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2001/16/section/42A>

and reports from third party organisations³. These two measures are intentionally designed as complementary parts of the same framework. They respond to the heightened and well evidenced risks faced by public office holders, for whom residential protest has become more frequent, and organised. As such, in practice the department anticipate they will be used far more often in cases involving public office holders, as comparable activity directed at private individuals in the community is far less common.

Enabling police to place conditions on intimidatory protests in the vicinity of a place of worship

7. The Home Office will amend sections 12 and 14 and 14ZA of the Public Order Act 1986 (POA 1986)⁴ to enable police to place conditions on a protest in the vicinity of a place of worship where a senior police officer believes it may have an intimidatory impact and deter people from accessing the place of worship.
8. The Home Office will also amend sections 12 and 14 of POA 1986⁵ to place a duty on senior officers to take cumulative disruption into account when considering whether a protest may cause serious disruption to the life of the community; currently police may do this, and the amendment will place an explicit requirement on them to do so.
9. These two provisions will help police to manage protests where communities experience serious disruption from repeat protests, and intimidation experienced by religious communities⁶.

Enabling Gold and Silver commanders to impose conditions on protests

10. The Crime and Policing Bill will extend powers to enable Gold and Silver commanders to impose conditions on protests to improve responsiveness and coordination. Under the current law, only the most senior officer physically at the scene can impose conditions on live protests. Gold or Silver commanders, who are often based in off-site control rooms, have better access to intelligence and this provision will improve the timeliness, consistency, and effectiveness of public order policing.

Amending sections of the Public Order Act 1986 which specify a 'no-return' period to three months for someone directed by police to leave an unauthorised encampment

11. The Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act 2022⁷ strengthened police powers to deal with unauthorised encampments by amending the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 (CJPOA 1994)⁸ to introduce a new criminal offence of residing on land without consent in or with a vehicle and extended the period within which an individual must not return if directed to leave by police, from 3 to 12 months. In May 2024, the High Court upheld a challenge to the 12-month no-return period, finding it disproportionate and issued a declaration of incompatibility with a Convention right protected by the Human Rights Act 1998.⁹ This provision amends the CJPOA 1994¹⁰ to return the 'no-return' period to three months, to rectify the incompatibility with the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR).

³ VRR – Steve R report document, 31 May 2024; Website – BBC News article, <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-dorset-68294886> Website – The Standard article, <https://www.standard.co.uk/news/london/youth-demand-protest-david-jammy-b1221398.html> April 2025

⁴ Public Order Act 1986 - <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/64/section/12>

⁵ Public Order Act 1986 - <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/64/section/12>

⁶ News story – 'New police powers to protect communities from disruption caused by protests' - <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-police-powers-to-protect-communities-from-disruption-caused-by-protests>

⁷ Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act 2022 - <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2022/32/part/4>

⁸ Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994, Part 4 - <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1994/33/contents>

⁹ Smith -v- Secretary of State for the Home Department - <https://www.judiciary.uk/judgments/smith-v-secretary-of-state-for-the-home-department/>

¹⁰ Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994, Part 5 - <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1994/33/part/V>

B. Policy options considered, including alternatives to regulation

Option 0: 'Do-nothing'.

12. Under Option 0, the existing powers in sections 42 and 42A of the CJPA 2001, and the current POA 1986 provisions, remain unchanged. This would leave gaps in the powers available to police to manage protests or address growing safety concerns.
13. Police powers would remain limited in application to protests about future events, and there would be no specific offence of protesting outside the home of a public office holder.
14. Taking no action to address the incompatibility of legislation on unauthorised encampments with ECHR would leave the existing legislation open to further challenge via judicial review.

Option 1 – To amend Public Order legislation

15. Amend Sections 42 and 42A CJPA 2001
 - To expand sections 42 and 42A to enable police to act against residential harassment in relation to both past and future events.
16. Introduce an Offence in the Crime and Policing Bill
 - Introduce a specific offence to criminalise the act of protest outside of a public office holder's home.
17. Amend CJPOA 1994
 - Amend sections 60C(3), 61, 62, 62B(2) and 62C(2) which specify a 'no-return' period to three months for someone directed by police to leave an unauthorised encampment
18. To amend the POA 1986
 - Amend sections 12, 14 and 14ZA to enable police to place conditions on intimidatory protests in the vicinity of a place of worship,
 - Amend sections 12 and 14 to place a duty on senior officers to take cumulative disruption into account when considering whether to impose conditions on a protest,
 - Amend sections 12 and 14 to enable Gold and Silver commanders to impose conditions on protests.
19. This option directly addresses the identified gaps, improves safety, and supports public confidence in democratic processes. **This is the government's preferred option.**

Non-regulatory options

20. There are no non-regulatory alternatives, changes to these statutory powers can only be achieved through changes to legislation. The government considered whether changes to operational practice or changes to guidance could achieve the intended objectives, but existing powers and offences do not cover the changing protest tactics these measures are designed to manage.

C. Past evaluations and rationale for government intervention

Amending Sections 42 and 42A of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 and Introducing a New Offence for Protests Targeting the Homes of Public Office Holders in the Crime and Policing Bill

21. The CJPA 2001 will be amended to expand the scope of sections 42 and 42A, which currently allow police to intervene where a person's presence outside a home amounts to harassment, alarm or distress. The amendment removes that restriction so that harassing activity linked to past actions or decisions is equally covered. This amendment will ensure that police have consistent powers to respond to residential harassment in all such circumstances.

22. Separately, creating a new offence in the Crime and Policing Bill that prohibits protests outside, or in the vicinity of, any dwelling used by a public office holder in connection with their public role. The offence is narrowly targeted: it applies only to private dwellings, excludes official residences, and includes a statutory defence where the individual did not know the premises were being used as the officeholder's home.
23. Without these legislative updates, gaps in protection would persist. The expanded provisions ensure police powers match the realities of modern protest tactics, such as intrusion on and around private property, while the new offence in the Crime and Policing Bill offers a dedicated tool to deter targeted residential protests against public office holders. Together, these measures respond directly to calls for strengthened safeguards for those serving in public life.
24. Parliamentary scrutiny, including the findings of the Speaker's Conference^{11 12}, has underscored the need for effective new police powers to address residential harassment, and protest, effectively. Current law has not kept pace with increasingly intrusive protest that targets public office holders at their private homes, requiring officers to navigate complex thresholds and limiting operational clarity. The combined effect of the amendment and the new offence is to modernise the legal framework and ensure proportionate protection for those carrying out public duties.

Enabling police to place conditions on intimidatory protests in the vicinity of a place of worship and placing a duty on senior officers to take cumulative disruption into account

25. Sections 12 and 14 of the POA 1986 allow police to place conditions on protests where there is serious disruption to the life of the community or intentional intimidation. Large scale protests since the events in Israel and Gaza on 7 October 2023, have led the government to consider that¹³ additional protections are needed to provide better protection to religious communities from intimidation caused by protests within the vicinity of their place of worship. An explicit duty on senior officers to take account of the cumulative impact of protest activity will mean the impact of successive protests in the same location will be taken into account. This will help protect communities from repeated disruption caused by protests, while protecting the right to peaceful protest.

Enabling Gold and Silver commanders to impose conditions on protests

26. Under the current law, only the most senior officer physically at the scene can impose conditions on live protests or where people are assembling with a view to take part. Gold or Silver commanders, who are often based in off-site control rooms, have better access to intelligence, oversight of unfolding events and are well placed to make informed decisions. Being unable to impose conditions directly can also lead to inconsistencies in how similar protests are managed across different locations, especially when multiple events occur at once. Policing stakeholders have made clear that allowing Gold and Silver commanders to impose conditions remotely would improve the timeliness, consistency, and effectiveness of public order policing.

Amending sections of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 which specify a 'no-return' period of three months for someone directed by police to leave an unauthorised encampment

27. The government has acknowledged the judgment of the High Court in May 2024¹⁴ and considers it necessary to amend sections 60C(3), 61, 62, 62B(2) and 62C(2) of the CJPOA 1994¹⁵ to ensure the legislation is compatible with the ECHR. By reverting to the previous

¹¹ Speaker's Conference on the security of MPs, candidates and elections; First Report of Session 2024 to 2025; <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm5901/cmselect/cmspeak/570/report.html>

¹² Speaker's Conference on the security of MPs, candidates and elections; Second Report of Session 2024 to 2026; <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm5901/cmselect/cmspeak/1303/report.html>

¹³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-police-powers-to-protect-communities-from-disruption-caused-by-protests>

¹⁴ Smith -v- Secretary of State for the Home Department - <https://www.judiciary.uk/judgments/smith-v-secretary-of-state-for-the-home-department/>

¹⁵ Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 - <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1994/33/part/V>

three-month no-return period, the Home Office is directly addressing the incompatibility identified by the High Court, while maintaining a proportionate and workable framework for managing unauthorised encampments. This approach ensures the law continues to operate effectively, fairly, and in a way that respects the rights of Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities.

D. Appraisal

General assumptions and data

28. The following general assumptions are used in this Economic Note (EN) which is in line with the guidance set out in the HM Treasury (2026) Green Book¹⁶.
- The appraisal period used is 10 years.
 - The price base year is FY 2025/26
 - The present value base year is 2026/27.
 - The HM Treasury GDP deflator¹⁷, December 2025.
29. Data and assumptions have been drawn from several sources, including:
- Police labour costs are derived from Home Office internal data.
 - Police workforce statistics published by the Home Office¹⁸.
 - The Readingsoft calculator is used in calculating familiarisation costs¹⁹.

Costs

Familiarisation Costs

30. The only monetised costs for these measures are familiarisation costs. Once the legislation is amended, police officers will need to become familiar with the new legislation.

Introducing a specific offence for protests targeting the homes of public office holders

31. It is currently estimated that there will be two guidance documents:
1. Protecting Democratic Processes: Policing Response to Harassment and Intimidation of public office holders (62 pages)
 2. Managing Protest at the Homes of public office holders (17 pages).
32. Although it is acknowledged that updated guidance is required regarding this amendment, the specific framework and format for its implementation has not yet been determined. The Home Office is working with the College of Policing to identify the most effective approach; therefore, the estimates above remain subject to change.
33. It is not known which officers will need to read the Protecting Democratic Processes document at this stage in time so the cost of familiarisation could not be estimated. These costs are currently unquantified and are not included in the monetised familiarisation cost estimate presented below

¹⁶ The Green Book - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-green-book-appraisal-and-evaluation-in-central-government>

¹⁷ GDP deflators at market prices, and money GDP - <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/gdp-deflators-at-market-prices-and-money-gdp>

¹⁸ Police workforce, England and Wales: 30 September 2025 - <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/police-workforce-england-and-wales>

¹⁹ Free Speed Reading Test: How fast do you read? (readingsoft.com) - <https://readingsoft.com/>

34. It is assumed all officers in relevant public order related functions will need to be familiar with Managing Protest at the Homes of public office holders.

Amending sections of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 which specify a ‘no-return’ period for someone directed by police to leave an unauthorised encampment

35. There is no monetised familiarisation cost for this measure as it is anticipated no additional guidance will be issued. Existing statutory guidance issued by the Home Office will be updated, but the changes are minimal.

Remaining Public Order measures

36. It is currently estimated that there will be a guidance document for policing to become familiar with the remaining offences. It is estimated that the guidance document will be between 2,000 and 3,000 words long with a central estimate of 2,500. It is assumed that officers in relevant public order relate functions will need to become familiar with this guidance.
37. To calculate the cost of familiarisation, the estimated reading time of the information documents was multiplied by the labour cost of those required to read them. The estimated reading time for each document was found using the reading time calculator from readingsoft.com²⁰.
38. The total number of officers were taken from the Home Office Police Workforce, England and Wales statistics²¹. The number of officers in each group listed above has been estimated using the closest police function. The labour costs for each officer type were taken from the Home Office internal data. The proportions of officers expected to read the guidance are based on those used in Public Order Act 2023 Impact Assessment.²²
39. The estimates and data described above can be seen in Table 1 below.

Table 1 – Estimates used to calculate the Familiarisation costs (Price year 2025/26)

Officer Type	Estimate	Number of Staff	Proportion of Staff who will be reading	Hourly Labour Cost (£)	Time spent reading (hours)
Constables	Low	47,648	50%	34.28	0.15
	Central		75%		0.57
	High		100%		1.30
Sergeants	Low	22,902	50%	45.24	0.15
	Central		75%		0.57
	High		100%		1.30
Senior Officers	Low	10,377	50%	57.70	0.15
	Central		75%		0.57
	High		100%		1.30

Source: Home Office Analysis, 2026

²⁰ Free Speed Reading Test: How fast do you read? (readingsoft.com) - <https://readingsoft.com/>

²¹ Police workforce, England and Wales: 30 September 2025: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/police-workforce-england-and-wales>

²² Public Order Act 2023 Impact Assessment: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-03/0008/Impact%20Assessment%20-%20Public%20Order%20Bill%20-%2017May22.PDF#page=8> (see page 8)

40. The total familiarisation costs can be seen in Table 2 below. All costs are assumed to be incurred in year zero (2026/27).

Table 2 – Total Familiarisation Costs (£m, Price year 2025/26, PV base year 2026/27)

Scenario	Constables	Sergeants	Senior Officers	Total
Low	0.24	0.16	0.09	0.49
Central	0.93	0.59	0.34	1.86
High	2.12	1.35	0.78	4.25

Source: Home Office Analysis, 2026

41. The total familiarisation cost is estimated to be between £0.49 million and £4.25 million **with a central estimate of £1.86 million** (PV).

Non-monetised costs

Criminal Justice System costs

42. **Introducing a specific offence for protests targeting the homes of public office holders:** Protest behaviour is highly variable and unpredictable. It was not possible to estimate the number of future offences, as forces do not currently track protests specifically targeting all public office holders, with only Op BRIDGER collecting information relating to Members of Parliament. While some forces record arrests for breach of conditions during protests, this captures all protest-related activity where conditions have been imposed and does not distinguish incidents occurring outside the homes of public office-holders. As a result, it cannot be used as a proxy for estimating the volume of offences targeted by this measure. This means there is no reliable data available on this type of behaviour and no appropriate proxy offence, as there are currently no separate offences which specifically protect public officer holders. This means there is no usable dataset or proxy from which to generate a forecast of future CJS impacts
43. **Enabling police to place conditions on intimidatory protests in the vicinity of a place of worship; placing a duty on senior officers to take cumulative disruption into account and enabling Gold and Silver commanders to impose conditions on protests:** It was also not possible to estimate the number of future offences. While the provisions provide increased flexibility to put conditions in place, it does not necessarily imply that there will be a change in the number of offences and there is no data available to suggest how often police will use powers.
44. **Amending sections of the CJPOA 1994 which specify a ‘no-return’ period to three months for someone directed by police to leave an unauthorised encampment:** Changes to the number of offences as a result of reverting to the previous three-month no-return period for unauthorised encampments have not been estimated. There is no evidence to suggest that forces used the 12-month enforcement period since the court judgement in May 2024. Therefore, there is not expected to be a change in arrests or court case volumes relating to this measure.

Benefits

Monetised Benefits

45. There are no monetised benefits.

Non-Monetised Benefits

Deterrence and public safety

46. It is expected that the creation of the new offence to criminalise the act of protest outside of a public office holder’s homes will result in some level of deterrence of the activity by clearly defining it as prohibited, and reduce crime associated with this behaviour, such as harassment

offences. The new offence is expected to improve safety for public office holders, their families, and neighbours by reducing targeted intimidation at private residences through both prohibiting the behaviour and improving police powers. Given that protest behaviours are especially hard to predict due to protest patterns being episodic and volatile, it is not possible to estimate what level of deterrence will occur, or to monetise the benefit of reduced intimidation at private residences.

47. Legislation amendments to protect places of worship are expected to improve safe access for worshippers without disruption by enabling conditions where a senior officer judges intimidatory impact likely to deter attendance. This is achieved through allowing officers to place conditions on and thus reduce protest activity that is expected to have intimidatory impacts and deter people from entering places of worship. This protects religious communities from intimidation at their places of worship.
48. The amendment to place a duty on senior officers to consider cumulative disruption is expected to improve protection for communities regularly disrupted by protest activity. This is achieved by requiring senior officers to take account of the combined effects of successive protests when making decisions, enabling interventions that better reflect the experience and impacts on communities facing repeated disruption.
49. Given that there is no data available on the extent to which disruption at places of worship or cumulative disruption in communities will be avoided, it is not possible to monetise the benefit of increased public safety and community protection from disruption.

Increased Consistency and Clarity for the Police

50. The amendments to sections 42 and 42A CIPA 2001 and introduction of the new offence criminalising protests outside the homes of public office holders are expected to improve consistency and clarity in policing. This is expected to be achieved by addressing areas where forces previously faced frontline uncertainty or insufficient powers, including removing the requirement for proving that protestors intended to influence future decisions and enabling police to act against the harassment in relation to past events.
51. Enabling Gold and Silver commanders to impose conditions on protests remotely is expected to increase consistency. This is expected to be achieved by allowing senior officers, who often have access to intelligence and oversight of unfolding events, to apply conditions in a more coordinated way across similar protests and protests across different locations, particularly when multiple events occur at once.
52. There is no data available on the extent to which officers will more confidently and consistently apply their powers, nor any way to quantify the impact of inconsistent applications under the current system. Therefore, it is not possible to monetise this benefit.

Increased Efficiency for Police

53. The amendments to sections 42 and 42A CIPA 2001 are expected to reduce repeated low-level interventions, such as officers returning multiple times to engage with protestors, monitor behaviour, and issue informal warnings, where current powers do not allow decisive action. By removing the restriction that limits intervention to protests about future events, officers will have clearer, more useable criteria for acting where harassment occurs. This is anticipated to increase efficiency by enabling faster dispersal and arrest, and reducing the time spent gathering evidence to meet the threshold under existing legislation. In practice, this will cut down on repeated visits to the same address and allow officers to resolve incidents more quickly.
54. Enabling Gold and Silver commanders to impose conditions remotely is also expected to increase efficiency, by allowing commanders to coordinate conditions across simultaneous or similar protests, and reduce delays in decision-making by removing the requirement to be physically present to impose conditions.

55. There is no evidence on how many low-level interventions would be avoided, or how much officer time would be saved as a result of the improvements described above, particularly given the difficulties in predicting protest behaviour. Therefore, it is not possible to quantify the efficiency gains for police.

NPSV, BNPV and EANDCB

56. The monetised costs have no impact on business therefore both the Business Net Present Value (BNPV) and the equivalent annual net direct cost to business (EANDCB) are zero.
57. The total costs and NPSVs are shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3 – Total Costs and NPSVs (£m, Price year 2025/26, PV base year 2026/27)

Scenario	Low	Central	High
Familiarisation Costs	0.49	1.86	4.25
NPSV	-0.49	-1.86	-4.25
EANDCB	0.00	0.00	0.00
BNPV	0.00	0.00	0.00

Source: Home Office Internal Analysis

58. The NPSVs is estimated to be between £0.49 million and £4.25 million with a central estimate of £1.86 million.
59. Whilst the NPSV is negative, there is a non-monetised benefit of the deterrence and improvements in policing clarity and efficiency. Option 0 – of a ‘Do nothing’ approach would not provide this and therefore would not meet the objectives of this policy.

E. Wider impacts

Amending Sections 42 and 42A of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 and Introducing a New Offence for Protests Targeting the Homes of Public Office Holders in the Crime and Policing Bill

60. The expansion of powers in the CJP 2001 and the introduction of a new criminal offence in the Crime and Policing Bill are expected to have a range of wider impacts. Socially, these measures are intended to enhance the safety and wellbeing of public office holders and their families by reducing the risk of harassment and intimidation at private residences. This may help encourage wider participation in public service, including among underrepresented groups who evidence provided by the electoral commission suggests are more likely to be subject to harassment²³. While the new framework places restrictions on protests outside private homes, any effect on the right to protest is minimal and proportionate. Lawful protest remains fully permitted; the changes apply only where targeted protections are needed to safeguard individuals and support the effective functioning of democratic institutions.
61. Across England and Wales, the combined effect of the CJP 2001 amendments and the new offence ensures a consistent and clear legal framework for protecting public office holders at their homes. The measures do not give rise to environmental impacts, as they relate exclusively to policing powers and criminal law rather than physical infrastructure.
62. There is no expected effect on income or wealth distribution, as these changes regulate behaviour rather than economic activity. Police forces may incur small training and familiarisation costs arising from the updated CJP 2001 powers and the introduction of the

²³ Electoral Commission (2025), Abuse and Intimidation, <https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/voting-and-elections/campaigning-your-vote/abuse-and-intimidation>

new offence, though these are expected to be minimal and absorbed within existing programmes.

63. There is no anticipated impact on small or micro-businesses. The measures do not impose regulatory requirements affecting business operations, competition, investment, or trade.

Enabling police to place conditions on intimidatory protests in the vicinity of a place of worship and placing a duty on senior officers to take cumulative disruption into account

64. The provisions on places of worship and cumulative disruption will provide additional protection to faith communities; and the cumulative disruption provision will more broadly protect any community impacted by protests repeatedly taking place in the same location.
65. The cumulative disruption provision may have a positive impact on small businesses as police may take disruption of access to essential goods and services into account when considering the disruption on a community, such as the supply of food.

Enabling Gold and Silver commanders to impose conditions on protests

66. Enabling Gold and Silver commanders to impose conditions remotely is not expected to have any wider impacts other than those discussed elsewhere in this EN.

Amending sections of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 which specify a 'no-return' period to three months for someone directed by police to leave an unauthorised encampment

67. Amending sections of the CJPOA 1994 which specify a 'no-return' period for someone directed by police to leave an unauthorised encampment.
68. The amendment to the CJPOA 1994 may have positive impact on the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller community who may be impacted by offences relating to unauthorised encampments.

F. Sensitivity

69. None of the measures in this EN are regulatory provisions as defined under the Better Regulation Framework. The equivalent annual net direct costs to the public sector are less than +/- £20 million, so an IA is not required.
70. Given the measures could not be appraised in full, beyond familiarisation costs, no sensitivity analysis could be conducted. Familiarisation costs could vary based on length of guidance and number of staff required to read. The impact of this has been assessed in the high and low scenarios throughout.

G. Risks

71. The main risk to the analysis is that CJS impacts are not monetised. As with any protest related offences, the number of future offences and charges is dependent on the behaviour of protestors. It has been assumed that these measures will create a deterrence to this behaviour. However, if there were to be one very large protest or an organised campaign of protests there could be an unanticipated spike in charges. This would result in higher CJS impacts.
72. A further risk to the analysis is that no benefits are monetised. It was not possible to quantify the levels of deterrence and improvements to police clarity and efficiency. Therefore, the full value of these benefits is not captured and the NPSV may be understated.

H. Annex

Mandatory specific impact test - Statutory Equalities Duties	Complete
The amendments to sections 42 and 42A of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001, together with the introduction of a new offence criminalising protests outside of public office holder's home, have been assessed with due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty. These measures are designed to provide proportionate protections against harassment and intimidation, with no differential treatment on the basis of protected characteristics. While public office holders may include individuals with protected characteristics, the measures are not expected to have disproportionate negative impacts on any group; rather, by reducing targeted intimidation at private residences, they may have a positive effect on encouraging participation in public life among underrepresented groups. The amendments do not restrict lawful protest generally and are narrowly focused on preventing harmful behaviours that undermine personal safety and democratic engagement. No evidence has been identified to suggest adverse equality impacts arising from these changes. The provisions amending the POA 1986 apply equally to all protests, and to anyone organising or participating in a protest. The proposed measures are not considered to subject any person to less favourable treatment than any other person and therefore no direct discrimination arises in relation to any protected characteristics. The places of worship measure applies equally to all faiths and is intended to protect the right to religious observance. This measure may, in some circumstances, confer positive discrimination in favour of individuals based on their religion or belief, by providing enhanced protection for those attending places of worship. The provision on cumulative disruption may also provide additional protection to those with the protected characteristic of religion or belief, in circumstances where faith communities may be more likely to experience serious disruption due to repeat protests in an area. This may be the case for other protected characteristics, for example race, sexual orientation and gender reassignment, as the provision is designed to protect the life of the community in a geographical area. The amendment to the CJPOA 1994 may have positive impact on the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller community who may be impacted by offences relating to unauthorised encampments. The SRO has agreed these findings.	Yes