



COUNCIL: 22 February 2017

Report of: Director of Leisure and Wellbeing.

Contact for further information: Mr A Hill (Extn. 5243)
(E-mail: a.hill@westlancs.gov.uk)

SUBJECT: PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER

Wards affected: Borough wide

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 To seek approval to make a Public Space Protection Order (PSPO).

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL

- 2.1 That the Public Space Protection Order detailed at Appendix 1 be approved for commencement on the 1st April 2017.
- 2.2 That any other areas suggested for restrictions during the recent public consultation exercise are kept on file for consideration in any future extension of the PSPO.
- 2.3 That authority be given to the Director of Leisure and Wellbeing to make any necessary minor amendments to the Public Space Protection Order.
-

3.0 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 On the 1st May 2008, WLBC brought into effect the The Fouling of Land by Dogs (West Lancashire) Order 2008. This order made the failure to pick up, after a dog had fouled, an offence.
- 3.2 On the 3rd July 2009, WLBC brought into effect four other Dog Control Orders (DCOs). A summary of the provisions are as follows:
1. Dogs Exclusion Order 2009 – applied to land set out in Appendix 2 (or is available by following – <http://www.westlancs.gov.uk/environment/dogs/dog-control-orders.aspx>). The Order makes it an offence to permit a dog to enter

or remain on any of the enclosed children's play areas to which the Order applies. Failure to do so attracts a fixed penalty of £75.

The Council has found this Order very effective in protecting children, reducing the risk of fouling and made it easier to prove an offence had taken place within the specific area.

2. The Dogs on Lead Order 2009 – this required dogs to be kept on a lead where the road speed is 40mph or higher.
3. The Dogs (Specified Maximum) Order 2009 – this made it an offence for one person to walk more than six dogs at a time.
4. The Dogs on Leads by Direction Order 2009 – this made it an offence not to put a dog on a lead when asked to do so by an authorised officer.

3.3 In 2014 the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act brought in the provisions for Councils to make Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs). These were designed to make public spaces more welcoming to the majority of law abiding people, by reducing anti-social behaviour being committed by individuals or groups. Existing DCOs automatically transfer to PSPOs after three years, but as PSPOs can contain a number of different restrictions Councils are advised to review current orders to try and simplify the “enforcement landscape”.

3.4 Consideration was given to the needs of the Borough and on the 20th July 2016 Members agreed that a public consultation exercise should take place to seek views on the possible implementation of a new PSPO, which would extend the scope of the original Orders to include 26 new or altered enclosed children’s play areas, where dogs would be excluded and 5 larger areas, where dogs would be required to be kept on a lead.

4.0 CURRENT POSITION

4.1 The public consultation took place between 28th November 2016 and 3rd January 2017. The relevant information was placed on the Council’s website and publicised using a press release and social media. In addition all Members and Parish Councils were advised of the consultation. There is a specific requirement to consult the Police and Lancashire Constabulary were advised on the 6th December and made no comments. The Police and Crime Commissioner and the LCC Highways team were also consulted, but provided no comments.

4.2 Responses were received from 25 residents/parish councils, details of which are contained in Appendix 3. It can be seen that in general there is support for the proposals, although some people who commented, wrongly thought that dogs were being excluded from large areas of parks, possibly due to the newspaper headlines about "banning dogs". Clarification was sent to any respondent who had misinterpreted the intentions of the proposals.

4.3 6 comments were received which proposed new areas where restrictions may be appropriate. All PSPOs last for 3 years and can be extended at any time within that 3 year period. Rather than extend the scope of the PSPO now, officers will monitor the areas suggested to substantiate whether there are issues that need to be addressed via a PSPO. Prior to any variation, the implications for any appropriate additional sites will be considered and may result in additional funding being requested through the Council’s budget setting process.

4.4 The most comments about an individual area were received in relation to the proposal to require dogs to be kept on leads on Alder Lane Playing Field in Parbold. Six residents sent objections to this, although the initial proposal, from Parbold Parish Council, was supported by another Parish Council and one resident. However, given the overall low numbers of responses received, it is not proposed to amend the original list, as it is difficult to say that this low level of opposition reflects the true feelings of the community.

4.5 If the PSPO is approved the Council is required to:

- Publish the Order on its website
- Advertise on each of the site that is covered by the Order the fact that an Order has been made and the effect of that Order

5.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS/COMMUNITY STRATEGY

5.1 There are no significant sustainability impacts associated with this report and, in particular, no significant impact on crime and disorder. The report has no significant links with the Sustainable Community Strategy.

6.0 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

6.1 During the budget setting process for 2016/17, £10,000 was allocated to implement these proposals. Some of that money has been used to cover the survey costs and the remainder will cover the appropriate signage, if the PSPO is approved.

6.2 The Council employs three Environmental Enforcement Officers who deal with dog issues alongside their work on litter and fly-tipping. Increasing the number of areas to be patrolled may result in less time spent in those areas.

7.0 RISK ASSESSMENT

7.1 Including the new play areas and new restrictions will demonstrate some consistency with previous work and assist in the reduction of anti-social behaviour.

Background Documents

There are no background documents (as defined in Section 100D(5) of the Local Government Act 1972) to this Report.

Equality Impact Assessment

There is a direct impact on members of the public, employees, elected members and / or stakeholders. Therefore an Equality Impact Assessment is required. A formal equality impact assessment is attached as an Appendix 4 to this report, the results of which have been taken into account in the Recommendations contained within this report.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Proposed PSPO

Appendix 2 – Current restricted play areas

Appendix 3 – Consultation responses

Appendix 4 – Equality Impact Assessment



Appendix 1

WEST LANCASHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR CRIME AND POLICING ACT 2014

PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER – (WEST LANCASHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL) 2016

West Lancashire Borough Council in exercise of its powers under S59 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (the Act), being satisfied that the conditions set out in S59 of the Act have been met hereby makes the following Order:

This Order comes into force on 1st April 2017 for a period of 3 years.

The Order supersedes the following:

- The Fouling of Land by Dogs (West Lancashire) Order 2008
- The Dogs Exclusion Order 2009
- The Dogs of Leads Order 2009
- The Dogs (Specified Maximum) Order 2009
- The Dog on Leads by Direction Order 2009

The Order applies to the land specified in the attached Schedules and maps (where relevant) and should be read in conjunction with the same.

Section 1 – General Provisions

1.1 Where specified, in this Order, “the Council” means West Lancashire Borough Council.

1.2 A person who habitually has a dog in his possession shall be taken to be in charge of the dog at any time unless at that time some other person is in charge of the dog

1.3 In relation to Section 2 and 6 of this Order the offence does not apply to a person who –

- 1.3.1 - is registered as a blind person in a register compiled under Section 29 of the National Assistance Act 1948; or
- 1.3.2 – has a disability which affects his hearing, mobility, manual dexterity, physical co-ordination or ability to lift, carry or otherwise move everyday objects, in respect of a dog trained by a prescribed charity and upon which he relies for assistance.
- 1.3.3 – each of the following is a “prescribed charity” for the purposes of this Order-
 - (i) Dogs for the Disabled (registered charity number 700454);
 - (ii) Support Dogs (registered charity number 1088281);
 - (iii) Canine Partners for Independence (registered charity number 803680)
 - (iv) Hearing Dogs for Deaf People (registered charity number 293358)

1.4 An “authorised officer of the Council” means an employee of the Authority who is authorised in writing by the Council for the purposes of giving directions under this Order.

Section 2 – Dog Fouling

2.1 This Section applies to the land specified in Schedule 1

2.2 If a dog defecates at any time on land to which this Order applies and a person who is in charge of the dog at the time fails to remove the faeces from the land forthwith, that person shall be guilty of an offence unless –

- (a) he has reasonable excuse for failing to do so; or
- (b) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his failing to do so.

2.3 For the purposes of this section –

- (a) placing of faeces in a receptacle on the land which is provided for the purpose, or for the disposal of waste, shall be a sufficient removal from the land;
- (b) being unaware of the defecation (whether by reason of not being in the vicinity or otherwise), or not having a device for or other suitable means of removing the faeces shall not be a reasonable excuse for failing to remove the faeces.

Section 3 – Specified Maximum Number of Dogs

3.1 This Section applies to the land specified in Schedule 1

3.2 A person will be guilty of an offence if, at any time, he takes onto any land in respect of which this Order applies more than six dogs per person, unless

- (a) he has reasonable excuse for doing so; or
- (b) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his doing so.

Section 4 – Dogs To Be Kept On Leads In Identified Areas

4.1 This Section applies to the land specified in Schedule 2

4.2 A person in charge of a dog shall be guilty of an offence if, at any time, on any land to which this Order applies he does not keep the dog on a lead, unless –

- (a) he has reasonable excuse for doing so; or
- (b) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his failing to do so.

Section 5 – Dogs To Be Kept On Leads When Directed To Do So By An Authorised Officer

5.1 This Section applies to the land specified in Schedule 1

5.2 A person in charge of a dog shall be guilty of an offence if, at any time on any land to which this Order applies, he does not comply with a direction given to him by an Authorised Officer of the Council to put and keep the dog on a lead unless –

- (a) he has reasonable excuse for doing so; or
- (b) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his failing to do so.

5.3 an Authorised Officer of the Council may only give a direction under this Order to put and keep a dog on a lead if such restraint is reasonably necessary to prevent a nuisance or behaviour by the dog causes or is likely to cause annoyance or disturbance to any other person on any land to which this Order applies or the worrying or disturbance of any animal or bird.

Section 6 – Dogs To Be Excluded From Designated Areas

6.1 This Section applies to the land specified in 3

6.2 A person in charge of a dog shall be guilty of an offence if at any time he takes a dog onto, or permits a dog to enter or to remain on, any land to which this Order applies unless –

- (a) he has reasonable excuse for doing so; or
- (b) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his failing to do so.

Section 7 – Penalty

A person who fails to comply with any obligation imposed by this Order is guilty of a criminal offence by virtue of section 67(1) of the Act and liable to a fine on summary conviction not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale.

Fixed Penalty Notices

In accordance with S68 of the Act an Authorised Officer may issue a fixed penalty notice (the Notice) of £75.00 to anyone he has reason to believe has committed an offence under this Order

The fixed penalty notice is a notice offering the person to whom it is issued the opportunity of discharging any liability to conviction for the offence by payment of a fixed penalty to the Council.

When a Notice is issued, no proceedings will be taken in respect of the offence before the end of the period of 14 days following the date of the Notice. If the person issued with the Notice pays the amount due within the 14 day period he may not be convicted of the offence.



WEST LANCASHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL
ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR CRIME AND POLICING ACT 2014

PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER – (WEST LANCASHIRE BOROUGH
COUNCIL) 2017

SCHEDULE 1

This Order applies to all land which is within the administrative area of the Borough of West Lancashire and which the public are entitled or permitted to have access with or without payment. The order will also apply to all Access Land within the Borough of West Lancashire within the meaning of S1(1) Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.

.....



WEST LANCASHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL
ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR CRIME AND POLICING ACT 2014

PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER – (WEST LANCASHIRE BOROUGH
COUNCIL) 2017

SCHEDULE 2

This Order applies to –

- (a) all carriageways in the West Lancashire Borough Council Area (either public or to which the public have access with or without payment) with a speed limit of 40 miles per hour or greater and the adjoining footways, cycle tracks and verges (either public or to which the public have access with or without payment); and
- (b) the areas outlined below and identified in the attached plans:
- Part of Beacon Country Park
 - Part of Coronation Park, Ormskirk
 - Coronation Park, Skelmersdale
 - St Helens Road Park, Ormskirk
 - Alder Lane playing fields, Parbold

.....



WEST LANCASHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL
ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR CRIME AND POLICING ACT 2014

PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER – (WEST LANCASHIRE BOROUGH
COUNCIL) 2015

SCHEDULE 3

The areas outlined below and identified in the attached plans:

Schedule of Borough Council "enclosed play areas" at:

- [Coronation Park, Park Road, Ormskirk, West Lancs \(PDF 75.2kb\)](#)
- [Ennerdale/Tanhouse Park, Skelmersdale, West Lancs \(PDF 78.1kb\)](#)
- [Cascades, Ormskirk Road, Skelmersdale, West Lancs \(PDF 82.8kb\)](#)
- [Bracknel Way, Aughton, Ormskirk, West Lancs \(PDF 68kb\)](#)
- [Abrams Fold/Lancaster Gate, Banks, West Lancs \(PDF 75.6kb\)](#)
- [Appley Playing Fields, Appley Lane South, Appley Bridge, West Lancs \(PDF 63.3kb\)](#)
- [Banksbarn, Digmaor, Skelmersdale, West Lancs \(PDF 79.9kb\)](#)
- [Abbeystead, Gillibrands Road, Little Digmaor, Skelmersdale, West Lancs \(PDF 87.3kb\)](#)
- [Fairhaven, Skelmersdale, West Lancs \(PDF 94.7kb\)](#)
- [Banks Leisure Centre, Greaves Hall Avenue, Banks, West Lancs \(PDF 83.1kb\)](#)
- [Hawksclough, Skelmersdale, West Lancs \(PDF 81.5kb\)](#)
- [Holland Moor, Digmaor, Skelmersdale, West Lancs \(PDF 72.2kb\)](#)
- [Mawdsley Terrance, Ormskirk, West Lancs \(PDF, 82.8kb\)](#)
- [Priory Close/Vicarage Gardens, Burscough, West Lancs \(PDF 78.3kb\)](#)
- [Rees Park, Burscough, West Lancs \(PDF, 73kb\)](#)
- [Richmond Park, Burscough, West Lancs \(PDF 90.4kb\)](#)
- [School Lane, Westhead, Ormskirk, West Lancs \(PDF 76.7kb\)](#)
- [Stanley, Coronation Park, Skelmersdale, West Lancs \(PDF 90.6kb\)](#)
- [Firbeck, Skelmersdale Town Centre, Skelmersdale, West Lancs \(PDF 76.7kb\)](#)
- [Trinity Walks, Tarleton, West Lancs \(PDF 71.7kb\)](#)
- [Broadacre, Upholland, Skelmersdale, West Lancs \(PDF 72.1kb\)](#)
- [Dewberry Fields, Upholland, Skelmersdale, West Lancs \(PDF, 91.1kb\)](#)
- [Moy Park, Scarisbrick, West Lancs \(PDF 70.7kb\)](#)
- [Willows, Victoria Park, Skelmersdale, West Lancs \(PDF 88.7kb\)](#)
- [Southport Road, Scarisbrick, West Lancs \(PDF 92.3kb\)](#)
- [Poppyfields, Hesketh Bank, West Lancs \(PDF 78.3kb\)](#)
- [Eavesdale/Edenhurst, Skelmersdale, West Lancs \(PDF 71.4kb\)](#)
- [White Moss Road, Skelmersdale, West Lancs \(APDF 71.6kb\)](#)
- Westhead (School Lane)
- Coronation Park, Ormskirk
- Halsall Lane, Ormskirk
- Westend, Ormskirk
- Mawdesley Terrace, Ormskirk
- Pickles Drive, Burscough
- Rees Park, Burscough

- Richmond Park, Burscough
- Banksbarn, Digmoor
- Beacon Country Park, Up Holland
- Alderley, Little Digmoor
- Belvedere Way, Aughton
- Fairhaven, Birch Green
- Helmsdale, Birch Green
- Inglewhite, Birch Green
- Stanley Coronation Park, Old Skelmersdale
- Tanfields, New Church Farm
- Evington, Tanhouse
- Ennerdale, Tanhouse
- Abbeystead, Little Digmoor
- Daisy Way, Scarisbrick
- Greenhill, Old Skelmersdale
- Chequer Lane
- Beacon Park
- Hilldale Playing Field
- Bickerstaffe Playing Field

Schedule of Parish Council "enclosed play areas" at:

- [Winifred Lane, Aughton, West Lancs \(PDF 51.7kb\)](#)
- [Redsands, Aughton, West Lancs \(PDF 40.5kb\)](#)
- [Holt Green, Aughton, West Lancs \(PDF 44.3kb\)](#)
- [Mere Avenue, Burscough, West Lancs \(PDF 40.7kb\)](#)
- [Engine Lane, Great Altcar, West Lancs \(PDF 40.1kb\)](#)
- [Memorial Hall, Halsall Road, Halsall, West Lancs \(PDF 44.7kb\)](#)
- [Shore Road, Hesketh with Beconsall, West Lancs \(PDF 44.1kb\)](#)
- [Glen Park Drive, Hesketh with Beconsall, West Lancs \(PDF 42.7kb\)](#)
- [Schwartzmans Drive, North Meols, West Lancs \(PDF 40.8kb\)](#)
- [Village Hall, The Green, Parbold, West Lancs \(PDF 54kb\)](#)
- [Burnside, Parbold, West Lancs \(PDF 40.6kb\)](#)
- [Village Hall, Smithy Lane, Scarisbrick, West Lancs \(PDF 43.5kb\)](#)
- [Carr Lane, Tarleton, West Lancs \(PDF 32.7kb\)](#)
- [Mill Lane, Up Holland, West Lancs \(PDF 41.5kb\)](#)
- [Lawns Ave, Up Holland, West Lancs \(PDF 45.6kb\)](#)

Appendix 2

- Coronation Park, Park Road, Ormskirk, West Lancs
- Ennerdale/Tanhouse Park, Skelmersdale, West Lancs
- Cascades, Ormskirk Road, Skelmersdale, West Lancs
- Bracknel Way, Aughton, Ormskirk, West Lancs
- Abrams Fold/Lancaster Gate, Banks, West Lancs
- Appley Playing Fields, Appley Lane South, Appley Bridge, West Lancs
- Banksbarn, Digmoor, Skelmersdale, West Lancs
- Abbeystead, Gillibrands Road, Little Digmoor, Skelmersdale, West Lancs
- Fairhaven, Skelmersdale, West Lancs
- Banks Leisure Centre, Greaves Hall Avenue, Banks, West Lancs
- Hawksclough, Skelmersdale, West Lancs
- Holland Moor, Digmoor, Skelmersdale, West Lancs
- Mawdsley Terrace, Ormskirk, West Lancs
- Priory Close/Vicarage Gardens, Burscough, West Lancs
- Rees Park, Burscough, West Lancs
- Richmond Park, Burscough, West Lancs
- School Lane, Westhead, Ormskirk, West Lancs
- Stanley, Coronation Park, Skelmersdale, West Lancs
- Firbeck, Skelmersdale Town Centre, Skelmersdale, West Lancs
- Trinity Walks, Tarleton, West Lancs
- Broadacre, Upholland, Skelmersdale, West Lancs
- Dewberry Fields, Upholland, Skelmersdale, West Lancs
- Moy Park, Scarisbrick, West Lancs
- Willows, Victoria Park, Skelmersdale, West Lancs
- Southport Road, Scarisbrick, West Lancs
- Poppyfields, Hesketh Bank, West Lancs
- Eavesdale/Edenhurst, Skelmersdale, West Lancs
- White Moss Road, Skelmersdale, West Lancs
- Winifred Lane, Aughton, West Lancs
- Redsands, Aughton, West Lancs
- Holt Green, Aughton, West Lancs
- Mere Avenue, Burscough, West Lancs
- Engine Lane, Great Altcar, West Lancs
- Memorial Hall, Halsall Road, Halsall, West Lancs
- Shore Road, Hesketh with Becconsall, West Lancs
- Glen Park Drive, Hesketh with Becconsall, West Lancs
- Schwartzmans Drive, North Meols, West Lancs
- Village Hall, The Green, Parbold, West Lancs
- Burnside, Parbold, West Lancs
- Village Hall, Smithy Lane, Scarisbrick, West Lancs
- Carr Lane, Tarleton, West Lancs
- Mill Lane, Up Holland, West Lancs
- Lawns Ave, Up Holland, West Lancs

Appendix 3

Person responding	Comment
1.	<p>Totally agree. Although most dog owners are responsible it only takes one and a child can come to harm both from physical attack but also from the muck they leave. Sick of taking my grandson out to the park and having to constantly be checking for Poo.</p>
2.	<p>I am disappointed that the park on Manor Road Burscough has not been included on your list. We live very close to the park and our kids love playing on there however during to the high volume of dog owners allowing the dogs to run wild off leads and on one of our visits 3 dogs jumping up at our 4 year old child to the owner sayin they are only playing!! this has put our child off visiting his favourite park. This along with the amount of dog mess in the long grass that you stand in is another reason we do not use the park as often as we like.</p> <p>I have just commented on the Burscough community page regarding why this wasn't included to be replied to by a dog owner advising that they take there dog on the park and there is often only other dog owners on the park with no children in site so if dogs where banned nobody would ever use the park. I think they are being blinkered in that the reason no kids are on the park is due to the above and the amount of dogs running around.</p> <p>After all a play area is supposed to be for children to have fun on not to stand in dog mess or feel scared of dogs running around??</p>
3.	<p>I whole heartedly agree with this proposal. This incident below occurred only last month in Richmond Park.</p> <p>One dog was let off the lead and it charged at my 2yr old from behind. He was on the path. The part that is 'D' shaped. Approaching the skate board park. The dog knocked him over running from behind (it was by accident, the dog was trying just to play). My son was trotting (on this occasion) about 2m in front of me. The dog then started trying to lick him, trying to make him better. Understandably, my 2year old was freaking out and screaming uncontrollably. It was only a little dog. And the owner did run up and apologise. It was just one of those things. I know that dogs need to be let off the leash to get a good run. I don't blame the owner. But dogs off leashes shouldn't be allowed where small children are playing in my opinion. I dread to think what would have happened had it been a big dog. That's without even getting into the whole dog mess and children debate. It's all very well trying to get dog owners to pick up mess. But there's always some that won't/dont. I agree they should not be allowed in Richmond Park. And I back this proposition.</p> <p>However in the interest of fairness, they do need to be able to run somewhere. So there needs to be a dog friendly alternative location. That would only be fair.</p>
4.	<p>I notice from the list of play areas detailed when following the link to the Borough Council website that the play area and playing fields adjacent to Mossy Lea Village Hall, Mossy Lea Road, Wrightington, are not</p>

	<p>included on this list. To my knowledge, and correct me if I am wrong, they have also not been included in any area dog control or dogs on lead orders either.</p> <p>This play area and playing field are in the ownership and control of West Lancs. BC and yet do not seem to appear on any lists with regard to dogs.</p> <p>Could you please confirm whether there are any dog control or dogs on leads orders already applicable to this area/field and if not, will any be placed on them in the near future.</p> <p><i>Clarification was provided</i></p>
5.	<p>Hi, I am emailing you regarding the item in the Champion newspaper about possibly banning dogs from children's play areas in the West Lancs area.</p> <p>I don't think dogs should be banned completely, because it is good for them to be outside with children, and get fresh air, as long as they are properly under control.</p> <p>However, I believe it would be better to make it compulsory to have all dogs on their leads when in the play areas. Then they can still enjoy being out, but with no risk of harming/upsetting children and other people.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read my views.</p>
6.	<p>I agree that banning dogs from children's play areas, or at least requiring them to be on a lead, can only be a good thing.</p> <p>With specific reference to Alder Lane Playing Fields, Parbold, there are plenty of areas nearby where dogs can run freely, and I am very much in favour of having dogs kept on leads here.</p> <p>The only thing I would ask is, how enforceable is this in reality? I live next to a children's play park (at the end of Burnside, Parbold) where dogs are banned. People regularly take their animals onto the play area and don't always clear up if their dog fouls. In order to report somebody, it is necessary to approach them and ask for details, which not many people would want to do.</p>
7.	<p>Once again the few irresponsible dog owners are spoiling things for the majority, most people who visit parks with dogs are families with their family pet, or older people who cannot take their dog elsewhere. Everyone should clean up after their dog. If this ban is introduced and there is no enforcement then the good people who are law abiding will stay away (these people being the ones who are responsible dog owners anyway) and others will still go and these are likely to be the people who were causing the issues in the first place. Would it not be a good idea for us to adopt the system in place in many other areas of Britain where there are dog parks, coronation park is certainly big enough to have a separate dog area. In my opinion banning the dogs from parks and other areas will only affect the good people who were never causing a problem to begin with, but the council seem quite good</p>

	<p>at doing that to the people of west Lancashire, as the only people they are interested in is the students, it seems everyone else can just get more and more things taken away from them.</p>
8.	<p>Although not a dog owner, I am a dog enthusiast with a toddler. After reading the article in the Ormskirk Champion, I felt it necessary to raise my objection to this proposal.</p> <p>For many people, dogs provide a huge amount of affection, love, friendship and comfort. Putting barriers in their way, particularly considering the ageing population, is discriminatory in my eyes.</p> <p>From my experience (and I use parks a lot with my little one), the dog fouling initiatives and penalties have had a significant impact in reducing this problem. If anything, the issue lies with the council emptying the bins.</p> <p>With ever increasing recognition of the rights of animals and fairness of treatment, I feel it is extremely sad that would aim to limit their well being in this way.</p> <p>Ultimately, parks are a shared space and while I agree that dogs should not enter fenced off children's play areas, they should not be banned from parks in general. Dogs form an integral part of many families and so, it is very reasonable to foresee that they would actually join children going to these play areas.</p> <p>Finally, I think you need to take real account of the best meet of once dents versus the number of dogs actually visiting these parks. My guess is that you'll find it is statistically insignificant. Thus, you need to question your real motivation as this proposal will impact a significant number of people.</p>
9.	<p>I have no issues whatsoever with dogs being excluded from any play space for children with play equipment.</p> <p>However, as a dog walker, I have some concerns with the imposition of 'dogs on leads' restrictions on areas which are now fully accessible to dog walkers such as Beacon Country Park. Existing regulations, regarding dog fouling and keeping dogs under control so they are not a nuisance, if enforced properly; should ensure that everyone is able to enjoy the area without any problems.</p> <p>I recognise that all dog owners do not always comply with these regulations, however they are no more likely to keep their dogs on a lead if an order is enforced. Responsible owners like myself however, will be penalised because, as a law abiding citizen, I would keep my dog on a lead.</p> <p>Myself and my dog gain a great deal of pleasure from using the public amenities which I pay for through council tax. There are many reasons why dogs benefit from off lead exercise. I would be really sorry to lose some of the opportunities to do this.</p> <p>Is there a particular reason that these specific areas have been identified?</p>
10.	<p>I object to the proposal to ban dogs from Beacon park Up Holland. I</p>

	have walked dogs in this park over the past 50years or more and regard this ban as totally unacceptable.
11.	<p>How anybody can disagree with a plan to stop dogs fouling such areas is beyond me.It is so obviously in the best health and safety interests of all,especially the children.</p> <p>You see dog owners with plastic bags to so call 'clean up the mess'.Next thing the dogs are released,into the darkness at this time of the year, and run a mile away to deposit their mess.The owners haven't got a clue where it is and some of them don't care.</p> <p>Westend is such an area,made worse due to the playing field being adjacent to the footpath also used for the children attending Westend School.This path is regularly soiled.</p>
12.	<p>What a stupid idea . Responsible dog owners don't walk their dogs in children's play areas . Why would they ? There is a huge field in Coronation Park in Ormskirk , why on earth would dog owners want to walk their dogs round a small children's park . Have the councillors got nothing better to think about and suggest . I have never seen dogs in children's play areas . Absolutely ridiculous . There are far more important issues to think about . I find this just unbelievable and stupid .</p> <p><i>Clarification was provided and a further response received</i></p> <p>Thank you . I don't understand if a dog is on a lead it stops it's control of bowel habits as suggested ?</p> <p>To quote</p> <p>' This will hopefully reduce the chances of dogs fouling in these areas.'</p> <p>The dogs will poop whether on a lead or not . It's not the dogs but the owners that need training . I re iterate , responsible dog owners do not walk their dogs thro children's play areas , and also carry poop bags to pick up a dogs mess .</p> <p><i>Further clarification was provided</i></p>
13.	<p>As a dog owner and regular user of Beacon Country Park I fully support the proposal for dogs to be kept on a lead for</p> <p>the area specified.</p>
14.	<p>Please add Summer Street to the list. Is a consultation necessary? Are dog attacks a product of my imagination? All childrens play areas should be fenced, gated and cleaned as one of the highest priorities on Council tax spend budget.</p>
15.	<p>With regards to the above, I am against this proposed action as this is</p>

	<p>the centre of the community for all residence of Hilldale. We all walk our dogs and socialise together whilst we walk our dogs. I have just recently moved to the area and this is how I made friends with people in the area.</p> <p>People of the area take their children and dogs to this area together.</p> <p>Also, there are no other open spaces where we can walk our dogs safely in the area. We would have to drive our cars to areas where we could walk our dogs.</p> <p>Poo bags are provided and everybody picks up after their dogs.</p> <p>Clarification was provided</p>
16.	<p>Please can you clarify a point for me: when referring to the intended change in Hilldale, does this refer to the entire playing field, or to the fenced off area which is already closed to dogs? The map would seem to imply the former, while the photographs seem to imply the latter.</p> <p>I would appreciate a prompt reply, so that I can formulate an appropriate response.</p> <p>Clarification was provided and further comments were received as follows</p> <p>Many thanks for your reply to my query. I cannot see that this change will be significant, as the children's play area is already forbidden to dogs. Is this change really giving the interdiction legal status?</p> <p>Having said that, I have more concern about the proposal to oblige dog owners to keep their dogs on a lead on Alder Lane playing fields. I would like to lodge an objection to this proposal.</p> <p>The basis of my objection is that I use this field to exercise my dog intermittently and at least 50% of the time that I am on that field, I am alone with my dog. It seems ludicrous to me that he should not have the benefit of the open space to run and chase a ball, which would be impossible if he were on a lead. Another 45% of the time that I am on the field, the only other people on the field are other dog owners with their pets, as it is a useful place to park and meet with friends, using the field as a starting out point for a more extended walk. There is a good understanding among dog owners in the neighbourhood of Parbold and there are never any problems. The remaining 5% of my visits to the field, I do see non dog owners, but no one has ever raised an objection to my dog, rather the reverse: I have had families approach me on several occasions, to ask if their children can pet my dog, as they can see what a friendly and easy going animal he is. On one occasion only, I was leaving the field and saw a crowd of young people coming onto the field with sports equipment and coaches, apparently setting up for a training session.</p> <p>From my experience of this field, it is more often than not either</p>

	<p>deserted or populated with one or two dog owners besides me. The dogs of Parbold and the environs are almost universally well controlled, peaceable animals, with responsible owners who pay attention to the needs of the users of this public area, by disposing of their dog's waste, as required, in the bins provided. I cannot see how they are causing a problem that would require this change to the law: it really does seem to be "using a sledgehammer to crack a nut" and I am at a loss to see what the "nut" in question might be. It is not as if there are hordes of pit-bulls running rampant over the field and scaring the populace. It is simply not that kind of area.</p> <p>The only issue that I can see is the possibility that some dog owners might be using the field at the same time as the sports clubs, whose activities I have witnessed once. Conceivably, it might be a problem if a dog not on a lead ran onto the pitch when a game was in progress. If this is the origin of this proposal, would it not be possible to frame the rule change to fit more exactly the circumstances that are causing the problem? For example, would it not be more logical to forbid dogs to be off the lead if an organised sports activity were in progress? Or on Saturdays during the football season?</p> <p>I hope that you will give due consideration to my objection. I am expressing the views of several dog owners with whom I have discussed the matter. None of us would have any objection to a proposal that is reasonable, but the one to do with Alder Lane playing fields does not fall into that category: it is unfair and unreasonable.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply.</p>
17.	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>Please can you advise me if the ban relates to the whole of the mentioned parks or is it just within the fenced children's play areas. For example at Richmond Park in Burscough, under the new proposals will my dogs remain able to run freely yet under control and enjoy the grassed area while my children play on the fenced play area? Will we still be able to enjoy picnics at Hilldale my dogs getting exercise on the green while my children enjoy the fenced play area?</p> <p>PSPO's are I believed used to reduce anti-social behavior. I believe if you ban dog walkers other problems will arise, a lot more anti-social problems than a few dog owners, who I believe, are the eyes and ears of a community. Problems with anti-social behavior arise when parks and public spaces don't have sensible dog walkers using them in the early hours of the morning and during the evening. As a mother and a dog owner I feel it is short sighted of the council to impose further restrictions on dogs. The enrichment my dogs bring to my family when out enjoying the fresh air and encouraging my children to grow up with a respect for great outdoors is immense and as a tax payer am I not entitled to that?</p> <p>Clarification was provided</p>

18.	<p>I regularly take advantage of Alder Lane playing fields to exercise my dog and am very concerned that you are considering introducing a "lead only" directive for this area. I am concerned about dog fouling in this or any other area but I think that such an order is an unnecessary and severely restricts the freedom of dog owners to enjoy the facilities available.</p> <p>Dog walkers are by far the largest group of people to use this area. I have seen rugby league being played on some Saturday's but very little sign of young children. The main health problem from animal faeces (dogs, foxes and cats) is the rare disease of toxicariasis. The following is a quote from the NHS web site.</p> <p>"Toxicariasis is a <u>rare</u> infection caused by roundworm parasites. It's spread from animals to humans through contact with infected faeces</p> <p>Roundworm parasites are most commonly found in cats, dogs and foxes, and usually affect young children.</p> <p>This is because children are more likely to come into contact with contaminated soil when they play and put their hands in their mouths."</p> <p>I have searched in vain for any cases of toxicariasis in the UK in the last 20 years. I have yet to see any teenage rugby players eating soil and if you are considering control options you should doubtless include cats on your target list.</p>
19	<p>After reading your proposals on the banning of dogs from public parks I felt compelled to write and give my view .</p> <p>I am the owner of a dog that is walked on two of the parks included in your plans.</p> <p>Is it really fair to include two parks so close together on a ban ? Maybe one banned and one lead only may be a better option?</p> <p>I personally do not let my dog off the lead and am very pro active in cleaning up after my dog - I have actually picked other dogs mess up if I see it left. Not all dog owners are irresponsible and unfortunately the minority tar the rest of us with the same brush .</p> <p>My personal option is as the owner of a nervous dog I'd be happy to see dogs having to be kept on a lead all the time and I do tend to use Halsall lane park more because less dogs are lead free here in fact most people I meet on this park use it for the same reason I do. Maybe it would be worth doing a survey before a decision is made ?</p> <p>I do agree coronation park should be a lead on area and actually suggested this to the warden once but got a negative response on how it would be manned .</p> <p><i>Clarification was provided and a further response was received</i></p> <p>Thank you Andrew , yes this has cleared it up thank you . I thought it was relating to the whole of Halsall lane park and the area on coronation park which includes the band stand . I also should of stated in my original message that I don't use the area of that park where the football fields are because of unleashed dogs (my dogs isn't good with other dogs)</p>

	<p>and I was in a bit of a panic as to where I could safely walk him . As far as I'm concerned I'd be happy to support dogs been kept I the leads at all times .</p> <p>thank you again for responding to what must have seemed like a madwoman lol</p>
20.	<p>Morning,</p> <p>As dog owners my husband and I are concerned and disappointed with the restriction on allowing our dogs to run free on the field, however we do appreciate the need when the field is in use for football or rugby at the weekends to put our dogs on their leads.</p> <p>We are responsible owners as are all the other local dog owner users of the field, if we see a unexpectedly missed dog waste we pick it up too along with the litter left post rugby/football matches and children's play in the summer.</p> <p>This is a valuable facility for local people that should be shared by all happily, thus far I am not privy to any incidents with regards to dogs behaviour or any other incidents so believe this is working well. Dogs need to run free occasionally in a safe fenced area which Alder Lane playing field provides.</p> <p>I believe the teams (rugby/football) using the playing field aren't local and are using this facility minimally compared to local dog owners and families, I do however understand the need for hygiene on the pitches and therefore do not allow our dogs to defecate there keeping them under control.</p> <p>Alder Lane playing field is not a playground, playgrounds are for children only.</p> <p>Thank you for the consultation.</p>
21.	<p>The issue of the West Lancashire Borough Council Public Space Protection Order consultation was recently discussed at our December Parish Council meeting. Although none of the places named were in Newburgh itself, there is a proposal to keep dogs on leads at Alder Lane Playing Fields in Parbold. I can confirm that Newburgh Parish Council fully supports this proposal in the interest of public safety and wellbeing. I have also been asked to request if it would be possible for a similar proposal to be put forward in the near future for dogs to be kept on leads on the KGV Field at Newburgh Sports Club on Cobbs Brow Lane. Any information you can provide on this matter would be much appreciated.</p>
22.	<p>I refer to your e-mail of 28 November 2016 regarding the consultation on Dog Control Orders which was brought to the attention of the Parish Council at our December meeting. Members were concerned that Parish Councils did not appear to have been formally invited to submit any areas for consideration prior to the public consultation. I will, however, make the following observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the Schedule of Proposals: dogs to be banned – we notice that under 'Skelmersdale' there is an area listed as Belvedere Way, Aughton and we think this should read Belvedere Park, Aughton and be included under the Parish list.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When the original Dog Exclusion Orders were made in, I think, 2009, I did point out to your officers that one area had been 'left off' the list, ie Rachel Taylor Memorial Playing Field Playarea, off Cherry Tree Lane, Aughton and I was assured that it would be included next time round. We would, therefore, request that this site is added to the Schedule of 'enclosed playareas' in order to help keep children safe and reduce problems with dog fouling.
23.	<p>As a responsible dog owner who always picks up after my pet and would not allow my dog to run on the field whilst children are playing sport I am dismayed by the proposal to order dogs to be kept on a lead at Alder Lane Playing fields, Parbold.</p> <p>The fields are only used at the weekends by sports clubs, so why does the restriction need to cover all week? Couldn't it be applicable when the fields are in use by the teams?</p> <p>We have precious few places to walk our dogs off the lead. Walking a dog is a healthy and sociable activity. Please don't further limit our options and consider a compromise to keep ALL Parbold residents (of which there are many dog owners) happy.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
24	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>Having read the documents regarding the proposed "Dogs on leads" order on Alder Lane playing fields I wish to contribute to the consultation by making the following points.</p> <p>1. Evidence of nuisance of dog fouling</p> <p>As a frequent user of Alder Lane playing fields I have not encountered significant examples of dog fouling in the area of the proposed order. As a responsible dog owner I pick up my own dog's faeces. I have not encountered other faeces on the playing surface. However I occasionally find other dogs' faeces on the field margins and pick them up.</p> <p>There is a significant issue with dog fouling elsewhere in the area.</p> <p>2. Evidence of dogs causing a nuisance to the public</p> <p>3. Evidence of fouling causing harm to individuals</p> <p>4. Enforcement of the proposed order</p> <p>5. Other concerns related to this consultation</p>
25	<p>Could I request that our Play Area at Station Road, Hesketh Bank is added to the list of areas at which dogs are banned. This land is owned by the Parish Council, is gated and fully maintained by us – plan attached.</p> <p>My Council has also asked me to comment at their surprise that the Parishes were not consulted before the issuing of your draft proposals.</p>

APPENDIX 4

Equality Impact Assessment Form	
Directorate: Leisure and Wellbeing	Service: Community Services
Completed by: Andrew Hill	Date: 4th January 2017
Subject Title: Public Space Protection Orders	
1. DESCRIPTION	
Is a policy or strategy being produced or revised:	No
Is a service being designed, redesigned or cutback:	No
Is a commissioning plan or contract specification being developed:	No
Is a budget being set or funding allocated:	No
Is a programme or project being planned:	Yes
Are recommendations being presented to senior managers and/or Councillors:	Yes
Does the activity contribute to meeting our duties under the Equality Act 2010 and Public Sector Equality Duty (Eliminating unlawful discrimination/harassment, advancing equality of opportunity, fostering good relations):	Yes
Details of the matter under consideration:	Commencement of new Public Space Protection Order with some restrictions placed on dog owners to encourage responsible behaviour
<i>If you answered Yes to any of the above go straight to Section 3</i>	
<i>If you answered No to all the above please complete Section 2</i>	
2. RELEVANCE	
Does the work being carried out impact on service users, staff or Councillors (stakeholders):	Yes
If Yes , provide details of how this impacts on service users, staff or Councillors (stakeholders): <i>If you answered Yes go to Section 3</i>	
If you answered No to both Sections 1 and 2 provide details of why there is no impact on these three groups: <i>You do not need to complete the rest of this form.</i>	
3. EVIDENCE COLLECTION	
Who does the work being carried out impact on, i.e. who is/are the stakeholder(s)?	Visitors to WLBC/Parish Council parks
If the work being carried out relates to a universal service, who needs or uses it most? (Is there any particular group affected more than others)?	Dog owners



Which of the protected characteristics are most relevant to the work being carried out?	
Age	No
Gender	No
Disability	No
Race and Culture	No
Sexual Orientation	No
Religion or Belief	No
Gender Reassignment	No
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No
Pregnancy and Maternity	No
4. DATA ANALYSIS	
In relation to the work being carried out, and the service/function in question, who is actually or currently using the service and why?	Parks are visited by all aspects of the community
What will the impact of the work being carried out be on usage/the stakeholders?	Restrictions placed on dogs to try to reduce fouling, dog attacks and anti-social behaviour associated with dogs
What are people's views about the services? Are some customers more satisfied than others, and if so what are the reasons? Can these be affected by the proposals?	Responses were mostly supportive
What sources of data including consultation results have you used to analyse the impact of the work being carried out on users/stakeholders with protected characteristics?	Public consultation
If any further data/consultation is needed and is to be gathered, please specify:	n/a
5. IMPACT OF DECISIONS	
In what way will the changes impact on people with particular protected characteristics (either positively or negatively or in terms of disproportionate impact)?	Park users should be able to enjoy WLBC/Parish Council parks more
6. CONSIDERING THE IMPACT	
If there is a negative impact what action can be taken to mitigate it? (If it is not possible or desirable to take actions to reduce the impact, explain why this is the case (e.g. legislative or financial drivers etc.).	n/a
What actions do you plan to take to address any other issues above?	n/a
7. MONITORING AND REVIEWING	
When will this assessment be reviewed and who will review it?	Andrew Hill January 2022