

## QUESTION

### Measure 5: Dog control – exclusion areas

The Council is considering using the Public Spaces Protection Order to prevent dog owners/walkers from bringing their animal into specified or signed areas whether or not the dog is leashed. This includes designated sports fields and fenced/enclosed children's play areas. This prohibition strongly supports the dog fouling prohibition in that it prevents misuse of playing fields regularly used for sporting events.


Areas for consideration of this restriction are:

- St Mark's Sports Ground
- Nevill Ground
- Enclosed children's play areas within parks or other open spaces

If there are other areas or locations you would wish to see dogs excluded from please use the comments box below.

Nothing in this order shall apply to a person who is registered as a blind person in a register compiled under section 29 of the National Assistance Act 1948; or a person with a disability affecting their mobility, manual dexterity or ability to lift, carry or move everyday objects and who relies upon a dog trained by a prescribed charity for assistance.

## OUTCOMES



### Measure 5a - Have your say on dog exclusion areas

FOR AGAINST

I was pleased when i saw the new notices at St Mark's on dogs with leads but people ignore it and dogs still jump up me

Dog exclusion areas are very negative and anti social thing. Just today on Sky news was report which said owning and exercising dogs cut cardiovascular diseases by 35% as well as

decreasing loneliness and prolonging life in older people. Taking away areas where they can exercise their dogs will lead to more isolation more illness which in turn places more strain on NHS and mental health services as well as leading to more people dying younger.

All these areas and their entrances MUST be signposted large by TWBC as a DOG EXCLUSION area.

Need to be monitored to make sure the exclusion is adhered to.

agree

You are penalising the many instead of the few careless dog owners.

We should be allowing dogs into more places not less. Deal with the real issue which is dog fouling. Don't ban all dogs just because of a few irresponsible dog owners. In fact could I use this consultation to request a permanent agility facility for dogs at Hawkenbury using outdoor equipment such as this: <http://www.byoplayground.com/dog-agility-equipment> The dogs ( and owners ) would have such fun!! Children's play areas should be fenced off from the rest of the park. Dogs should be allowed to be walked in all open spaces provided they are kept on a lead when required to do so.

DO NOT introduce this ban on St Marks, Nevill other parks. The vast majority of people who walk their dogs who use these areas pick up their dog mess. A ban will only penalise those people.

Whilst I would support excluding dogs from children's play areas I strongly object to excluding them from the Nevill Ground. If there are no cricket/hockey matches being played and if dog owners can be fined for not clearing up faeces then I can see no reason why people should be excluded from walking dogs on this land.

I am strongly arguing against the banning of dogs from these public spaces.

This makes sense in regard to enclosed childrens playgrounds, but why include St Marks Recreation Ground? If this area is included, why are none of the Council owned football pitches being included? I spend many hours watching my children or husband play rugby at St Marks, with my dog on a lead by my side.

It is not realistic or reasonable to exclude dogs and their their owners from anywhere even if the dog is on a lead.

Dogs must not be allowed on anreas where children and aduklts play sport as there is such a significant health risk This measure has been taken in Brighton and is succesful and is taken by all schools in this area.

Irrespective of the specific areas listed above, ie: St Mark's Recreation Ground and the Neville Ground, the inclusion of "Enclosed children's (sic) play areas within parks or other open spaces" leaves open the possibility/probability that the council will apply this to exclusion to other, previously suggested, public recreational areas, eg: Hawkenbury Rec. This would be a disproportionate response and would deprive thousands of responsible pet owners of important amenities efforts must be made to ensure the tiny minority that are

selfish improve their behaviour dogs should be banned from play areas to protect those children who are scared of them

I strongly disagree with this proposal, dogs/dog owners should not be discriminated against. St Mark's recreation ground is used for rugby during the winter/cricket in the summer and The Cricket Club uses the Nevill in the summer months and dog owners/walkers totally respect this, however certain members of the cricket club don't reciprocate this feeling towards dog owners. In fact on occasion they have harassed dog owners when they have been doing nothing illegal and are just walking their dogs! The cricket pitch was covered in bird poo in the summer after the groundsmen had covered the field in seed, there is fox poo/other animals mess on the pitches, that is what wildlife does. It is an integral part of family life to be able to take your dog with you to long cricket matches and rugby matches.

Why could a compromise not be found as per councils who have responsibility for beaches when dogs are excluded on part of the beach for part of the year? Surely a solution for all can be agreed these spaces are for all to share.

As the Chairman of Youth Cricket at TWCC, and subject to many rules on child protection, I have a duty of care to ensure that the 300 youth members aged 6-18 at the Club, can train and play in a dog litter-free zone. I am unable to fulfil this duty when it comes to dogs. Apart from the fouling, the youngest children age 6/7 have sometimes been frightened by bounding dogs. Over the years when bringing this to the attention of dog walkers who let their dogs off the lead, I have often been subjected to verbal abuse. I have fielded complaints from parent on a regular basis. Similarly, I find it inexplicable that people actually drive to the Nevill to exercise their dogs.

No - except enclosed children's play areas (dogs already banned there). I have been walking my dog at St Mark's Sports Ground (the Rugby Pitch) and the Nevill Ground for 17 years and feel very strongly about this. I can walk to these places, but would have to use my car to go elsewhere.

TWBC must erect large signage at all the entrances to these sports grounds and remove the dog poo plastic bag dispensers. Please see previous comments. It is not right that the council provide this land and designate it for recreation activities and then for dogs to foul on it. I fully support this my nephew got e coli from treading on dog foul near a playground and was on dialysis and nearly died when he was 6 .I see dog owners just let their dogs off leads and go for a run and dont pick up after so it should be that dogs are banned as so many owners do not keep on lead or clear up .And when you address it with them the owners are rude ,in response,

I strongly agree that this should be brought in at The Nevill cricket ground, St Mark's rec and all enclosed children's play areas.

Sports facilities should be available for full movement without any form of health risk

Dogs already have to be on leads. If poo is left then it's just irresponsible ownership. Not fair on those who use eg. Nevill ground and do pick up their dog muck. And what if a disabled dog owner wished to watch the cricket

Dogs should not be able to wander off the lead from areas used as playing fields by children and adults

I support this measure to exclude dogs from children's play areas. However, unless there is a massive regular problem with fouling on sports grounds, I am against excluding dogs from these areas.

I agree with the childrens play area exclusion. Exclusion from St Marks should not be included as most people are sensible enough to keep their dogs off the playing areas. You cant ban Foxes, Badgers, Cats, Many of the people, parents who support,finance and responsibly use these areas should not be victimised. In the case of St Marks 100's use responsibly against very a few, irresponsibly!

This is unnecessary

Enclosed children's play areas should be protected from dogs entering. The sports grounds are frequented by supporters of the current sport taking place. They should also be encouraged to pick up their dogs mess and heavier fines and bold signs, with more poo bag dispensers will help educate the few uneducated dog owners.

I am opposed to the inclusion of the Nevill Ground; this area is frequently devoid of any sporting activity in the upper field.responsible dog owners should not be excluded from any space except children playgrounds.

only in closed off childrens areas, or perhaps when matches are played.it is essential for everyone to wbe able to walk round sports fields IMHO

It is sad but yes I would support this as I feel that the irresponsible walkers spoil things for the responsible ones.

There are plenty of other spaces to walk dogs.I think that St Mark's Recreation Ground should only have these in force when it is not being used for sports matches. When there is a TWRFC or TW Borderers CC home match on, people should be allowed to bring dogs providing they are kept on a lead and the owners clear up after them. That way it ensures that there is no fouling on the sports pitches, and people can still bring their dogs to rugby or cricket as they have done for years prior. As a regular user of St Mark's, what I have proposed I think is a fair compromise.

Instead require dogs to be kept on a lead.

I want dog owners to watch events at st marks, but the fouling and non collection needs larger penalty and enforcement.

I agree dogs should be excluded from children's play areas but not to designating public spaces as dog exclusion areas. Enforcement of dogs on leads would provide safety to others and minimise dog fouling which can occur off lead.

All dog owners should be expected to behave responsibly, to control their dogs and clear up after them Without the need for restrictions being imposed due to a few irresponsible dog owners. I am a dog owner.

**Terrible to exclude dogs and their owners from these areas. Much better to compel them to be responsible for their dogs fouling the area.**

Definitely exclude dogs from fenced children's play areas but **not from parks**. Could allow dogs on leads only so that more control is exercised over behaviour and fouling. It is of course a tiny minority's of dog owners who do not €œpickup€• . The most vigilant are those with children as they are acutely aware of the risks of infection.

I'm a dog owner, but yes I agree there are some places dogs shouldn't be allowed into. **However, these areas need to be fenced off so dogs cannot physically enter**, without enforcing the dog to be on the lead anywhere near it (which wouldn't be acceptable to me). I am strongly opposed to any changes to the current arrangements. I walk my dog at the **Neville Ground and Dunorlan Park** every day and am on good terms with the staff at both. **This is a draconian proposal that penalises the majority of responsible dog owners for the actions of the very few**. I am completely in favour of prohibition orders for irresponsible dog owners (two/three strikes and you are banned for 12/24 months) but it is not reasonable to penalise all the responsible owners (who far outweigh the irresponsible) in this way.

**It is very unfair to penalise responsible dog owners. The neville ground in particular does not have large amounts of dog faeces on the ground there are always bags available at every entrance.**

**I take issue with not being able to walk a dog AROUND the Neville Ground** perimeter such that a cricket lover can not watch cricket with his dog. If the owner can not control the dog and or clean up after him hen penalties should apply.

**Absolutely NOT I use the Nevill regularly for coaching cricket and walking my dog and have very rarely seen any dog mess.**

**I have no objection to enforcing the exclusion of dogs from enclosed children's play areas. I DO object to the designation of the Nevill Ground as a dog exclusion area. This area is underused as a sport venue. From April to September there are cricket matches perhaps 2 afternoons per week (excluding the KCCC festival).**

I have had to say no even though I support exclusion of dogs from children's play areas. **To stop someone walking their dog on or around a sports field is unreasonable and I would suggest impossible to enforce.**

Step up the education, notices & fines rather than have a minority spoil the pleasure of dog walking of the majority. This is ridiculous, I use all these facilities and there are many other families that use them as well including their dogs which 99% are well controlled and if they foul it is always picked up. I do agree that dogs should be on a lead in children's play areas. **PLEASE DON'T REMOVE DOGS FROM THE NEVILL COMPLETELY - IT IS A LOVELY, SOCIAL, CENTRAL COMMUNITY RESOURCE AND IT WOULD BE A REAL SHAME TO RESTRICT ITS USE AND DEPRIVE LOCAL RESIDENTS. WE WANT TO ENCOURAGE MORE USE OF OUR OPEN SPACES, NOT LESS.**

I would like to see the exclusions extended to Dunorlan Park, Calverley Grounds and Grove Hill Park. **The childrens play area in Dunorlan Park is a particular problem as it is not**

enclosed. Many dogs are threatening, particularly to children, and it has really affected my enjoyment of parks in TW. I do not support the exclusion of dogs at the Nevill Ground

If you lot had your way you'd probably have every dog in the country shot.

I do not think this a problem at all. I am against it as I think that it will stop people who attend matches or training at these grounds from bringing their dogs. We should do more to make dog walkers aware of their actions rather than penalise those who abide to the right moral code. Dogs should definitely not be allowed into cordoned off childrens play areas but not banned from grassed sports areas. I like to take my dog to St Marks when watching rugby and it is a lovely place to walk - I feel most dog owners you meet there are very friendly and responsible. It can be a problem on games pitches, but parks are for general recreation as well as for organised sport, and dog walking is for many, particularly older people, their exercise regime.

Creating an exclusion around sports fields would only displace the problem, potentially, onto neighbouring footpaths. It would be more suitable to enforce dog owners to clear up after their mess €“ effective solutions in other councils includes installing CCTV and rewards for reporting dog fouling (Stafford & Hyndburn Council).

Space is for everyone to enjoy and not everyone feels safe around dogs.

Dog access The Kennel Club does not normally oppose dog exclusion or dog on lead orders in playgrounds, or enclosed recreational facilities such as tennis courts or skate parks, as long as alternative provisions are made for dog walkers in the vicinity. We would also point out that children and dogs should be able to socialise together quite safely under adult supervision, and that having a child in the home is the biggest predictor for a family owning a dog. With regards to playing fields, we ask local authorities to consider whether or not access restrictions are absolutely necessary. If they are deemed to be needed, whether time/season limited restrictions would be more appropriate than a continuous on lead order. We are aware in many areas, dog walkers do allow their dogs to exercise on playing fields when they are not in use. If of course they are in use we understand the safety reasons behind restrictions. It is also worth noting that compliance with such an order can be difficult for a dog walker if there are no boundaries around the playing field as when exercising their dogs off lead, dogs will not recognise the difference between playing fields and other grassed areas. The council should be aware that dog owners are required, under the Animal Welfare Act 2006, to provide for the welfare needs of their animals and this includes providing the necessary amount of exercise each day. Their ability to meet this requirement is greatly affected by the amount of publicly accessible parks and other public places in their area where dogs can exercise without restrictions. This section of the Animal Welfare Act was included in the statutory guidance produced for local authorities by the Home Office on the use of PSPOs. The Government provided clear instructions to local authorities that they must provide restriction free sites for dog walkers to exercise their dogs. This message was contained in the guidance document for DCOs, and has been retained in both the Defra/Welsh Government and Home Office PSPO guidance documents, with the Defra guidance for PSPOs stating €“local authorities should ensure there are suitable alternatives for dogs to be exercised without restrictions€”. A common unintended consequence of restrictions is displacement onto other pieces of land, resulting in new conflict being created. It can be difficult to predict the effects of displacement, and so the council should consider

whether alternative sites for dog walkers are suitable and can support an increase in the number of dog walkers using them. To be compliant with the Public Sector Equality Duty we submit the council should consider the accessibility of restriction free alternatives for those with reduced mobility (including but not limited to those with a disability or elderly persons for instance). Alongside considering any direct impact as a result of the PSPO upon those with protected characteristics.

I know that St Marks have been very vocal in their wish for dog owners to not use the sports areas because of major concerns for safety and have shut the gates at the ground. At the Nevill dog owners have got worse and drive there to walk their dog and foul and many do not pick up. Even if they do pick up the remnants remain a significant hazard and for a ground such as the Nevill it is very important to have this proposed order so that a clean area is maintained for sports use to safeguard children and adult users. A dog is an integral part of the family and, as such, will be taken along for a walk whilst supporting family members playing cricket, rugby, football etc. As long as the dog is kept on a lead then this should be not be a problem. The majority of people adhere to this set of rules.

As the father of a daughter who plays cricket and also a big cricket fan, during the cricket season I regularly walk our dog round the Nevill Cricket ground whilst watching the game. As we live next door to the cricket ground, my wife takes the dog over there on a daily basis and always on a lead. We also have nephews who play rugby and regularly take the dog up to the rugby ground to watch them play.