

## Summary Responses 2021

### Q1

I've ticked no because I believe that the current measures in place are more than adequate and most dog owners are perfectly capable of respecting public spaces and do collect their dogs mess. I strongly disapprove of further overly controlling measures to enforce dog owners therefore potentially criminalising good people and creating Further rules which have only the effect of making people feel under pressure and restricted. I believe dog owners are already very responsible and there are already good measures in place to keep our public spaces clean and safe.

"Re; Fouling of Land by Dogs Order: Dogs Trust consider 'scooping the poop' to be an integral element of responsible dog ownership and would fully support a well-implemented order on fouling. We urge the Council to enforce any such order rigorously. In order to maximise compliance we urge the Council to consider whether an adequate number of disposal points have been provided for responsible owners to use, to consider providing free disposal bags and to ensure that there is sufficient signage in place. "

They should clear up but I strongly oppose this as a focus of a PSPO - failure to do so should not be criminalised in this way

Basic health and safety. And common courtesy.

Absolutely. There is never any excuse for dog faeces not to be picked up

If you are responsible enough to have a dog then picking up dog poo is easy

I am a responsible dog owner and pick up my dog's faeces. Dog faeces can cause blindness, smell disgusting and are antisocial. Dog mess is offensive and has a detrimental impact on local environment.

Who want to step in faeces plus it could be dangerous especially for pregnant ladies and for children.

If you own a dog you are responsible for cleaning up after it!

Hygiene, elf and safety

Every dog owner I know agrees that it is unacceptable and disgusting not to pick it up, yet judging by the amount of dog faeces left in Public Places there are numerous other dog owners who don't.

I play football for bampton and there is nothing worse than on a Saturday after picking up dog mess before a game also you can't get it all and I have lost count the amount of time people have slid in dog mess is disgusting and very unpleasant.

Public health risks and common decency - completely disgusting that some don't do it.

It's a health risk not to pick up and also horrible to see on paths and walkways.

Owners should pick up there own dog poo.

It's disgusting & against the law not to. I am a dog owner & believe that is part of responsible ownership.

It is anti social to leave your dog's faeces anywhere within any public area, including footpaths. If you have a dog you should be responsible for clearing mess away.

It is a health hazard and unpleasant for others to see

Hygiene

It should be their responsibility as it's their dog. Same as littering.

There is far too much poo not picked up currently.

Because its discusting when I take my children to the recreation ground and we have to be on dog poo alert constantly!

Their dog, its faeces so their responsibilty

Yes and No, if the dog does it in a 'wild area' (like a patch of gorse bushes) and there's no way anyone is going to tread on it then it's best to leave it where it lies, however on a footpath then yes, however there should be equal fines for leaving filled poo bags to leaving dog poo

Including rural areas

Because all responsible dog owners should

I do not want to step in it and be constantly looking at the ground when out walking

health hazard unpleasant to look at and to smell, apart from the risk of stepping in faeces, particularly children.

Those few irresponsible owners give us good owners a bad name.

It's dangerous not to. It makes using parks and green spaces hazardous and unpleasant.

It is their responsibility to do so.

Unhygienic, detrimental to health, the main reason I avoid public areas

Hygiene and appearance of area

child safety, and unpleasant for walkers

It is good manners and safer for other users of the area

They should pick up their dog's faeces wherever it is.

It is a known public health issue and horrible when children get dog mess on them.

This is obvious and as noted, the vast majority of people do it. However, Imposing a PSPO is a massively heavy handed overreach of the law and once in place, we will be at risk of being criminalised for any number of misdemeanors as decided by the whim of the local authority. This is a slow creep of excessive power.

dog faeces carry diseases and are dangerous to all, particularly young children. It put me off going to places where dog poo is not picked up. It sticks to your shoes and is difficult to remove. It is smelly and can be trodden into your house and car. It is generally disgusting.

Faeces must always be picked and responsible dog owners do. If bins are not available then bags should be taken home. Sometimes though very elderly people who find great companionship from their dogs have difficulty bending down to pick up.

As dogs usually defecate in the same area, this is extremely important to avoid faeces to build up

Dog faeces are unhygienic and unpleasant.

Of course. There's simply no excuse not to. These are public spaces for use by ALL and should be clean and safe.

It's unsightly and unpleasant if stepped upon

Do not leave them for others to clear up. I have had dog fouling on my front lawn

It is our responsibility to keep areas clean to prevent spreading of diseases and unwanted mess on shoes clothes etc.

It's a health issue to those who use recreational facilities. Children can become ill if we're they touch dog faeces. It's not nice to step dog faeces .

We have two dogs and always pick up their faeces however on walks we have spoken to several dog owners who refuse to do this. This needs to change as our village is an unpleasant and unhealthy place to walk when there is the risk of exposure to dog faeces, especially to children.

It's a health hazard at worst and a messy hazard in the least. Plus the dog owners responsibility.

To limit risk of infections and diseases both in humans and animals.

Unpleasant if not picked up and unhygienic

Because in the village of Uffculme where I live, the incidents of children stepping in for faeces is ridiculously high. In the village there is dog faeces in all the paths and more needs to be done to stop people leaving the faeces.

It would be anti social not to do so.

I believe it's a social responsibility to clear up after any animal you own. I am disabled and cannot walk so my wheelchair wheels are my legs, if people don't pick up their dogs poo I could end up going through it and then drive my wheelchair into my home, leaving excrement on my floors, which is not only disgusting but it can cause diseases that could blind me. It also means that my carer has to clean my wheels and the floor taking time away from caring for me. Just because someone was too lazy to pick up THEIR DOG's Poo.

Otherwise people step in it by accident. It is a nuisance and a risk to health.

Bacteria and disease spread very easily - particularly with young children - too easy for even adults to step in dog mess and not realise it - filth gets transmitted into houses

It's a disgusting health risk to the public.

Any responsible Dog owner should pick up after their Dog, with NO exceptions. I am a Dog owner.

There are no reasons not to: none.

Why should unsuspecting members of the public have to clean it off their shoes? Dog faeces can cause Toxoplasmosis, which is serious.

..and not restricted to 'Public Spaces'. To do otherwise is anti-social.

Obvious, why ask the reasons.

It's part of the responsibility of being a dog owner

I live on Bartows Causeway where there is always dog faeces - people let their dogs off the lead on their way to the park.

If you take on the responsibility of owning a dog you should pick up, not to is disrespectful to your community

It is important to have a clean space and not tread in dog excrement into your own homes along the streets back to homes, it is an expectation that this should be done by every own if they wish to own and dog.

Apart from the fact it is disgusting to step in, wheel a pushchair or mobility scooter/wheelchair, it is a public health hazard

Unpleasant and unhealthy to other walkers, children and farm animals

Dog Faeces are an environment hazard and should be picked up and disposed of in a bin

Risk of disease to dogs and children. Dog faeces can take 12 months to break down and may wash into storm drains. As a responsible dog owner It is common courtesy to pick up your dog's faeces, to keep our open spaces clean.

For the health & safety of the general public

Common sense, courtesy, hygiene, sociably acceptable etc. etc. etc.

too much dangerous fouling around Hensleigh area near to tiverton foxhounds. This has been going on for years/decades. I have sent 3 emails this year without response.

Public health

Dog mess is a serious health hazard and dog owners should be obliged to clear up after their dogs and dispose of the waste safely and appropriately.

Responsible Dog owners do

it's the decent thing to do

It is unhealthy and irresponsible to leave dog faeces on the ground.

No one wants to walk in dog faeces

Injurious to children's health and wellbeing; detrimental to enjoyment of environment. Responsible dog owners do this anyway, every dog owner should.

Health and safety and just good manners

Not to do so is a hazard to public health and demonstrates a complete lack of social responsibility

For the health of humans and dogs.

It is unacceptable for dog owners not to clear up after their pets, and it is most unpleasant to see pavements, and other public areas with dog mess left on them.

Public health

Dog mess is smelly, dirty and dangerous, and people who are responsible for dogs should ensure that they remove it. This is a health and safety issue and there should be clear powers to stop fouling.

Because it's dangerous and revolting to leave dog faeces lying around.

It is no longer acceptable to leave your dog's faeces behind.

Foul smelling, especially in warm weather. Risk of spreading disease from dog to dog, other wildlife or anyone unfortunate enough to slip and fall in it!

'Disgusting and potentially dangerous when you step in it. Our village ( Bampton) and the surrounding roads are plagued with people who will not pick up the mess

Pathogens in dog faeces are a danger to human health.

Every dog owner should be responsible for picking up the mess. Most owners do, and no matter how many orders you put in place, there will still be those that don't whether on a lead or not

Being in charge means 'in charge of EVERYTHING', including the poo! Council's have made it easy to dispose of them with 'Any Bin Will Do'. It is unkind to allow child buggies and bikes to unwittingly collect poo on their wheels and end up with it indoors at home or having to have a thorough scrub. I'm very old and a dog-owner but my sympathies lie with parents, children, walkers, cyclists...

it is their responsibility

dog faeces are a health hazard and responsible owners should take responsibility for their animals

We live in Crediton by the popular public footpath called tin pot ally - there is , on a daily basis bags of dog faeces and actual faeces littering the steps and pathways and even hung on the trees despite the provision of bins on the walk

Health .....especially that of children. Dog faeces make our streets and parks unwelcoming. Rapid control of dogs that turn dangerous.

If you own a dog you are responsible for any mess that dog makes. Others should not have to pick up after you or have the worry of stepping in dog mess.

Because dog faeces is a serious public nuisance and a health hazard. Cleaning it off shoes or clothing is grossly unpleasant and can be the cause of several serious illnesses

It is horrible for other people wanting to make use of the given area and especially with children

and heavily fined if not.

## Q2

I believe that most dog owners already do carry appropriate measures to collect dog poo. However everyone is capable of making a mistake and forgetting something so therefore I do not feel it is appropriate to take yes in this box.

"We question the effectiveness of issuing on-the-spot fines for not being in possession of a poo bag and whether this is practical to enforce."

It is an essential part of responsible dog ownership

Again, they should but there are many reasons why someone might fail to do so and, again, to criminalise that failure in this way of a wholly disproportionate use of the law

If they can afford to keep a dog then they can afford bags for their mess.

Responsible dog owners do carry them. Some people walk their dogs off lead and do not seem to care when they wander off and have no idea what their doing

All dog owners should do this. Dog waste bags are cheap and readily available. No exceptions.

Why should someone who doesn't have a dog pay to clean up after lazy dog owners.

How can you pick up after your dog if you don't carry the appropriate and number of bags to pick up poo.

To pick up their poo.... I take my baby's nappy home with me. They should take their peta poo home with them

Picking up dog faeces is only part of the process, it should then be disposed of in the bins provided and not hung from trees or fences or flung into the undergrowth. Bampton Town Council provide both bags and bins in recreational areas but it makes no difference.

Always pick up after yourself

Part of the responsibility in owning a dog. There should also be requirements to use a bin and fines for those who leave bags of poo beside paths, hanging in trees etc. Disgusting.

No excuse not to be prepared

How else would they clean it up?

Your dog, your responsibility.

It is responsible ownership

Common courtesy

It should be totally their responsibility to pick up their animals mess abs so if course they should have something to pick it up and dispose of it.

There tiny and not hard to carry

Depends what you call appropriate Council need to provide more bins

They will not pick it up without bags

without bags, they are unable to remove faeces. Suggest an increase in bins to deposit. it would be impossible to enforce but why so some people hang the bags in hedges and on fences?

If they have no bags they are clearly not intending to pick up and should be prosecuted

If you own a dog you need to cleanup after it.

Dog owners need to be responsible for their own dog's mess and not rely on the council to provide them with bags, etc.



If you choose to have a child you choose to look after it including ensuring any biological waste is appropriately dealt with and disposed of, its no different with animals.

If they have no bags, they have no intention or picking up

To ensure they clear up their dogs mess

This is obvious and as noted, the vast majority of people do it. However, Imposing a PSPO is a massively heavy handed overreach of the law and once in place, we will be at risk of being criminalised for any number of misdemeanors as decided by the whim of the local authority. This is a slow creep of excessive power.

Having no poo bag is used as an excuse not to pick up and this is not right.

There is no excuse for not doing so,

It is very easy to pick up faeces and deposit the bags in bins

Bags needn't be expensive. Standard nappy bags are plentiful and cheap.

This should be mandatory.

If you wish to be a dog owner you need to accept the responsibilities that come with it.

To clean up the mess a dog has made. The bags should then be disposed of in either appropriate bins or at home.

If you more then one dog they don't do their business at the same time .

It is a dog owner or walkers responsibility to do this.

Their responsibility.

Dog not dof!

You cannot clean up after your dog unless you have the means with which to do so.

Won't be able to pick up if no bags

As a responsible owner you should always have dog bags to pick up faeces.

There is no excuse not to clear up the mess if they have the means to do so on their person.

It is very easy to put a handful of dog poo bags in your pocket or fix them to your dog lead and then when they are full - Take them home to dispose of - Do Not Hang On A Tree Branch !!

Prevention of spread of disease and unpleasant mess

As above. If owners don't carry bags then they have no intention of picking up their dog waste.

Any responsible Dog owner should pick up after their Dog, with NO exceptions. I am a Dog owner.

No reason not to

Of course. Why should it be left as a health hazard for people to step in?

how else to comply? walk the dog and look after it.

I know people who never pick up after their dog.

Shows your intention to do the right thing and pick up

Common sense and shows a responsible dog owner with good intent.

a responsible dog owner would already carry these, it's the ones who don't clean up that need to have this enforced

To save others treading in it

so that they can pick up after the dog

I agree that everyone should carry appropriate means to use to pick up dog faeces however enforcing this requirement could prove very difficult. You have to start considering what powers will council enforcement officers have to search individuals and require them to turn out their pockets.

Dogs often poo more than once on a walk & without the means of picking up they are unable to provide the required health & safety of the general public

Disposal of dog mess is best carried out using a compostable disposable waste bag. A clean and complete removal into a bag is the best way for an owner to clear it away completely.

Again responsible people do

they should, but we all forget them sometimes and i don't think a punitive measure should be the case for not carrying a bag.

If you decide that you want to keep a dog, you should take into account everything that you need to do so that the dog is not a nuisance in any way to others.

Owners/ walkers of dogs have a civic and moral responsibility to always be appropriately prepared to clear up after the dogs.

Have a dog -your responsibility

It's obvious. No bag.. No pick up.

Dogs can go 2 or3 times on each walk.

Dog owners, or a person exercising a dog(s) should be made aware that it is unacceptable, and unlawful, not to be prepared to clear up after it.

Dog owners need to show that they are responsible and having the means to remove faeces is just one way to show that they are prepared to manage dog mess.

Because not to do so would make question 1 impossible to achieve.

It is no longer acceptable to leave your dog's faeces behind.

And to dispose of in appropriate bins, or take the bag home for disposal. NOT just left in hedges, on pathsides etc.

No bag, no pick up. Collection bins are as important

Again, pathogens in the faeces constitute a risk to human health. It is deeply offensive to have to clean dog muck from shoes or clothing, especially children's footwear.

Bags are inexpensive and easy to carry. Of course they MUST pick up so of course they MUST have the means to do so.

without bags they cannot comply

if you own a dog then you should have the means to clean up after it.

To fulfil reasons given in section 1. Dogs may defecate several times on a walk.

If you have a dog - buy dog poo bags .. or use nappy sacks. They aren't expensive - some are biodegradable - there are plenty of bins to put them in.

Because there is a social obligation to pick the stuff up and it ought to be a legal obligation too.

It is no excuse to say you have run out of bags, most responsible dog owners know how many to take on a given walk and heavily fined if not.

If dog owners are approached at the end of a walk they may have already used the bags that they have taken out or given a spare bag to someone who has run out for example.

### Q3

I'm unable to take any of the following boxes because I think it's common sense to put the dog on a lead when the owner knows it's not capable of controlling the dog without doing so. I prefer people to use common sense where possible.

All of the above

"Re; Dogs on Leads Order: Dogs Trust accept that there are some areas where it is desirable that dogs should be kept on a lead. Dogs Trust would urge the Council to consider the Animal Welfare Act 2006 section 9 requirements (the 'duty of care') that include the dog's need to exhibit normal behaviour patterns – this includes the need for sufficient exercise including the need to run off lead in appropriate areas. Dog Control Orders should not restrict the ability of dog keepers to comply with the requirements of this Act. The Council should ensure that there is an adequate number, and a variety of, well sign-posted areas locally for owners to exercise their dog off-lead. Re; Dogs on Lead by Direction Order: Dogs Trust enthusiastically support Dogs on Leads by Direction orders (for dogs that are considered to be out of control or causing alarm or distress to members of the public to be put on and kept on a lead when directed to do so by an authorised official). • We consider that this order is by far the most useful, other than the fouling order, because it allows enforcement officers to target the owners of dogs that are allowing them to cause a nuisance without restricting the responsible owner and their dog. As none of the other orders, less fouling, are likely to be effective without proper enforcement we would be content if the others were dropped in favour of this order. "

Part (a) & (c) YES part (b) answer YES & NO

I DISAGREE with ALL of the above, but it is not possible to leave all options unticked - this is a flaw in the design of the survey. There is already ample legal provision regarding proper control of dogs where this is a problem. In general, dog owners should be trusted to know how their dog can best be walked. Again, this kind of blanket proposal appears wholly disproportionate as a response to something that does not appear to be a problem in many of the local areas covered, and would also severely limit dog owners' options for walks that give their pets appropriate exercise, as well as forcing many of them into extra and longer car journeys to find places that are conducive to walks that give their dogs sufficient exercise and stimulation, harming other attempts by the council to encourage people to be more environmentally friendly. Furthermore, being on a lead is no guarantee that a dog is under control - an owner

that does not have appropriate control of their dog as a matter of course will rarely have any better control with a lead, although this might give others a false sense of security

I agree with all of the above. All dogs should be on leads in public areas. Too many owners allow their dogs to wander when exercising them. Extendable leads use should also be restricted in public areas.

There are signs at the entrances to the church yard in Bampton, but some dog owners pay no attention to this

I have tried to check all options above but the survey would not allow me to

What is the park for if dogs can't run around play if they are looked after by responsible owners and kept away from the children's play area. Bike riders and joggers no better than dog owners. Give the dogs and responsible owners a break .

Dogs should be kept on a lead at all times when out of their home.

I think it's bad news to specify that dogs have to be kept on leads in public parks. I completely understand in children's parks but public parks I think is terrible. My dog is so well behaved and walks to heel and I feel we are being penalised as other people don't know how to train their dogs. I always pick up my dog poop and again feel dog owners are all being tarnished with the same brush

There is no option for all of the above My children are scared of dogs and I don't want dogs running up to them, sniffing them, or reaching up to them.

I would like to check all of the above, and I would also like to see enforcement officers from time to time otherwise this PSPO is a pointless paper exercise.

I wanted to tick all the above but no option to do this. The behaviour of dogs can be erratic and as a passer-by you cannot know if a loose dog is aggressive or not. More people seem to have aggressive breeds these days too. I especially worry about children being attacked in parks and public spaces. It's not a nice feeling to be anxious when just enjoying family time in a public space.

The form will only allow me to select one option. I believe that all 3 are important.

Actually I would tick all three options, but the survey won't let me.

Parks except for enclosed play areas are designed for dog exercise.

Dogs shouldn't be allowed to go in areas such as the recreation ground or anywhere where children play or the public use for community events such as football matches etc., when there are other perfectly good fields to walk their dogs in! They would lick up the poo of it was in their garden I bet!

Within reason this is ok but sometimes the older generation can't travel to walk their dogs

Why Can't I tick all three (Non working) dogs in public place should be under the control of a lead

You can't check more than 1, although I think they should be on leads in church yards, parks I think it depends on the size of the park

Only play parks Council provide dog parks

I checked all 3

Dogs should be kept on leads in ALL public places

i would like to check them all

Churchyards are important and dogs should not roam free off leads.

They should be on leads in cemeteries and parks and if requested by officer

Enforcing the rules will be difficult and the fine is only damaging to those on a tight budget...the penalty should be higher and easier to enforce but also there should be a system for those trying to keep their pet if they are responsible with things like bags or leads available at discounted prices or through free serviced where necessary

I would have checked all

Should be applied in all circumstances

All of the above

Badly behaved dogs can be dangerous and frightening for both children and adults. They can also attack other dogs and animals.

With any of the above yes. However, Imposing a PSPO is a massively heavy handed overreach of the law and once in place, we will be at risk of being criminalised for any number of misdemeanors as decided by the whim of the local authority. This is a slow creep of excessive power.

Some public parks have large enough areas to allow dogs off lead in some areas

I ticked them all but they unticked and would only let me pick one - I think that all apply

I wanted to select all 3 of the options, however this was not possible. All dogs should be kept on suitable leads to avoid dogs attacking other dogs, children or cyclists, walkers as well as causing accidents by running into cyclists. It is distressing having to explain other dog owners that very few dogs are completely reliable and obedient and close control is required at all times which can only be achieved by keeping them on leads.

I want to be able to select all of the above options but am limited to one for some reason.

Schedule B excludes the cemetery/churchyard in my village of Zeal Monachorum. Please can this be added as the public regularly walk through.

I believe there should be designated areas where dogs can be let off lead. Pent up energy and the absence of dog socialisation often leads to dog aggression

I also think the Tiverton Canal should be included

Dogs should be allowed off lead exercise. It is absolutely ridiculous that you are going to force dogs to be on lead all the time!

Yes to all of the above

Tried to check all three.

Enforcement officers - will likely lead to the abuse of power (different for police, agree they should be listened to!). Not in all of the parks - dogs need exercise off the lead. By limiting public space for this there is the risk of more dogs off lead through land with livestock. They need somewhere large and safe to go. Solution is to fence around play equipment. Dogs should be on the lead at the skateparks - risk of injury to dogs and skaters.

The survey will only allow me to check one box but I want to check all the above.

All of the above

Dogs should be let off the lead if under control and providing not in enclosed play areas.

I think you should have the option to tick 1 and 3 options as I agree with two options .

I would have checked all three.

Dogs should be on leads at all times in public areas.

All three should be ticked

I'm trying to check all 3

all the above

A drip-drip towards banning dogs from everywhere.

Agree with all 3, only allows me to select 1.

because the survey would not allow me to check more than one !!!!

Restriction on Amory Park is unfair to dog walkers, currently 90 % is restricted for sports or BMX track, with a small triangle area used by dog walkers, why can't this area be fenced off for dog walkers for off lead throwing of balls etc, restricting the whole of Amory Park is unfair, and not considerate to dog walkers that currently use this area more often than sports field.

I do not agree that dogs should need to be on a lead in Willand Recreational Ground. Willand is one of the most densely populated areas as long as the owners have their dogs under control everyone should be able to enjoy this space. Dog owners pay council tax as well as parents and they should have appropriate areas where dogs can be exercised. During lockdown without the opportunity to travel this has been the only place with in the Parish Boundary that you can throw a ball for a dog.

I would have preferred to be able to tick all three locations

I think all things above should apply. I have seen several dogs attack other dogs causing harm and vets visits and this should not be allowed. I do not like dogs running towards me or my children I do not know if they are safe and I feel it is frightening.

There should be an area set aside where dogs could be freely exercised and socialised

I think that all of the above apply but it only allows one option to be checked

I agree to all 3 proposals.

all options

All the above.

I want to check all but the system

I wanted to check all of the above. I live in people's Park and have had 3 dogs off leads attack my pets, killing 2 and causing massive physical damage to my husband when he tried to protect one. I've seen at least 3 incidents of dogs off the lead attack other dogs, and twice of them knocking children off their bikes. The owners never seem to have control so dogs need to be kept on leads except in specific areas designated as dog areas

In public parks and cemeteries and churchyards amongst other places, to keep them from running round, urinating and messing in those areas and others.

Responsible people do not need to be told what to do with their animals



respectfulness to mourners is absolutely necessary. dog exercise areas have not been mentioned at all. this issue doesn't have to be one thing or the other without any compromise. a few signs in parks have to be more cost effective than extra enforcement officers patrolling the parks.

I think that dogs should be kept on leads in all the above environments.

would tick all of these. Very glad to see List in Schedule has been amended

Agree with all 3

Agree with all 3.

I agree with all of the options but am unable to select them all. I have repeatedly seen and talked to dog owners who believe that their dog is fine to let off the lead in parks and there is no law to stop them

Why isn't it all of these, or at least the first two?

Dogs have no place in cemeteries and churchyards and I believe they should be banned. Having said that, I am a frequent visitor to Crediton's extremely well kept cemetery and I cannot recall ever having seen a dog in it.

I agree that dogs should be under control, however there should be provision where dogs can be exercised off lead. It is cruel to deny some animals the need to run, especially those of medium and larger size. The largest users of park areas are those using them for exercising their dogs.

Agree with all above, but can only check one. Some dogs, children and adults are anxious when dogs get close and therefore cannot use public paths where dogs might be off lead. . Not all dogs recall well - therefore ALL dogs on leads in any public space.

Strict enforcement of the rules. Name & shame in the local paper.

Sorry, but this survey is flawed, you can only tick 1 box. I agree with all of the above

Absolutely on all three options.

To the maximum extent permissible by law, dogs should be held on a short lead at all times when not in secure private areas.

Park (in Wembworthy) prohibits dogs already.

People and dogs need space and the latter has been a lifeline for people like me during Covid restrictions and with no immediate family in the UK. Some free-running space is important. Sweden and Finland provide such areas for dogs and their owners. It seems that the Council may take away a few that are

available (i.e. Old Park, Tiverton) with no provision for more. Elderly people (like me) often take dogs (on leads, of course) to visit graves while people with no respect let dogs run free. Dog wardens need to work out of office hours to catch offenders like the man who every evening lets his dog loose in Tiverton Cemetery and another with two large dogs throws balls between the gravestones.

In all places of public use.

Dogs should not be in either cemetery or churchyard. Safety & health should always come first.

#### **Q4**

I do not agree that any further enforcement needs to be carried out to ensure that dog owners keep dogs out of public parks. Most public parks have a sign that restricts dogs from entering and where this is seen dog owners are already complying with that guidance.

"Re; Dog Exclusion Order: Dogs Trust accepts that there are some areas where it is desirable that dogs should be excluded, such as children's play areas, however we would recommend that exclusion areas are kept to a minimum and that, for enforcement reasons, they are restricted to enclosed areas. We would consider it more difficult to enforce an exclusion order in areas that lack clear boundaries. Dogs Trust would highlight the need to provide plenty of signage to direct owners to alternative areas nearby in which to exercise dogs. "

every child should be able to play safely in an area where there is no possibility of dog fouling

The exclusion of dogs from play areas, especially since of the larger sites, would constitute an indefensible discrimination as to which residents can and can't use public amenities, as well as reinforcing for many children that dogs are to be feared.

Children should be allowed safe clean areas to play in. Dogs have the use of most of park areas, it is not a hardship for them to have no access to play areas. Ideally the dogs should be given their own designated area to run and play.

Dogs should be excluded from children's play areas, BUT (in the case of the Bampton play area on Morebath road) the gates are regularly left open by the people using the play area. If gate springs were fitted, the gates would automatically shut themselves. Young teenagers using the play area yesterday had a terrier with them and refused to take it out. Their argument was that it was friendly and they had poo bags with them

Risk of children playing in dog mess in playground and health risk to pregnant women

Safety

Children need areas to play safely in without being frightened of aggressive dogs and avoiding dog poo.

As the above.. my children are scared of dogs

Obviously we don't want dog faeces where children are playing but we also don't want aggressive dogs in these areas. Not all children are comfortable with dogs and should be able to play safely.

Reasons above

For public safety and cleanliness & health.

Many children (and adults) are frightened of dogs especially when they run around and jump up at them

Everyone should be able to enjoy the spaces, you shouldn't be allowed to exclude one type of person (dog owners). It's about making sure people respect the areas i.e. picking up dog pop, throwing away rubbish, not vandalising play areas etc. No banning people from using it.

To provide dog-free play space for children's play. I am pleased to see that the Bampton Morebath Road play area is included but that the wider recreation field is not. This is used by large numbers of Bampton residents for exercising dogs (often while kids play in the new play area) so the arrangement works well for family life.

Dog faeces is detrimental to health not to mention disgusting if stood in or children touch it. Also not everyone is happy around dogs and many children are scared of them. It is intimidating for children and parents if there are dogs in a safe area.

Dogs and ex item dogs do not mix

The owner can then ensure the dog doesn't out of sight and leave a mess.

Children are there. Some dogs are not good around children.

It's disgusting!

So often families particularly in our area have dogs and children. This is the countryside. If you ensure that ALL dogs are kept on leads at ALL times the owners (including myself) cannot miss their dogs defecating and MUST pick it up or we can never come to Bampton which effects us the community the income of Bampton and our dogs welfare for exercise.

If you are in control of your dogs can't see the problem, sometimes I have people's children run upto my dogs mine aren't used to kids

As a source of antisocial behaviour, infection and irritation, dogs should be so excluded

Just seems like not a great place to take a dog

Difficult as families have dogs so maybe only dogs if with families with children

I do not want my grand children harmed by dog mess or aggressive dogs

health and safety hazard

If it is a clearly marked play area for children with equipment and secure boundrie absolutly yes!

Child play areas are enclosed for a reason, don't punish us good dog owners and good dogs because of the behaviour of the few. Discrimination at its best no reason to be in play areas.

Regardless of how friendly dogs can be they can all turn and children are more likely to be unable to recognise a quick change in temperament and situation, unfortunately neither all dog owners nor parents feel the need to monitor situations such as interactions between children and animals appropriately.

But not the areas around.

For the reasons given in 1 and 3 above.

However, Imposing a PSPO is a massively heavy handed overreach of the law and once in place, we will be at risk of being criminalised for any number of misdemeanors as decided by the whim of the local authority. This is a slow creep of excessive power.

For reasons given in number 1. It is hard to stop children accidentally stepping in/picking up or falling into it.

Some young children are afraid of dogs even on a lead. But as families with young children take dogs out with the children it would be thoughtful if hitching points for dogs could be available away from the entrance to the play area so parents do not have to stand outside with the dog.

Dogs on leads should not cause a problem

Even if dogs are well behaved or kept on a lead, having them in a sometimes hectic and unpredictable playground area, is clearly a risk.

Dog mess and children is a health hazard

Stops children being exposed to dog mess

If they are on a lead they should be allowed. Often parents with a dog will want to walk the dog and allow children to play at the same time. Family time restraints.

Not all children like dogs it then spoils their enjoyment of playing. Even if a dog is friendly a child went up to pat it the dog could still turn not only that but also of health issues of a dog fouling.

Dog faeces carry disease. Children need clean places to play.

A lot of families have a pet dog.

I think that if Specific play area as children play on grass etc

Not all children are comfortable around dogs. Also to limit dog fouling.

Keep kids safe and clean

Safer for children using play equipment

To lessen the risk to users of the areas posed by dogs eg mess anti social behaviour.

Play areas should be for parents and their children only but I believe there should be an area outside of the park where a dog or dogs can be tied up whilst the parents supervise their children, whilst also able to watch their dog/dogs. As dogs are part of the family.

Prevent dog fouling and difficulties with children

If dogs are under control and waste is picked up there is no risk to children. But people will abuse it if allowed.

They spread diseases, they bite.

Go poo can carry Toxoplasmosis, which could blind a child. A child should also not have to encounter dogs which may frighten them.

kiddies can get excited when playing. An excited dog in the same space is not clever.

Obvious.

Risk of eye damage from infection.

I think it would be appropriate for dogs on a lead to be able to walk through the Orchards, Willand it connects a housing estate to Jaycroft which is a nice walk for dogs to get there without wading through could involve walking on roads with out footpaths and which are also busy.

I think children and adults should have access to clean spaces.

with the current spate of dog thefts dogs should be allowed inside, but tied up in sight

I think all small enclosed play areas should have dogs excluded but in Willand the Orchards should allow dogs on leads to be in keeping with the other areas identified it is not a small enclosed play area. It can be a useful cut through from Orchard Way to Jaycroft where dogs are allowed off the lead

Yes, dogs must be under control in designated children play areas.

Plenty of places to exercise dogs without having to mix with children in their play areas.

Common sense.

fouling is dangerous to young children

They are dangerous around small children and some children are scared

Dog mess harbours nasty bacteria that can cause very serious health issues for children and adults. Play areas must be kept clear of dog mess. Some dogs may be unsafe and/or frighten or hurt children.

Enclosed children's areas need to be protected

some children aren't comfortable with dogs. dog faeces remain even after being picked up.

Some children are frightened or nervous of dogs, and some owners do not keep their dogs in check in these areas.

Children should be kept free to run and play without the risk of harm be that from an out of control animal, even if it is just excited play and also kept safe from dog mess within play areas. As not all dog owners can be relied on to be responsible a ban safeguards children thoroughly.

Hazards to children's health

Responsible dog owners should not be penalised

Dogs naturally mark areas and need to be excluded apart from potential danger from unsupervised dogs attacks and fouling

Because even when picked up, dog faeces remain in small amounts which would pose a risk to children and just be really unpleasant for anyone using the area.

Some children find dogs intimidating.

Children should not be expected to play in areas where they have to look out for dog mess

We need to encourage young people to go to designated play areas. Dog faeces make it less likely to happen

Children are particularly vulnerable to dog faeces left on the ground because they play on the ground and with balls that have been in contact with the ground that they then handle.

Not all dogs are child-friendly and not all children are confident with dogs. If the area is designated for children/young people, then take dogs elsewhere and give youngsters the space and opportunity to enjoy themselves.

play areas are for children and families not dog exercise areas.

To protect children from dog faeces and over excited dogs who may bite.

No matter how well behaved your dog is it can cause a nuisance to very young children who may not know how to act around a dog - keep them on a lead.

For the safety of the public and the avoidance of public nuisance and alarm.

As children play there

Lots of dogs are family pets and so children may be unsupervised if not allowed in; could make it mandatory that they are kept on leads in the area instead.

These people should be named and shamed (in The Gazette?) like those who regularly exercise dogs on football pitches (like Amory Park) and children's playgrounds.

Of course! Dog muck causes disease!

## **Q5**

An arbitrary maximum number of dogs is an inappropriate approach. Consider accreditation scheme for commercial dog walkers.

How can anyone on a mobile phone concentrate on 4-6 dogs.

I believe that there is no need to actually place a restriction on the number of dogs with a dog owner instead I think the restriction should be on the safe use of walking dogs. For example if six dogs or more are extremely well-behaved and safe and there is no issue however when somebody is with one dog that is not under control this is unsafe and therefore they are not capable of controlling the dog properly and should not be in a public space.

"Re; Taking more than a specified number of dogs onto a land: The behaviour of the dogs and the competency of the handler need to be taken into consideration if considering this order. Research from 2010 shows that 95% of dog owners have up to 3 dogs. Therefore the number of dogs taken out on to land by one individual would not normally be expected to exceed four dogs. "

multiple dogs on leads are a hazard to both the general public and the the dog walker

Again, there are many reasons why it might be appropriate for an individual to walk several dogs at once, as long as they are properly under control this is not in and out itself a problem, and so a blanket ban is once again an entirely disproportionate proposal

A lot of dog owners seem to lack the capability to walk one dog let alone multiple ones. There has to be a limit on how many dogs one person can control.

It can be hard enough negotiating pavements with one or two dogs. The strength of dogs when they want to pull should never be underestimated

Professional dog walkers may exercise greater than 6 dogs at a time. Most common offenders of dog owners not picking up their dog mess have just one dog

How can someone with many dogs control them.

I don't see why this needs to be done. You are just targeting dog walkers who are all responsible people .

Limit should be lowered

Control.. or lack of with too many dogs

I have often observed people walking numerous dogs, they can barely keep them under control, never mind picking up after so many animals. While one dog is doing it's 'business ' the others are tugging the owner/walker along and invariably the faeces gets left

Dogs should be banned from the recreation ground

No need for anyone to have more than 6 dogs. I would even limit it to less. No-one can control do many and their behaviour tends to be worse. Also professional dog walkers should not use our public spaces and basically destinations to deposit a whole lot of dog poo.

For safety, i would imagine it's difficult to control multiple dogs so to limit risk, limit the numbers.

I do not know enough to comment. If they are all under control/being supervised by a responsible owner, I am not sure what the issues would be.

yes definitely



The dog Walker has to be responsible for all the dogs in their care all the time.

Ten dogs under strict control can be safer than one dog not.

Too many dogs and there will be no control

Walking too many dogs means the Walker does not have full control of all dogs, mess may not be picked up when too many dogs .

If you have more than two dogs you are very likely to be a responsible to be a very good and aware dog owner. The tiny minority and I'm sure we all know who they are, should not affect our countryside environment. All dogs on a lead at all times solves the issues as we can point out irresponsible owners as we all should do.

One human two hands therefore two dogs maximum

If the walker is in control then no problem

dogs of one family Business walkers should be less

they either fill pavements or are a nuisance on lanes

Again not all dogs are bad behaved, there are a good few that have been trained.

Limit should be THREE at most(TWO better)As long term dog owner i know noone can be in control of more than two or three.(exception could be for reg.dog walkers-say 5)

The more dogs the less chance of being able to physically hold onto them all in some situations or be able to protect them from attack from humans and other animals.

picking up and control over numerous dogs is all but impossible

To ensure full control can be exercised

An owner or dog walker cannot control more than 6 dogs at once.

This is irrelevant. If people are having excessive numbers of dogs with them, or by any other behaviour and causing a nuisance, tackle them. Do not impose a PSPO.

Dogs are powerful and it could be very hard to restrain several large dogs.

If the dogs are under control and behaving well or on leads I think this seems harsh. Pre Covid groups of owners walked dogs together and it would be unfair to limit a single owner when some groups can be quite large and well behaved.

Yes. I do not see how it is possible to suitably control more than 2 dogs at a time. 2 hands, 2 dogs...

It is very difficult for an individual to have complete control over a large number of dogs

Quite simply, there is only a certain number of dogs that one person can keep under control at any one time, no matter how small. The larger the dog of course, the harder that job becomes.

Impossible to be fully in control of that number of dogs

6 is too many. They have to be held while the handler bags the droppings. Find out by experiment what the max number of dogs that can be handled in order that all mess is cleaned.

Unless a qualified dog walker / minder.

Having witnessed how some owners can't control their dogs on or off leads .

One person cannot control a large number of dogs both on or off a lead. They cannot watch dogs going in different directions and could fail to notice when dogs are defecating.

It's up to individuals how many dogs they have

As a dog owner and walker I see too many people walking dogs out of control.

There's a limit on how many dogs one person can be reasonably responsible for.

Surely it is impossible to control a large number of dogs

Safety for children and to enable Walker /owner to keep track of faeces collection

Difficult to control large numbers of dogs and to see if they need to be cleaned up after.

Because I do not believe handling too many dogs is safe.

I think 6 is too many and it should be no more than 4.

It is very difficult to hold onto more than 6 dogs. I would limit owners of small dogs to max of 6 and large / medium dogs to a maximum of 5. If another owner's dog goes for one of your 6 dogs how are you going to intervene and maintain control of the other 5?

Difficult to keep track of dog fouling

People should have control of their dogs at all times.

Any more than 6 i believe is unmanageable , to some degree it does depend on sizes of dogs

Basic common sense

Because they MUST have control over their mutts and the higher the number, the less chance of this.

If all dogs had perfect training then this wouldn't be an issue. However not all owners have control or the strength to hold more than 1 or 2 dogs.

to be responsibly in control? most people could not handle 6 (yes I know that some people can handle more)

I would limit to 4. More than 4 dogs, very hard to control.

The key here is 'under control', if competent an owner can control multiple dogs, if not then 1 dog is too many.

People who walk dogs professionally should be allowed to walk an unspecified number of dogs.

Impossible to be aware of the behaviour of a large number of dogs.

The important thing is for the owners/walkers to be in control. I don't feel this is the councils job to dictate. Some owners can't control 1 dog others spend a lot of time training and can lots.

Few people have the ability to control one dog let alone 4 or 5.

I still think six dogs is excessive, dog walkers tend to have more and they are not always in control of these dogs. Dog walkers are often the people who let the dogs off in the park.

one person could not control a large number of dogs in the event of something happening, eg an accident to the person in charge

People can not easily keep an eye on more than one dog when they are running free although it is easier if they are on leads.

You should consider the proportionality of this restriction as you will be targeting a minority group of the community.

Too many dogs together work as a "Pack" and in general cannot be controlled - better to be safe than sorry when looking after a lot of dogs.

Too many and they lose control over them

There are too many dogs for a start! It's hard for people to keep control over or clear up after, more than 2 dogs.

Because its not the number of dogs itshow well trained they are.

If you look after dogs properly this isn't an issue

should be common sense but that isn't so common.

I do not think it is so easy for one person to control a larger number of dogs.

Anyone would struggle to responsibly control and clear up after large groups of animals.

The number may be multiples, but should be reasonable to be under effective control

I think it should only be two to have proper control of the dogs.

Responsible dog owners should not be penalised

It may seem obvious but some dog walkers do not appear to realise that all dogs should be under control and a limit is needed for practical reasons

Because these pro dog walkers cannot properly control a large number of animals and they cannot properly manage their fouling.

This gives the walker a better chance of keeping control.

To maintain control. If one dog decides to 'turn' aggressive, how can 1 person control it when they have multiple dogs/leads to manage? Or if another dog in the area is not properly controlled and attacks?

We see too many " dog walkers " with too many dogs and out of control.

A dog walker can only watch one or two dogs closely at any one time. The usual practice, I have observed, is to let them all off the lead together and they run off and poop.

Happily there are now enclosed specialist dog-friendly secure fields which can be booked to allow dogs to run free. If a walker/owner is running unlimited numbers in public spaces, their control may not only be compromised but keeping an eye on lots of dogs e.g. where they poo etc. is less easy. Some people feel quite intimidated by a 'pack' or bunch of dogs running free or going up to them.

I think it should be lower than six

to allow access for pedestrians and safety of all road and footpath users and of course the safety of the dogs .

Too many dogs can overwhelm a dog walker.

Dogs - no matter how well behaved - can act unexpectedly sometimes - if you have too many dogs it'll be hard to control all of them 100% of the time.

A single person cannot exercise full control over more than one dog. Six is too many. Two should be the maximum.

They are not able to keep them all under control or surveillance to pick up poo

## Q6

Once again I do not see any point in placing a number on the number of dogs that are kept safely and under control.

As above

I do not think 6 dogs can be safely controlled. I am a reasonably fit 15 stone male who sometimes struggles to control one border collie. logically it should be limited by the total weight of dogs in relation to that of the walker but this is obviously impractical so I would suggest a maximum limit of 4

I disagree with the principle of setting a limit. If a limit is to be set, the reasoning behind the number specified ought to be explicitly spelled out by the order. (If satisfactory explicit reasoning cannot be given, then a limit ought not to be imposed)

6 is a lot of dogs for 1 person to be in charge of 4 or 5

It really depends on the dogs and person in charge of them

I think it should be 4, 2 per hand is reasonable.

I think the number should be lower on public pavements - maybe 4 dogs

What about dog walkers who exercise more dogs at a time? They are responsible and would be penalised if your suggested limit was imposed

Should be limited to 2

Limit to 3. I have seen owner struggling to control 3 dogs. If you wish to own more than 3 dogs then you find an appropriate area away from parks playgrounds etc.

Three is more than enough.. one out of control dog is mayhem..

Maximum should be three. One person simply cannot control anymore than that.

Reasons above

I think the limit should be less. 4 would be plenty.

Three is really enough to keep an eye on

I think 6 is too high, people struggle to control two dogs most the time 6 is too high. 6 is a pack and the dogs then behave as a pack.

I think four is a more realistic number.

As above

Seems too many still

6 is far too many. 4 would be more appropriate, 2 leads in each hand.

As above. It's not the quantity of dogs it's the owners who can't be arsed to pick up their own animals excrement. The majority should not be punished.

Think no more than four would be more appropriate

Maybe set at 6 off lead at one time but can walk more if in total control

Two, as above

Same as above

Less in highly populated areas town, canal etc

4 (two per hand)

Because all but a few are incapable of looking after more

The limit should be reduced to 2 dogs maximum

five should be the limit

I think this really depends on the size of the dogs and experience of the owner though. I can't say I see anyone walking more than 6 dogs anyway in any of the areas in Cullompton.

Should be 3 you can't keep an eye off lead with 6 dogs and unlikely to pick up after them all

As above. No one can be in full control of more than 2 or 3 dogs. I am a long-term owner and you could not be sure 6 were not being a nuisance or check none pooped out of sight

They shouldn't have them on council estates as these people have no respect for others and once one barks they all start! It's like living in a kennel!!

Should be 4

I think 6 dogs per person is too many at one time! Should be only 3

I think it should be lower - 3 max

One person cannot control 6 dogs. The limit should be 2.

It should be lower!

6 is too many! To the best of my knowledge a human has two hands a maximum of four is a push at controlling if they pull in different directions never mind how someone could begin to separate them in an attack on a human or other animals

Lower, 3 or 4

I feel that is an absolute maximum, 4 would be more acceptable

Think it should be less with the exception of say a dog walking business. Proof of exemption to be shown on request if requested by an Enforcement Officer.

Three maximum. Difficult for a keeper to control more than this number, especially if the dogs are not tiny.

I feel that a lower limit of 4 dogs would be appropriate.

It is behaviour that is the issue, not an arbitrary figure you have decided. Why aren't any of these questions asking directly about the implications of bringing in an overly punitive PSPO?

4 would be more appropriate - if they are all large dogs and are roused to chase something I think it would be very hard to control them all and they might break free.

I know 6 dogs can seem a large number but I have a small breed weighing less than 5½ kgs and I have walked 6 dogs on leads occasionally although not regularly. If I do take them off leads I only have 1 or 2 running free. This is a sensible restriction for larger dogs - perhaps over 10 kgs or 7.5 kgs.

I think it depends on the breed of dogs and the competence of the handlers

I think that is far too many for a single person.

I think it should be less. It can be very intimidating to meet multiple dogs when out walking

See above. 6 May be too many

Unless it is a business with adequate supervision for all dogs.

Because you can't control six dogs on leads let alone off their leads.

4 dogs should be the limit.

Or even lower

You are excluding qualified, and licensed dog walkers.

It only takes one incident. Not all dogs are easily controlled. I've worked with dogs and horses all my life and can't see how you can be in control of six dogs. Six tiny dogs may be ok, but it only takes one big dog to cause a problem or other dogs off lead towards your six.

I think it should be set lower, perhaps 4.

This would allow commercial dog walkers to still walk a number of dogs but even 6 is still quite, more so if they are larger dogs.

I think it should be less.

It should be no more than 4.



I believe you can control 6 well-behaved dogs but once you add more or even one badly behaved dog to the pack I believe your control is lessened.

any more than 6 for one person would be difficult to control.

My concern is someone walking 6 German Shepards or similar sized Dogs would struggle if they decide they want to go.

Should be lowered

I'd rather it was 2 or 3, but 6 is better than no limit at all.

If all dogs had perfect training then this wouldn't be an issue. However not all owners have control or the strength to hold more than 1 or 2 dogs. I would have it dependant on the dogs size and strength. One Rottweiler or 6 Yorkies.

difficult. 2 wolfhounds could not be restrained buy anyone, IF they decided to be 'naughty' (not that they ever would). can 1 person actually watch the antics of 6 Yorkshire terriers?

Maybe 6 small dogs and 4 larger dogs.

the number of dogs is irrelevant. I have working dogs that are under control and know many people that can control more than 6. I also know and see when exercising my own, many people who cannot control 1 dog.

Suggest 4 as a reasonable number

The important thing is for the owners/walkers to be in control. I don't feel this is the councils job to dictate. Some owners can't control 1 dog others spend a lot of time training and can lots.

I would set the limit at 3

I think the limit should be three and I think that they should show they can control all three dogs.

6 dogs at once is more than enough with one person in charge

I think 4 per person is sufficient

See 5 above.

6 is still too many - I would prefer a limit of 4 - with maybe the exception of suitably qualified, professional, dog walkers

Should be 3.

4 is plenty

Too many, four un enough; the more there are the more intimidating it is for the average person. let alone those wary of dogs.

6 is too many. A maximum of 3 would be more reasonable. Consider the space they take up, the impact on other people using the space, the increased potential of losing control, and of not collecting all the dog mess.

That's enough to cntrol

six is more than enough dogs to control.

6 sounds plenty.

This seems like a reasonable number of dogs that could be safely walked together.

No single person can control 6 dogs simultaneously.

Too many. A maximum of 3 should be set

6 dogs are too many for one person to control, 4 would be more reasonable.

Should be two.

I see a responsible lady who rescues dogs walking them past my house, but she always has helpers, as there are often between 8-10 of them. It would be impossible for her to keep control of them and clear up after them, if she was walking them all by herself. So I think that a limit of 6 is reasonable.

I think the limit should be lower, I think 4 dogs is the maximum that can be handled by one person

Six seems too many, I suppose depending on breed. Six chihuahuas is different to six doberman...

In my opinion the limit should be set at 4.

3 to 4 should be a maximum. No one person can control 6 dogs without causing some anti social effects.

Fewer - see above.

6 is far too many. People with 6 dogs are generally dog walking for a living

Maximum of Four dogs at a time. Nobody needs a pack of dogs.

I think 6 is generous and will help professional paid dog-walkers. Personally, I think 3 or 4 should be the maximum.

It should be less than 6 - 4 maximum in order for proper control

It should be less if they do not have a license to run a dog walking business and have had training in controlling dogs

4 is plenty. Who has 6 dogs ???

Six is far too many. Six dogs in one hand is unmanageable, and an obstruction to other users of the pavement or footpath

Fewer

Far too many for 1 person to control.

Should be no more than 3.

Should be 4.

I think 4.

or lower.

Limit should be less, maximum 4.

2

6 is too many. Suggest 3-4 as maximum.

4 dogs would be more appropriate.

It was agreed it would be difficult to determine what could be considered reasonable for individual dog owners eg individuals' capability and also the size of the dogs they are responsible for/walking.

We advise as much consistency as possible is required so that dog owners become aware of restrictions and are confident in walking their dogs in other areas. We note that the neighbouring authorities of East Devon and Teignbridge have set a limit of six so it is appropriate that Mid Devon should propose

the same number. It is not clear whether professional dog walkers have been considered and whether these are currently licenced by the authority as this is a growing business sector.

## Q7

Professional dog walkers will probably want a minimum of 6 dogs.

A blanket ban on dogs "off lead" in public parks is unnecessary and oppressive. Parish & Town Councils should be given delegated/discretionary powers to ban dogs "off lead" either completely or in given areas or at specific times.

The Council should enforce heavy fines on people breaking the rules rather than inadvertently penalising those who do not offend with more restrictions imposed on responsible dog owners.

All dogs should be on lead walking amongst livestock.

Yes. When this consultation relates solely to Schedules B, C & D as opposed to across fields, public footpaths and roads etc.

When seeking to put a dogs on leads restriction in public spaces, the Forum advises that there is a need to consider a fair balance between rights of owners and non-dog owners, particularly in urban areas where the restrictions can be extensive. This could have the effect of forcing dog owners into cars to go to rural areas with public rights of way and other public space not affected by restrictions. Alternatively, owners may ignore the legislation if they believe it to be unreasonable. Dog owning is important to health and wellbeing and the major reason why people go out. More consideration needs to be given to providing areas where dogs can legitimately be let off lead.

The only thing I feel it's important to state is that the UK has a tradition of good safe management of dogs and have good levels of animal care and safety in the community and I feel that these measures will only create problems where dog owners are tying dogs outside of parts that become stressed and anxious that could then become aggressive and that they could then go on to harass people who entered or left the park. The only thing I feel it's important to state is that the UK has a tradition of good safe management of dogs and of good levels of animal care and safety in the community and I feel that these measures will only create problems where dog owners are tying dogs outside of parts that become stressed and anxious that could then become aggressive and that they could then go on to harass people who entered or left the park. in particular I feel that the UK does not need to create further laws to restrict safe use of dogs especially within quiet Rurel communities such as mid Devon. I feel it's an entirely different prospect when large and potentially dangerous dogs are kept in urban areas.

The PDSA's 'Paw Report 2018' found that 89% of veterinary professionals believe that the welfare of dogs will suffer if owners are banned from walking their dogs in public spaces such as parks and beaches, or if dogs are required to be kept on leads in these spaces. Their report also states that 78% of owners rely on these types of spaces to walk their dog. I would also like to bring your attention to the similar recommendations stated in the

Government's 'Anti-social behaviour powers -Statutory guidance for frontline professionals' document, pages 52/53. We believe that the vast majority of dog owners are responsible, and that the majority of dogs are well behaved. In recognition of this, we would encourage local authorities to exercise its power to issue Community Protection Notices, targeting irresponsible owners and proactively addressing anti-social behaviours.

Myself and a number of other responsible dog owners value the opportunity to safely exercise our dogs on linear park Cullompton. The only other similar opportunity is the CCA fields but due to antisocial behaviour these are far less safe. Damage caused by broken glass has presented me with vets bills of around £600. We note there is a new play park/assault course being built in linear park Cullompton and as far as we are aware there has been consultation on this construction. If we were to have been consulted we would have made strong representations that the area be enclosed in the same way as the existing play area in the park to ensure that dogs and children playing can safely coexist.

Part of responsible dog ownership is giving your dog appropriate and sufficient exercise and stimulation - this order seems to criminalise this aspect of good dog ownership without seeing it any good reasons why it is considered necessary and proportionate. If it is to be enacted, it should only be in locations where there is a genuine problem (for instance in my village (Willand) NONE of these issues is at all a problem, and any enactment of this nature in respect of the village would be grossly inappropriate and disproportionate. The proposals have the potential to cause an increase in traffic and pollution as dog walkers are forced out of their local area, as well as forcing more dog walkers onto country lanes where they can cause a nuisance to traffic and are themselves at significantly greater risk. Further, as a young family with hopes of dog ownership, we would be unable to make use of our local parks and play areas, discriminating against our children for no good reason. These proposals also risk reinforcing the belief that dogs are dangerous, a nuisance or to be feared, which is generally untrue and can be damaging not only to community relationships but also to children's development. Finally, it is unclear who 'Enforcement Officers' are, how they are designated or how a dog walker would identify a genuine enforcement officer from a member of the general public.

Only that the people who dont pick up still will not pick up even when their dogs are on leads. Cameras would help

sledgehammer to crack a nut springs to mind

No. Public health and safety must come before pets. You wouldn't allow a toddler to defecate in a public area nor would you allow them to run around on people's gardens, you would also prevent them from running up to strangers or into roads. Dog owners need to be aware of the impact their behaviour has on others.

I think there need to be safe places to allow dogs to run freely as we are surrounded by such beautiful countryside which is populated by wild and farm animals. Socialising puppies and young dogs off lead is important to raise dog who are safe around people and other dogs. During Covid, allowing my dog off lead to play with other dogs has been vital to my mental health. Regardless of orders being placed on areas, there are people who will always ignore them

Dog does need to run off lead and the rec is ideal and was donated to the people of Bampton not just the football team

See comments above re professional dog walkers. Potential impact on a responsible dog owner who 'runs out' of dog poo bags while out with their dog. I usually carry lots of poo bags but recent picked up my dog's mess and during the same walk I realized that I dropped the rest of the poo bags at the first poo stop. If my dog had further dog mess I wouldn't have been able to pick it up. Some dogs cannot be left tied up eg outside a play area. It is possible that some young families with dogs would have to avoid children's play areas

Rubbish always left where people sat. Meant to be alcohol free zone but it is not. Broken bottles always left around the park. Dangerous for dogs and children. People urinating against hedges we even saw a man defecating next to a tree wiping himself with leaves, near the children's play area ( don't always blame the dogs).

How can anyone control 6 dogs.

Yes I feel there will be no places left to walk our dogs soon. There are a lot of responsible dog owners out there

No dog owners need to be responsible for their animals

No.. I just require owners to take responsibility for their dogs as I do for my children

A PSPO is only going to be effective if it is backed up with enforcement and fines. It also needs to be communicated within the community so that it is a proper deterrent and not just a 'tick in a box'

No, I think they should go further and extend to keeping dogs on leads on public footpaths, towpaths and bridleways.

It's no good making rules and regulations unless they are monitored

Telling people to do these things won't change the in educated it just penalises responsible dog owners there needs to be actual repercussions for owners who let their dogs fowl in the public domain without clearing it up.

Alienation of people with dogs, by not allowing them in these spaces you're stopping them from being able to enjoy them. If the dog is part of the family unit the family should be allowed to enjoy the space in the same way any other family can.

No. This seems a sensible and proportionate response for the play areas in Bampton, enabling dog owners to continue to exercise their pets while protecting children's play areas.

It seems unfair to the people that pick up after their dogs.

Elderly people who don't have transport will struggle to exercise their dogs if they must be leashed in parks.

See above. The minority fail us but the majority should prevail.

More poo bins required by footpaths, the footpaths to remain usable some are so over grown

As the restrictions are proposed for Grand Western Canal, for the same reasons the entire length of the Railway Walk should be included in the schedule. The nuisance of incontinent uncontrolled dogs and their irresponsible owners applies just as much there as in many of the other proposed restricted areas.

Yes, I think an increase in having to pick up your dogs mess in 'wild' places will lead to more filled bags being left on trees fence posts etc, instead educate people to use a stick or something to flick it off path or take bags home. I walk frequently up around the culmstock beacon and the trees up there can look like some horror story Christmas trees

The hanging of poop bags

I would also like to highlight properties close to public rights of way and/or walking dogs on public rights of way. I personally have been attacked by a dog off the lead when out riding my horse on a public right of way! I wouldn't like to imagine if it was a child on a pony instead.

No adverse impacts but how are these proposals to be enforced,I can't recall one case of a prosecution!!

The proposals and penalties should include leaving dog mess in plastic bags on the ground or hanging from trees and fences etc. Also dog mess should not be allowed to be placed in waste bins. I have no intention of using a waste bin myself if there's a risk of touching dog mess.

Elderly dog owners wanting to exercise dogs and unable to walk far.

Im not totally clear on the impact of these proposals will have in some areas. I walk my dogs in the field off of crowbridge in cullompton. I have done for 20years. As a person with a disability which can affect my mobility i rely on this field for exercising my dogs. I do not let them off if children are playing and always pick up after them. Not all dog owners are irresponsible and not all dogs are badly behaved.

Dogs need off lead exercise need to be an area for this.Dogs can be more aggressive on leads then off .

This is a complete discrimination of good dogs and good dog owners!! There will be no places we can go to play with our dogs, exercise our dogs and let them have a good play!! We should be naming kids that trash and litter the open spaces and ruin it for us that have well behaved dogs that have fun running and playing without the risk of cutting their paws with glass because of kids that don't care what they do.

No, but as a response dog owner I don't want the proposals to go too far. I would prefer to see more enforcement of the existing legislation.

You should come down heavily on bad owners with untrained dogs who are irresponsible for sake of good owners.

All dogs should not be left alone throughout the day or night and should always be on leads minimum one dog a family

Loss of social contact for single person households who use their dog walk to share time with other people

It's cruel to dogs to be kept on leads at all times

Not strict enough

This should apply to cat owners too. The smoking of cat poo on the pavements/driveways and private gardens is shocking

Fines are not high enough and have not worked to date punishment needs to be easier to enforce and greater

No, I'm a dog owner and think this is reasonable

As always good owners will be penalised - there are no consequences to bad ownership - no dog wardens and no one to report too

I do feel some areas should be able to allow a dog under control, to have some off lead exercise. ie top area of Amory Park, which I back on too. Dog owners pay tax too

No - I am pleased that the Council are taking this issue seriously.

PSPO represent as huge creeping of power and curbs of peoples use of public space. This "consultation" is a completely disingenuous tick-box activity that simply asks people about behaviours that all sensible people agree on. This "consultation" deliberately evades any mention or discussion of the impacts of PSPO themselves which can be extended to cover all manner of behaviours used repeatedly across the country to impact the lives of generally poorer and more vulnerable people. Typical of this local authority, who rather than engage anyone positively would rather cover up seating areas in corrugated metal or bringing sweeping powers to criminalise their constituents. It is awful.

Not that I can think of. The situation is pretty frustrating at the moment

If dogs aren't allowed off lead anywhere owners will take them to farmland

I am concerned about the limit of 6 dogs being walked by one person. My dogs are shown and I have no difficulty managing 6 on leads as they are small and behave well. In my experience owners with a single dog can cause more problems. Owners of multiple dogs are more responsible in all aspects of dog ownership.



The order should be enforced otherwise it will not have effect

Unfortunately it is the few irresponsible dog owners who cause problems for others. Restrictions will impact, potentially adversely on others.

Yes. People may simply think that the introduction of the PSPO means that effective action is being taken. I live close to Newcombes Meadow in Crediton and use it regularly to walk my own dogs. There are signs clearly visible at the entrance to the park saying dogs should be kept on leads and that there is a potential fine for those owners who do not abide by it. Lack of enforcement is the real issue and so those signs are ignored by many, many owners. Some dogs don't even have collars, let alone being on leads. I'm tired of hearing "Oh, he/she is friendly and wouldn't hurt a fly". My dogs are from the Blue Cross and one hasn't been socialised properly and so I often find myself having to hold him back from a dog hurtling towards us off a lead. It really doesn't help with training. Enforcing the measures that exist already would be better than introducing an unenforced PSPO.

Mandatory to carry sufficient Poobags.

Yes, please include the Zeal Monachorum churchyard

I all said above

This all seems to be about dog fouling. We are in a rural location. Are dogs blamed for fox and badger faeces? We all have to live together. How about bells on bikes and joggers letting people know that they are coming up behind you. A spooked dog will go for fight of flight then the dog is blamed and considered uncontrollable when it has been scared.

It will make life better for those who want to enjoy a dog free area without having to worry about dog mess and if a dog is going to turn on you or a child .

Detrimental and discriminative towards responsible dog owners. Dogs should be allowed off lead exercise. How about you patrol and stop all the vandalism from teenagers!!

Dogs could have less freedom to roam.

As stated above, dogs need off lead exercise and there needs to be safe places away from livestock for this to happen which also takes into account the ability of people to drive their dog somewhere, exercise their dog with children present and the mobility of elderly who won't be able to walk their dogs in some places.

I think dogs should be allowed off the lead in parks with the exception of the enclosed play areas. Responsible dog owners should be able to walk their dogs off the lead locally, particularly elderly people.

I believe there should be areas in each locality where dogs are allowed to run freely with other dogs and feel a FREE secure doggie park with lots of natural attractions would be a great asset to every neighbourhood. With dog poo bins and clean water available. I also believe there should be more dog poo bins in beauty hot spots and local walks that should be regularly emptied.

Irresponsible dog owners get away with behaviour through a) insufficient official monitoring (dog wardens) and insufficient follow up of reports of anti-social behaviour

There are rules in place presently but how will they be enforced?

My only concern is how you intend to enforce Section 5 in regards to Children walking Dogs as being under age you I believe you can't Fine them. This order should clearly state in the event of Children walking the dog it is the owner of the dog that is held fully responsible and liable to fines ec

None: problem always is implementing. I see so many irresponsible and ignorant dog owners; I have never seen any dog wardens or similar.

If it doesn't get implemented someone probably a child will get attacked

The dogs being blamed for misbehaviour when the responsibility is the humans.

Yes. Soon there will be a ban on dogs being anywhere.

Dogs must be well socialised with other dogs and people and then they will behave better. To do this, they must be allowed off lead. If we can never let them off lead, this will inevitably make any normal dog and owner anxious. Please don't tar us all with the same brush. The majority of dogs and owners I meet pick up after their dogs, and put them on leads when necessary.

Penalising people who can actually control dogs and have well trained dogs, the number of dogs isn't an issue it's the control of the dogs be it 1 or more.

You must leave spaces where people can safely allow their dogs to play off lead. Perhaps provide safe fenced areas that are only for dog exercise.

Section C Public Parks - Restriction on Amory Park is unfair to dog walkers, currently 90 % is restricted for sports or BMX track, with a small triangle area used by dog walkers, why can't this area be fenced off for dog walkers for off lead throwing of balls etc, restricting the whole of Amory Park is unfair, and not considerate to dog walkers that currently use this area more often than sports field.

Restrictions would adversely affect elderly people or people without a car who are unable to take their dogs into the countryside to exercise.

Stopping dogs being off the lead in the jubilee field will have several adverse impacts. This is a area where families with children and dogs can enjoy together. During lockdown it has been the only space that is within the village that is not under threat of development that you can throw a ball for a dog. I have spoke to various people some with dogs in flats or houses with little garden that do not know how they would have managed if they could not have

used the jubilee field to exercise their dogs. No one disputes that there are irresponsible dog owners but every one shouldn't pay the price for it. Dog owners pay council tax too so there should be space they can enjoy in their community without having to travel. If we have learnt nothing more in lockdown it is that we should not be making unnecessary journeys.

Yes, there are those who think their rights will be infringed. Invariably these very people infringe on the rights of others. The right to enjoy free space  
It could hinder a dog walking business, but I do not think business should be above the communities safety.

Would possibly need more bins and then emptied at regular intervals

there will be difficulty in enforcing this as those irresponsible owners will continue to ignore

no, and this question ought not to be required

Not stringent enough.

Laid dog walkers may find restrictions on numbers difficult, but the impact on other people using the space must be a priority.

Yes there should be a dog warden to catch and fine the bad dog owners why have those of us who behave have to suffer for their stupidity laxness etc. As usual the honest Joe loses out

no more enforcement officers or cctv in public spaces.

There should be a good provision made for dog walking if the restricted areas are extensive.

Do you mean impacts OF the proposal?

Dogs require off lead exercise. They need to be able to run. But they need to be under control

How do you stop a dog fouling in public spaces, it may have escaped your notice that dogs cannot talk so they they cannot warn their handler. I'd a dog need to go they need to go

Limiting places that dogs can be properly exercised

Some people have been abusive when I have challenged them in a public area regarding not having their dog on a lead. There needs to be a more effective reporting system to avoid disputes.

I suppose parents with assistance dogs may need to be able to have them accompany them and their children into play areas?

People being forced into using non-appropriate venues for exercising their dogs. Upsetting a larger group of the local community - much, much larger than the few who may have complained and prompted this proposed public spaces protection order. It seems a sledgehammer approach.

Many public spaces will still have badly controlled dogs off lead.

I pity the poor enforcement officer. The level of entitlement by many dog owners beggars belief. The Officers will likely be verbally abused for suggesting dog walkers comply with the rules.

It will be frustrating for owners of very obedient, well-trained dogs having to keep them on a lead. But, of course, there are very many dogs not under control so a PSPO would help address that. Most enforcement people are sensible and wouldn't be heavy-handed if a dog walker/owner's dog was, on occasion, unleashed. What the PSPO will do is give powers/authority to address the difficult owners/walkers.

I cannot see any mention of streets and alleyways. Chapel street, which is walked by many mothers and toddlers, has too much dog faeces and inadequate provision of poo bag bins....or any bins, and the alleyway from the old school to the Chinese takeaway had about 20 piles of faeces along it a few days ago. The bin there gets too full. The adequate supply of and emptying of bins is key to the dog owners complying.

None, save that they are not restrictive enough

#### **Q8**

No written response

#### **Q9**

I strongly do not approve of restricting dog walking times on public places such as beaches or large open parks to non-seasonal periods just to avoid disruption during tourist times. I believe that the onus needs to be put on safe and manageable well-trained and responsible dog ownership and not on creating overly controlling laws to prevent people from living peaceful lives with their dogs.

All times

Please refer to earlier comments regarding dogs on leads

Neither, too difficult to administer

If any restrictions were to be introduced (which I very strongly oppose), they should be limited to only the times of the day when they can be shown to be of particular relevance (i.e. children rarely play in play areas between 5pm and 9am, so the restrictions works be timed accordingly.

Neither dogs still need their walk regardless of time

a responsible owner would not allow their dog to be out of control - yet again a minority are spoiling the freedoms of the majority.

The restrictions should be in place at all times otherwise confusion will be caused. So long as there are specific areas where dogs can run free there should be need for restrictions.

Fortunately I live in Bampton which is not on Schedule C, but neither restriction allows for the local home/dog owners (1) who have to exercise their dogs 12 months of the year, (2) only allowing dogs off leads after 18.00 in the winter puts the elderly and children in the parks after dark in order to give their dogs sufficient exercise. This seems a dangerous proposal if there is no lighting in the park.

Neither

Neither. Should be permanent restrictions

Time restriction.

She kept on a lead at ALL times.

No restrictions completely stupid idea. Dogs need to run to be exercised properly . You cannot do this on a lead. Dogs need to be socialised and need to be digged. You are targeting this all wrong. Owners are the issue in big training their dogs properly. My dog loves to run freely and comes to my every command because I put the time and effort into training her!!

Dogs to be kept on leads in any area where children play .

Neither

All year please. My children go out all year as do dogs.. From 8am until 7pm is when children could be out.

None of these, as it simply leads to confusion. Restrictions should be clear and simple.

Full ban

It should apply at all times all year round. If can only be 1, the daytime hours slightly preferable to help protect children playing during the day.

All dates and times....dogs can mess at any time

Dogs poo all year.

Time

Time

None, the rule should be that dogs without recall should be kept on a lead. Putting dogs on a lead unnecessarily is a pointless rule.

Seasonal restrictions. If someone is an irresponsible owner & does not clean up after their dog, a time limited restriction will not make any difference.

I don't think seasonal or time restrictions would be appropriate. The rule should apply all the time, children play throughout the year and different age groups play throughout the day too. People often think the rules don't apply to them, if you give them caveats they definitely won't abide by them. You see this on Hadron Hill where people are asked to keep their dogs on a lead from March to July because of ground nesting birds. Hardly anyone does this. This rule should apply all the time.

Neither

On leads at all times

None why would a dog be more dangerous at specific times?

Seasonal

Time restrictions

No dogs should be allowed in areas where children play, where football matches are being held or they should just be banned from the recreation field in General!

All dogs on leads at ALL times so everyone knows where they stand.

Time restriction

Maybe look at splitting the park in areas for dog and areas for others ie bikes

All restrictions should apply at all times/seasons

Time restrictions

No times should be set dogs on lead areas

No all year around

Time restrictions, most people are working and exercise their dogs before and after work

The restriction should be at ALL times. Any aggressive or badly behaved dog stay aggressive or badly behaved all year round  
time restrictions. It would at least allow dogs to exercise but need to be watched by owners to pick up faeces

Time

Time

Not happy with either most dogs are better behave than children they don't throw Tesco trollies in the river and litter the parks with broken glass and rubbish

None ban children in stead of punishing us good dog owners and dogs

A combination of both

Seasonal best as on beaches.

All the time kept on leads

Restriction time

I think the restrictions should be either time or seasonally limited. The restrictions should be all the time

Seasonal restriction

Time

Neither, I don't take my grandchildren to parks where dogs are allowed, owners never pick all of the faeces up!

No

No restrictions

Restrictions should be 24 hours a day all year.

No restriction in the parks. Dogs need to be able to run freely in parks

Time restriction

Neither is appropriate...parks can be frequented at any point in time. Why should those times be restricted by giving dog walkers preferential treatment? The rules should apply all the time with no concessions as the other park rules do to everyone!

Time

Neither - dog fouling and poor dogs are around at all times and all months this won't change anything but will penalise good owners who work shifts etc

Large majority of dog fouling in Amory park occurs overnight

Dogs should be kept on leads in parks etc

Seasonal Restriction

Twenty-four hours

Permanent restrictions should be enforced.

Do not bring in a PSOP. PSPO represent as huge creeping of power and curbs of peoples use of public space. This "consultation" is a completely disingenuous tick-box activity that simply asks people about behaviours that all sensible people agree on. This "consultation" deliberately evades any mention or discussion of the impacts of PSPO themselves which can be extended to cover all manner of behaviours used repeatedly across the country to impact the lives of generally poorer and more vulnerable people. Typical of this local authority, who rather than engage anyone positively would rather cover up seating areas in corrugated metal or bringing sweeping powers to criminalise their constituents. It is awful.

No, it would be more confusing

Dogs should be on leads at all times in parks and public areas.

None. Some areas allocated for dogs and owners all year round

Both are necessary - children can fall into dog poo in the winter as well as in the summer and in the evening as well as during the day.



I would prefer no restriction but I think the time restriction more appropriate. Owners who have no alternative but to exercise their dogs off lead in the parks can do so on a daily basis within the set times. Dogs need the opportunity for free exercise from time to time. If too restricted it could become a welfare problem.

Neither

Time restrictions

Restrictions should be in place at all times.

Time restrictions

Should apply at all times

Item 2

I wouldn't consider either. In a park with children and families either BUT have a designated area where dogs can run off lead.

If I have to choose then it would be seasonal has in autumn and winter people don't tend to be out in public spaces after dark then in the spring and summer months.

No restriction otherwise owners let their dogs foul when it is dark

I suggest you limit it to times that you will employ sufficient staff to enforce it!!

Time restrictions as long as faeces was picked up. More CCTV would help around the village and in public parks etc

What's the matter with all year around. No restrictions.

N/a

I don't agree with question 8. You have set this survey up to get the answer you want!

This should be a blanket order

2 because kids use parks all year round and it Ned to be safe and clean for them all year joy just in summer.

I do not think there should be any restrictions on dogs in public parks.

I think dogs should be kept on leads at all times in parks. But I would consider a time constraints more appropriate.

The restriction should be at all times

Neither I believe all well behaved under control dogs should be able to be off the lead during their walk

It should apply at all times. With dogs off the leads owners can use the excuse they did not see their dog fouling.

Neither - should be unrestricted - dogs that cannot be controlled by voice alone should be on leads in these closed areas.

Dogs should be on a lead and under control at all times. It's nice to be able to allow your dog off the lead but there are too many irresponsible dog owners in the area.

Time restriction is more appropriate in a none tourist area, with may be seasonal ie during school holidays

All seasons all times.

Dogs should be on leads at all times, every day.

Never

let the dog off before 08.30 and from 'dusk'. Car 'lighting up' times, to keep it simple and enforceable? Must still be picked up after a No 2.

Time restriction. It is not fair to make it a seasonal restriction. Dogs need to be walked every day - not seasonally when it suits others.

Time restrictions

I don't think dogs should be allowed off the lead in public parks at any time.

Seasonal

time restrictions, when children are not playing in the park, dogs would be allowed to exercise off lead

If you provide area for dogs, then no restriction/time is required. Parks should be for all users and not exclude people with dogs

Time Restrictions

Time restriction

The only time restriction I think would be sensible would be during school drop off / pick up time as the way the school now staggers this means the jubilee filed gets very congested.

Quite simply "Dogs should be on leads in public spaces at all times"

Neither, this only serves to confuse people, I think you should implement a straight forward instruction that dogs in a public space should be on a lead. There are rolling hills and countryside, if they want to let off their dog they can do so in a safer environment.

Time restrictions as the public who are concerned about dogs having a free run time would know to avoid public spaces at that time

Time restriction

If any are brought in then it should be time restrictions

n/a

I would recommend exclusion for dates (Seasonal Restriction). Rather than times. Easier to enforce!

Restrictions should be at all times!

time

Permanent restriction.

seasonal

Should be all the year; all times.

All the time. There is no need to let them off the lead in public parks. If they want to let them off then go to a designated dog area

Restrictions should apply at all times.

Time because it allows dogs to be walked before and after work and most dog walkers don't want to walk dogs in the middle of the day in the summer.

Time restriction if I must choose

neither, i would prefer to see designated areas for dogs to exercise. like us they need to run about more ; )

Time - although if dogs are well trained, this would not need to be a restriction. In fact if people had well, properly trained dogs, many of these restrictions would not be necessary.

Time restriction

Think it needs to be a blanket ban otherwise how would it be supervised? Also fail to see difference really in time of day or year. When given access during some of the time same problems of irresponsible dog owners would still apply, so nothing really gained. Sadly fear it would need to be all or nothing.

Restrictions at all times

No restriction

Dogs must be kept on the lead at ALL times in public spaces (and on farmland where livestock is present)

Time restriction. It does not matter which season, people are always out and about.

Time restrictions.

No

Neither

Time restriction - children still go to parks throughout the year.

Neither

I do not agree with restrictions being limited as I think these restrictions should apply all the time and all year

Well, I said no to Q8, but if pushed I would say seasonal with a summer dry weather (yeah right) restriction being more stringent than during winter when people are less likely to be using the park in a way that unmanaged dogs would disturb.

I'm not in favour of a seasonal restriction. I consider the time restriction should be 8am - 6pm

Seasonal restriction is stupid. Dogs still need exercise. Better to have a time restriction so as not to cause a conflict to other users.

Neither.

Time restriction is more relevant away from the sea shore

At all times. Then there can be no misunderstanding of the order. Under the cover of darkness is probably the worst time for offending, people get away with it, because they can't be seen

Maybe run it like the beaches

Seasonal & Time Restricted.

the restriction should not be to a time or season

No, all dogs should be kept on leads at all times in public parks within the Mid Devon Devon Area.

Both seasonal and/or time restrictions should be used for the maximum benefits to be seen in the neighbourhood.

no time restrictions only

Time restriction. Dogs need exercise all year round, but most owners could walk them morning and evening if they need to be off the lead. The time would need to vary according to the season.

Time Restriction if either although I think in public parks they should be on a lead all the time . . .

The restriction should apply at all times

All the time

Time

Time restriction, due to the busier times of the day with more people and more dogs around within those hours.

Time Restriction

Time Restriction so it applies for the whole year.

At all times.

Time Restriction - more likely to be obeyed.

Dogs should be kept on leads at all times.

Time Restriction.

Time Restriction between hours of 8am to 8pm.

Blanket rules are unnecessary (see previous comments).

Time Restriction. Maybe extend time restriction to 8pm during British Summer Time.

All the time.

Time restriction.

Dogs should be kept on leads at all times in Schedule C Plan 25 & 26. Restrictions should be in force at all times.

On leads at all times. One child bitten is one too many. No restriction.

Neither

Seasonal or time of day restriction.

#### **Q10**

Fines rather than education.

It does not appear to have worked on the Grand Western Canal in spite of more signs.

There has been ample 'education' in our village by way of signs, pink spray, school poster competition, social media publicity. Best education is a few fines with press publicity.

TV/press campaigns. More stringent fines.

Signs explaining simply the problem.

In schools for future generations. Explain toxic nature of dog faeces. Posters explaining this in all parks and play areas.

The emphasis should be on successful dog handling and management not on how horrible and anti-social dogs can be.

Prosecution is the only answer. It is no use putting up more notices to be ignored.

I think those who will pick up are probably already doing so and those who won't pick up will just never be bothered.

Only if enforcement happens.

Enforcement i.e. fines and dog wardens would be more effective; Dog owners/handlers should clear up after their pets regardless of where they are walking them; Dog faeces/excrement does not need to be in a bag. Concerns regarding plastic bags thrown in hedges or left scattered around. Totally in favour in urban or defined public spaces but as long as 'waste' is dealt with responsibly, using bags is not necessarily required.

You cannot educate pork.

Many dog walkers are unaware even of the existence of dog control orders, and even less the specific details of restrictions. People are particularly unaware that dog fouling applies to all public land. In its response to a consultation on the refreshed Country Code, we suggested Social media and influencers, citizenship education in schools and clear graphic messages. These suggestions would apply equally here. Publicity and information about dogs on leads should emphasise to people that dogs should be kept on a short lead in the vicinity of livestock to protect stock from potential injury and disease.

Proactive measures include communicating to local dog owners that bagged dog faeces can be disposed of in normal litter bins; running responsible ownership and training events; or using poster campaigns to encourage dog owners to pick up after their dog.

It is my feeling that education is always the best form of society control. Education will only help inform people of the pros and cons and methods are used for responsible ownership and can avoid the need for any unnecessary punitive and controlling laws where common sense and a community-based approach is much more beneficial.

Dogs Trust works with local authorities across the UK to help promote responsible dog ownership. Please do not hesitate to contact us at [campaigns@dogstrust.org.uk](mailto:campaigns@dogstrust.org.uk) should you wish to discuss this matter.

Highlighting the health dangers, particularly to young children. Perhaps with case studies.

Education regarding the cost to the council of cleaning up, and as to the risks associated with dog fouling

Warning to dog owners the impact they are having by using cameras for not picking up. Not sure how you can get the offenders to listen sadly

Put more flyers up informing of fines and of diseases caused by dog fouling. Pet shops and vets could be included in educating owners. Even educating children in schools would be good as they would educate their parents.

Education doesn't work. If they don't care, education won't change that. I saw a "Wanted Poster" created by Dover District Council recently inviting people to provide information on people not cleaning up after their dogs. Reward - 'A cleaner district' Think this is a brilliant idea. We know which local residents tend to allow their dogs to roam the streets on their own

They need to be seen, named and shamed. Gives us who are responsible a bad name and only a few.

They should be fined heavily.

You need more dog poo bins more fines given out to offenders. There is no deterrent

There are some people who really don't care and no amount of education is going to make a difference. Unfortunately they never get caught and just laugh at you if you say anything or you get a mouthful of abuse.

Particularly MEN rarely pick up for some bizarre reason

No.. everyone who owns dogs know they have to look after them.. fines/penalties are the only education for these individuals

This has been an on going problem for years. Unless dog owners are named, shamed and fined they will continue to let their animals foul public areas. What is need is Enforcement Officers to be visible and for fines to be imposed. As at present nothing is enforced and these people will continue to foul public areas unchallenged. If members of the general public take it upon themselves to challenge someone they are likely to be subjected to a tirade of abuse or worse!

I think tough enforcement is needed. Everyone knows they shouldn't leave their dog poo, but they are too lazy & irresponsible to deal with it.

The owners are usually aware and opt not to pick poo up

Targeting the areas where this is a problem - for example in Bampton this is an issue which affects the whole town not just play/green spaces. It is a cultural issue - how do you change mindsets so that all understand this to be a crucial issue? How do you make it socially unacceptable? It is the same one or 2 ignorant dog owners who spoil it for everyone else.

On the spot fine

Information packs at vets

The owners of dogs that don't pick up their dogs poo are unlikely to change their behaviour but if ALL dogs MUST. E kept on leads in Bampton the irresponsible ones will find it difficult to talk themselves out of their dogs excrement when it's viewed by others.

No education would work the people who don't will never do it

Adequate public signage; sufficient dog bins; appropriate fines



Do not leave filled poo bags

Invest money in dog wardens let them do their jobs

Through schools as the children can educate their parents

Whilst I do not need to be educated to know how harmful dog fouling is, if there are dog owners that do need to be educated then I'm all for it.

Why dog faeces can be dangerous to children. notice at the entrance to park, cemetery etc. national campaign to educate all or local stations radio and tv with repeats annually

About the affects of dog poo on wildlife and people. Leaflets and visable presence. Talking to people. Unfortunately the people who cause the issues walk their dogs when they cany be seen at night.

People are idiots and don't care which is a shame as it's ruining a lot for the people that do care, do clean up after their dogs.

Concentrating on offenders and not the responsible owners.

People know right from wrong.Heavily fine those that break law on increasing scale.That would finally educate them perhaps..

Pet owners should pass animal welfare and training test before license issue.

Perhaps pop up information stands in the cca fields so dog walkers can pickup literature and learn how to access dog training options

Being challenged by a patrolling council officer

There needs to be more dog owning classes not just dog training but owner training similar to the parenting classes offered in childrens centres. Making the classes a legal requirement of owning a dog will increase the number of responsible owners

But more importantly there needs to be consequences for their actions, I have not seen a dog warden in years. So unfair for those who stick to the rules

Consistent messages via Community Groups, Dog Charities, Vets etc through Social Media campaigns dealing with responsible Dog ownership

Toxicaria risks and dog attacks on children and adults. If people wish to keep a dog they must prevent it from posing a risk to others.

Unfortunately the people that allow their dogs to foul and don't clear up after them are unlikely to take any notice of education. A fine might make them think twice before allowing it to happen again - maybe a doubling of the fine each time they are caught would be more effective.

Most of these questions are irrelevant. The issue here is not tackling irresponsible dog owners. I am more concerned about an irresponsible and overly punitive local authority who would like to bring something as far reaching as a PSPO to tackle such an issue.

Puppy training is essential for both the owner and the dog. Local canine societies run various training classes and new owners particularly should be encouraged to join classes. The Kennel Club Good Citizen Dog Scheme is excellent training for dogs and owners and covers all situations in which dogs might find themselves. Dogs are sociable animals and benefit from interaction with one another if properly trained. More support should be given by Councils to local training clubs. During the pandemic training clubs have been closed so many dogs will have missed out on crucial early socialisation and training. Council could give more publicity to training clubs.

Those who do not pick up after their dogs seem to think the rule does not apply to them, they say this only happened this once when I confront them. Similarly it is the same people who break the existing rules. The only way I see education working if the individuals caught breaking the rule had to take part in compulsory training, bit like that having to attend if one caught speeding

People who don't pick up their dog's mess are unlikely to be influenced by anything other than a fine of some sort,

Compulsory registration of all dogs and a test of competency should be part of the process

I would hope that was true but rules are the. Best way

Education on the harmful effects of faeces to children and the environment including not disposing of bags efficiently

I think people should have to have a licence to have a dog and could be told how hazardous dog poo is and the amount of children who end up treading in it are are risk

I think people choose to disregard the law as it's easier for them to do so.

Think we've been trying to educate for to long.

The risk of infections and diseases

Posters warning of fines

Tv, Radio, pop up ads, postal mail shots.

Education about the dangers of dog faeces in schools as children would then nag their parents

I believe enforcement of rules and fines needs to better

People know that dog waste is a hazard to public health. Education would be a waste of money on people that can't be educated.

People know what they need to do, they just ignore it. Heavier fines and stronger enforcement is required.

In school (ambassador dogs)

Pick up, no exceptions. It gives the message it's okay if it is not in a public place. Create more bins. Need to educate people it's not okay to bag it and leave it in the hedgerow, edge of the field etc etc.

I think those who let their dogs foul and do not pick it up do it deliberately. They often walk their dogs very early or late at night to avoid being seen. I'm not sure education would reduce this activity. Handing out more fines would make people think about what they're doing.

Shortage of dog bins is a massive issue and needs resolving

alerting people to the dangers of dog poo. You could also try rewarding people for picking up their dog poo, a simple 50 p voucher perhaps.

Posters and warnings

Emphasis on disease and public displays in parks where dogs are walked.

I think it should get the same sort of publicity that smoking does. Smoking is now seen as fairly anti-social and with the right message being continually be promoted could make people more confident to challenge anyone they see not pick up an/or give them the information on how to report offenders.

Any form of education (the practice of teaching) has to be useful. Followed by persecution through the law

I am sure officers of the Council have tried to do this, unfortunately it is the same offenders that appear to ignore and do not engage with training, because they think they know better and have a right to allow their dog to foul where they like.

A mandatory course for those not following the above outlines, schools education to hopefully produce responsible adults

Leaflet social awareness talks descriptions how farm animals can be affected

PCSO and council joint enforcement patrols. Intervention / education in schools - educate the children they educate the irresponsible adults!

Educating offenders - reduce fine & get the offenders to attend a class - a little like speed awareness classes - where they are given detailed facts & guidance as to why they should do it!

There are always those who deliberately ignore the rules.

social media is now the preferred way to discuss these issues. naming and shaming is what instills most fear in the proletariat these days.

Maybe the dangers of dog fouling to small children if they come into contact with it.

National tv advert

Posters/ leaflet campaign. Active engagement with dog owners by council representatives. More poo bins and notices too please!

Leaflets? it should be part and parcel of how you bring up a dog.

Dog wardens and better signs

Talks to schoolchildren about the responsible ownership of dogs, because if you can teach them at an early age to clear up after a dog, it will hopefully be something that they continue into adulthood.

Information about the harms of dog fouling especially for children, information about the rules, information about availability of bags, information about community and care for the environment

Efforts made so far have been very successful. Almost every dog walker I see picks up after their dog.

More signage, More fines and publication of same.

Detailed, graphic information of the disease risks. Cost analysis of cleaning up and collecting abandoned poo bags

Street posters, school talks

Hardly! This has been a problem for years. The number of polite notices have little effect. Some of these people clearly have psychological problems throwing poo bags into trees & bushes.

In my former Neighbourhood, we raised grants to employ a part-time Community Warden, complete with bodycam. His/her position had no authority but the bodycam and polite 'advice/guidance' in the park worked wonders!

provide bags and bins to take the waste

Highlight disease

Education in Schools - giving out poo bags Leaflet drops with pics of dog mess on shoes/prams Maps showing dog bins - added on MDDC website ..

Dog licences should be re-introduced at a sufficient price to include third party insurance and only issued after compulsory training, much like driving licences.

### **Other Comments**

I raise the following points: 1 I do not consider that other options have been considered, as required by the Govt Guidance. 2 I do not consider that the need for a PSPO has been properly evidenced, as required by the Govt guidance. 3 The PSPO is unenforceable since there is no power to require names and addresses to be given to officers. The responsible cabinet member has said that the officer could simply call the police, but he is presumably unaware that it takes 40 minutes or so for a non-urgent call to police even be answered, let alone for a police officer to subsequently attend. Does he think that there is a power to detain individuals for any period? Such a power to require names and addresses is easily obtained delegated authority from the chief Constable, but it has not been done. 4 Likewise there is no power to take photographs by officers (nor are body-worn cameras issued to them) and this is remedied in the same way as point 3. 5 There is little point in having a PSPO if insufficient officer time is then given to enforce it.