

Responses to Haddenham Parish Council Consultation for the proposed Dog Control Order

Summary

It's not always obvious whether people are objecting or simply discussing the matter but I have attempted to interpret people's views in order to summarise and put some numbers to the opinions.

Number of responses: 44	
Opposed: 28	
Support: 7	
Support with modifications: 3	
Uncommitted: 6	
<u>Banks Park</u>	
The majority of people who had an objection related it to Banks Park with the following issues raised repeatedly:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adverse impact on the use of the buildings as community spaces e.g. dog shows, training classes, bringing a dog when collecting children from scouts or children's centre.	Dogs are permitted on a lead around the building as shown on the plans.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Should allow dogs on a lead up to scout hut.	This is allowed as shown on the plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Attendees at the market will not be able to bring their dogs.	Dogs are allowed on the road area and can be left tied up to the fence.
<u>Old Station Play area</u>	
Several people commented that there should be an area here for dogs to be allowed off their leads (southern part)	This is not incorporated, consultation cannot be reopened
<u>General comments and questions which could be answered by PC</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Responsible dog owners will also be penalised.	Responsible dog owners do not walk their dogs in childrens play areas or football pitches or allotments where there are

	no dogs signs – so no – they will not be penalised.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will to DCO be negated by the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014? 	No – it they will be valid for a further 3 years during which time AVDC will implement new orders in accordance with the act
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Isn't the existing Dogs (Fouling of Land) Act 1996 (DFLA) already in place and sufficient? 	No – it requires to high a level of evidence that a dog walker has allowed fouling and not cleared it up. Very few prosecutions have succeeded and irresponsible dog walkers act with impunity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the total expenditure on public notices and signage good value for money? 	Yes – there is no other way to prevent irresponsible dog walkers.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PC office was closed for 2 weeks during the consultation period and no letter box at office, this was a poor time to hold a consultation. 	The postal address on the Public Notice was the Clerks home address and correspondence was received during the office closure at that address. The majority of respondents used the email address as published and received an acknowledgement when the office re-opened
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Without someone to patrol how will this be policed? 	It will only require a clear photograph of a dog walker allowing the dog off a lead or in an area from which they are excluded.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dogs should be allowed onto the airfield playing field 	There is a large open area adjacent to the playing field where dogs are permitted off the lead – no restrictions are proposed there. It is inappropriate to allow dogs onto the football pitch.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dogs aren't a problem on the allotments. 	The Parish Council erected 'No Dogs' signs some years ago and not taking dogs onto the allotments is a condition of each plot holder agreement.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Footpaths are not included – why? 	The Parish Council has tried to first implement DCOs to cover

	main areas where there have been reported. If these are acceptable to the village then the council will look at implementing further controls.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dog exclusion areas should be enclosed. 	Most dog exclusion areas are bounded by 'dog on lead' zones, so there should be no problem of dogs being out of control where they are excluded.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signs to indicate where dog owners can walk their dogs should be included. 	Details of where dogs are not excluded are available at the parish office.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be areas available where dog owners can allow their dogs off of a lead 	There are a number of these around the village and on footpaths out of the village.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How many and what complaints has the PC received about dogs? 	We have not kept a record but recently have received complaints relating to a dog regularly running loose in Banks Park play area & scaring children. There is a long term issue with dogs fouling on the playing field pitches and running loose and interrupting football training / scaring children which the users are keen to address. A cat was killed by three dogs which were not on leads on a footpath.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PC should display signs to say 'No dogs'. None are currently in place. 	They are regularly removed by someone every time they are put up. When the orders are implemented news signs will be erected of a more permanent nature. See attached photos of existing signs.
<u>Responses</u>	
1.	
Why can't the hpc buy the field with the help of the residents of haddenham for the dog walkers to continue to use. It is crazy building there where there was considerable flooding early this year. Which ended up with the road being closed and the fire brigade having to come out.	HPC does not have funds to buy land.
It is a very good field for walking the dogs and many lonely people are energised	There are still plenty of opportunities for walking dogs

from the walk and company . Even young mums walk there with their children and dog which is also very healthy.	without going onto playing fields and childrens play areas
Haddenham will become over crowded It's not always obvious whether people are objecting or simply discussing the matter but I have attempted to interpret people's views in order to summarise and put some numbers to the opinions. wded, crime rate will increase because you are letting all the green space go. Children need space to grow and keep healthy. You have only to look at other towns where they went mad on building to see what happens. It is mans greed once again that causes these problems and our Haddenham Parish council should be aware of these facts	The dog control orders will not support or enable the building of houses – they are totally unrelated.
<p>Please may I make a couple of general points about the consultation?</p> <p>First, the timing of the consultation is unfortunate. Generally, public consultations are not undertaken during the summer school holidays; many people go away, organisations, including the Parish Council, go into recess, business is less active and people generally “switch off”. Arguably a public consultation during the summer school holidays is not an effective consultation. If you really want a full public input, I would suggest extending the consultation period and re-publicising it.</p> <p>Secondly, I am grateful to David Lyons for drawing my attention to the consultation. Until he telephoned, I was not aware of it. Maybe I should have kept a closer eye on Haddenham.net or the local press? However, I would have thought that you might have alerted the Scout & Guide Association to the consultation formally when the consultation started. The Association owns the Scout & Guide Centre which is in effect used as a community hall and stands in Banks Park where Orders are proposed that would impact on users of the Centre. On the same basis, I would have thought that you might have alerted the Village Hall Management Committee. Maybe you did so?</p>	
2.	
I appreciate why Dog Control Orders are being proposed.	

However, in deciding the restrictions and the areas to which they should apply it is important to accommodate the various needs of all the residents of the village and of other people who use the facilities offered by the village and to achieve a balance between them. The needs of different people may conflict and compromises may need to be made.	The council has sought to take into the needs of all residents and has relaxed existing controls making more areas accessible to dog walkers
It is important to remember that not all dog owners act irresponsibly. I would suggest that it is a small minority who do so.	A number of irresponsible dog walkers regularly disobey the no dog signs at Banks Park, Recreation Ground, Allotments and the Airfield playing field
People need to be able to go about their business in the village, including recreational activities and exercising their dogs and also visits to the various community buildings at Banks Park.	People will still be able to visit the majority of these places – in fact more so – they just will not be able to allow their dogs in areas where children or footballers play.
Banks Park is different from the other areas in respect of which Orders are proposed in three respects:	Dogs are currently prohibited from Banks Park – the orders will relax this restriction – dogs on leads will be allowed on the road area, but not in the children’s play area
All the other areas are large open grassed - or cultivated - areas without buildings (except for the pavilion that serves the recreation ground). In contrast, about 70% of Banks Park is developed with various community buildings and hard surfacing and there is only a small grassed area.	Dogs are currently prohibited from Banks Park – the orders will relax this restriction – dogs on leads will be allowed on the road area, but not in the children’s play area
The areas other than Banks Park, are used for recreational purposes. On the other hand, most of the people who come to Banks Park do so to visit the Village Hall, the Scout & Guide Centre, the Community Library or the dentist and do not use the small grassed area at all. I do accept that some young children do play on the slide and swings on the grassed area, but that is not the dominant use of Banks Park.	Dogs are currently prohibited from Banks Park – the orders will relax this restriction – dogs on leads will be allowed on the road area, but not in the children’s play area
Owners frequently walk their dogs at the Recreation Ground, the Old Station play area and, I suspect, also the Airfield Playing Fields. This use is in addition to the dominant recreational use of those areas and arguably there is a conflict that needs to be addressed. In contrast, few owners walk their dogs on the small	Dogs are currently prohibited from Banks Park – the orders will relax this restriction – dogs on leads will be allowed on the road area, but not in the children’s play area

grassed area at Banks Park.	
I accept that it is important to try to reconcile the conflict between the two uses of the Recreation Ground, the Old Station play area and the Airfield Playing Fields, that is for recreational purposes and for dog-walking.	Dogs are currently prohibited from Banks Park and the recreation ground – the orders will relax this restriction – dogs on leads will be allowed on the road area, but not in the childrens play area. Dog walking is currently prohibited in the airfield playing field
There is no such conflict between uses at Banks Park. The dominant activities at Banks Park are the use of the Village Hall, the Scout & Guide Centre, the Community Library and the dentist; every day many more people come to Banks Park to visit those buildings than to use the small grassed area - for any purpose. It is important that those dominant activities are not compromised.	Dogs are currently prohibited from Banks Park – the orders will relax this restriction – dogs on leads will be allowed on the road area, but not in the children’s play area
If the Dog Control Orders proposed for Banks Park were implemented, they would impact adversely on the use of the buildings and in particular the use of the Village Hall and the Scout & Guide Centre. As community halls, those two buildings are put to variety of uses. Notably both are used for activities involving dogs: the Village Hall frequently for dog shows and the Scout & Guide Centre for weekly puppy training classes. In addition, dog-owners who deliver and collect young children for activities at the Scout & Guide Centre every day and at the Village Hall often bring their dog with them – that is simply as part of the “family” and not to walk the dog on the grassed area.	Dogs are currently prohibited from Banks Park – the orders will relax this restriction – dogs on leads will be allowed on the road area, but not in the children’s play area
In my view, there is no case in principle for Dog Orders to be made in respect of Banks Park.	Dogs are currently prohibited from Banks Park – the orders will relax this restriction – dogs on leads will be allowed on the road area, but not in the childrens play area
Notwithstanding my conclusion regarding the principle, I would like to comment on the details of the Dog Orders proposed for Banks Park. The boundary of the “No dogs allowed” area has been drawn such that it would not be possible to	The published plan shows there is access to the front door

walk up the path to the front door of the Scout & Guide Centre with a dog on a lead. The only pedestrian route to the Centre would apparently be by way of the tarmac'd area leading to the handyman's building, to the right of the fence, and then through the gate and along the front of the Centre. That would not only be inconvenient but also unsafe; when the handyman's building was being planned the Parish Council and the Scout & Guide Association agreed that the fence should be erected to separate pedestrian access, particularly by children, to the Centre from the handyman's vehicular movements.	
I have mentioned that a weekly puppy training class is held at the Centre. Access to the Centre for all the people attending the class with their dogs would be made unnecessarily inconvenient.	Dogs are currently prohibited from Banks Park – the orders will relax this restriction – dogs on leads will be allowed on the road area, but not in the children's play area
The trainer who runs the classes operates a stringent and effective protocol for the dogs who need to toilet during the classes. She asks owners who need to take their puppies to the toilet to use the small patch of grass under the tree, immediately outside the Centre. She asks them to clean up afterwards and she is, herself, fastidious in checking at the end of the evening. To preclude dogs completely from that small grassed area would prevent the sensible toileting arrangements that the trainer has put in place from continuing.	Dogs are currently prohibited from Banks Park – the orders will relax this restriction – dogs on leads will be allowed on the road area, but not in the children's play area
As I have said, every day adults deliver and collect young children for activities at the Scout & Guide Centre and not infrequently they have their dog with them. It is important to appreciate the number of pedestrian movements to and from the Centre. In term time, Puddleducks Pre-School runs every weekday with 20-25 children; 5 scouting and guiding units meet each week with a total of more than 100 young people and other weekly activities are attended by a further 30 or so youngsters.	Dogs are currently prohibited from Banks Park – the orders will relax this restriction – dogs on leads will be allowed on the road area, but not in the children's play area
In conclusion, I would suggest that:	
No Dog Control Orders should be made in respect of Banks Park; or, if any Orders	

are made, that:	
Any “No dogs allowed” area should be drawn to exclude the path leading to the front door of the Scout & Guide Centre and also the area to the right-hand side where the chestnut tree stands, that is to allow a person with a dog on a lead to use the path to get to the Centre and also to allow the continuation of the toileting arrangements that the puppy trainer operates successfully.	Dogs are currently prohibited from Banks Park – the orders will relax this restriction – dogs on leads will be allowed on the road area, but not in the children’s play area
3.	
While I have not looked into the setting-up of a Dog Control Order (DCO) in very great detail, I hope that these comments will assist Haddenham Parish Council (HPC) in considering this matter further. No doubt the Council is able to check up on the points that I make. Nonetheless, I certainly agree in principle with action being taken to avoid any dog mess being left in public places, and I accept that keeping a dog on a lead and excluding dogs from certain areas help towards that aim – but see paragraph five below.	
As I understand it both the Dogs (Fouling of Land) Act 1996 (DFLA), and the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2006 (CNEA) are probably the most relevant to this subject. Nonetheless the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (ASBCPA) will amend much of the existing legislation. In particular, Chapter 2 regarding Public Spaces Protection Orders as in the ASBCPA includes matters similar to a DCO.	The DCO will remain in force for 3 years during which time AVDC will implement orders under ASBCPA
However experienced advisers on dog law have expressed to me their extreme surprise that a DCO is being considered when announcements regarding the commencement dates, and Statutory Instruments relating to ASBCPA are due to be made in the next few weeks. Since those matters may very well impact on an existing DCO is HPC convinced that an order will not be negated or improved by the provisions in the ASBCPA which may well cover similar matters and be set up by AVDC?	The DCO will remain in force for 3 years during which time AVDC will implement orders under ASBCPA

<p>If AVDC have designated land under DFLA this is still effective and does this cover all the areas that you wish to cover. Thus do we not already have the procedure by which anyone allowing their dog to mess and not clearing it up is guilty of an offence? An authorised officer of the Council can then issue a fixed penalty notice. However, AVDC have very few resources to police this, using either their employees or PCSOs. Initially the culprit may well be given a caution, but it can happen that no details are kept of the offence. Nonetheless, the penalty (less than £100), or even less probable a successful prosecution through the Magistrates' Court, if a sufficient case can be put, may well result in a modest fine which is certainly likely to be much less than £1,000. Are these sanctions likely to result in stopping those who flaunt the law already anyway?</p>	<p>DFLA is very difficult to enforce and very few prosecutions have resulted. These DCOs will be much simpler to police as the level of proof is lower.</p>
<p>Presuming that we do have land designated by AVDC under DFLA, does not the creation of a DCO for only two of the four possible offences by HPC cause any DFLA to lapse? I understood that part of the aim of the HPC DCO was to cover offence (a) in CNEA – fouling of land by dogs and the removal of dog faeces – is that offence thereby not culpable if any DCO is created? (See SI 2006 No 795 – inc transitional provisions).</p>	<p>DCOs do not negate any provisions of DFLA</p>
<p>Should a DCO be created are the sanctions against offenders similar to, and difficult to impose successfully, as those under the DFLA, as outlined above?</p>	<p>No – the level of proof required is lower</p>
<p>As to costs I have heard it said that the two public notices in the newspaper will cost some £500 each. I am surprised to note that there will be no further costs for signage and, maybe, training. Is the total budgeted expenditure good value for money?</p>	<p>A smaller notice will be required to say the notices have been implemented. The PC will manufacture signs. No training requirements have been identified. The PC believes the DCOs to be good value for money.</p>
<p>Having said all that I am nonetheless very surprised that HPC has decided to investigate the setting up of a DCO with the consultation being in a period when any contact and advice from the office is restricted rather more than usual. This coincides with the absence of the Parish Clerk on holiday for about half of the 28</p>	<p>The postal address on the Public Notice was the Clerks home address and correspondence was received during the office closure at that address. The majority of respondents used the email address as published and received an</p>

day consultation period; a voicemail message on the HPC telephone to say simply that “the office is closed until 18 August”; no letterbox at the office; and no delivery point in the village during that time due to there not being any address in Banks Park that is recognised by Royal Mail anyway. While the office was open from 09.00 to 11.30 on Tuesdays and Thursdays (as advised on the HPC website) for about the first two weeks of the consultation, I question as to whether those who are not familiar with the internet are not somewhat disenfranchised. After all you will be aware that CNEA states that the details should be available “at all reasonable hours”.	acknowledgement when the office re-opened.
To summarise, I am not convinced that HPC’s proposal for a DCO is prudent and well thought out at this time.	
4.	
I am writing with reference to the proposed dog control orders. Firstly let me assure you that the mess left due to irresponsible dog owners not clearing up after their dogs annoys me as much as it does other responsible dog owners. However I am concerned that the proposal has not been fully thought through.	
1) Unless you are going to have someone patrolling I cannot see that the orders will have any effect. An irresponsible owner is not going to pay any attention unless someone is 'on patrol' and if you don't have someone there how will you gather any evidence?	There is no requirement for a patrol – the PC cannot afford staff to do this without a significant increase in tax.
2) The food market held at Banks Parade is a great village social activity. I went to the last one with my dog (on its lead) to buy a cup of coffee. Under your proposal I will no longer be allowed to take my dog onto the grass. So this proposal is reducing social interaction within our village.	Dogs are currently prohibited from Banks Park – the orders will relax this restriction – dogs on leads will be allowed on the road area, but not in the children’s play area
3) I understand that Banks Parade grass area is used by the dog show users from	Dogs on leads will in future be permitted in the area around

the village hall to exercise their dogs. The control orders will prevent this and without this amenity I suspect that village hall bookings for dog shows will drop leading to a loss of income for the village. Also the dog training in the scout & guide centre will be impacted if they can no longer use the grass. They would need to look for an alternative venue leading to a loss of income to the association.	the village hall. Dogs should not be allowed in the children's play area
4) Similar to 2 above we have a playing field next to the airfield which is underused. It has the potential to be a social space for the village. If you could encourage family picnics or similar it might be better used. By saying no dogs you reduce the chance of this happening.	There are no restrictions proposed for the amenity area next to the playing field.
5) The allotments are already a dog free zone. I have recently given up my plot after around 10 years and in that time we never had a problem. We might need a bigger sign at the entrance but it doesn't need a dog control order.	Dogs are sometimes taken onto the allotment contrary to the allotment agreements. The DCO will support existing policy – not add any new restriction
I think the issue we have here is similar to 'cycling v drivers' in that people start talking about segregation etc when what is needed is responsibility/give and take by all. We should be spending money on education/more dog waste bins etc rather than trying to isolate a part of the village community.	
We seem to have a tendency in this country to introduce rules and regulations at every opportunity. What we need here is instead to mobilise the community so that leaving dog mess is socially unacceptable.	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
Having said the above I really do appreciate the parish council asking for village opinion, I hope you will take a balanced view on this issue.	The PC serves the interests of the village and is proposing DCOs following many complaints over a number of years
5.	
As responsible dog owners of fifty years, we strongly object to the proposal by	

the Parish Council to introduce any dog enforcement order simply because of a few owners who do not control or clean up after their pets.	
It is grossly unfair to punish the majority of owners due to the thoughtless actions of the few	
This is a friendly village, lets keep it that way	
6.	
While one must commend the members of the PC trying to do something I feel it is something one cannot do effectively.	The PC believes it will be able to apply the rules effectively and fairly
Who is to 'police' or try to implement these orders? Even areas where they install a dog warden have an almost zero percent of success in catching/ taking action against people who ignore the rulings.	All that is needed is a photograph of the offender and dog – much less evidence than with existing legislation
This would be an utter waste of the parish funds. The majority of dog owners would still clear up after their dog whereas the people who leave a mess will still do so.	Irresponsible dog walkers who continue to flout the existing rules will be liable to a visit from the police who can easily be emailed pictorial evidence of their misdemeanours
There will always be people who ignore signs whether it is the people who take balls for their dogs to play with on the football pitches or the Parish Council, who I presume are in charge of the Village Hall, who allow the Hall to occasionally be let to people organising Dog Shows who come in large numbers and walk their dogs around Banks Park past all the signs saying no dogs allowed. If the Parish Council ignore their own rulings and allow dogs there they cannot expect others to take note too.	Dogs on leads will in future be permitted in the area around the village hall. Dogs should not be allowed in the children's play area
Please save the money this will take and put it to some useful purpose.	The PC believes this will be good value for money
7.	
As far as I can see – and since I am having problems with my vision at present (hence the use of large type) it is possible that I have missed it – the proposals do not cover the fact that dogs should be kept on a lead along the footpath between Flint Street and the railway bridge. Since it was the dreadful and very distressing incident of out of control dogs savaging a pet cat to death which seems to have sparked the recent moves, I feel it would be very unfortunate if	The PC is starting by implementing DCOs in the areas with highest risk and history of complaints. If these are successful and supported by the village it will look to extend these.

this was not covered by the proposed orders, which now seem to be concentrating just on the problem of dog mess, rather than on general safety matters.	
It is of course very regrettable that responsible owners who do keep their dogs under control and clean up after them may suffer as a result of measures being taken against a minority, but unfortunately this is nothing new these days. I fully appreciate the importance of keeping children's play areas free from dog faeces to make them a pleasant and safe place for children. However, I wonder whether in the present proposals an exception should perhaps be made for the Banks Park area where the monthly market is held. This in itself must cause some considerable dirt to accumulate, what with the many hundreds of feet walking around the stalls, etc. However, a lot of people treat it as somewhat of a social as well as a shopping outing and attend with their families and/or their dogs, which as far as I am aware are kept on their leads (the dogs, not the families!). It would be a pity if this general convivial atmosphere was compromised. I also wonder what adverse effect a total ban, rather than a requirement to keep dogs on leads in the area, might have on the regular dog shows held in the Village Hall, which must account for a good chunk of the Hall's income.	The majority of these orders are for areas where dogs are currently prohibited. As shown above, dogs on leads will be permitted in the Banks park area, excluding the play area. Visited to Vale Harvest will be able to tether their dogs to the fence whilst they shop.
Apart from the above I have no comments on the proposals.	
8.	
Dogs Trust has been made aware that Haddenham Parish Council is planning to introduce a series of Dog Control Orders. As the UK's largest dog welfare charity, we would like to make some comments for consideration.	
1. Re; Dog Exclusion Order:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dogs Trust accepts that there are some areas where it is desirable that dogs should be excluded, such as children's play areas and sports grounds, however we would recommend that exclusion areas are kept to a minimum and 	Dogs are currently prohibited from banks park, the DCO will relax this somewhat. Suitable signage will be provided shown the boundaries between the 'Dogs on lead' and 'No

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' areas.
Dogs Trust would highlight the need to provide plenty of signage to direct owners to alternative areas nearby in which to exercise dogs.	Dogs are currently prohibited from banks park, the DCO will relax this somewhat. Suitable signage will be provided shown the boundaries between the 'Dogs on lead' and 'No Dogs' areas.
2. Re; Dogs on Leads Order:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dogs Trust accept that there are some areas where it is desirable that dogs should be kept on a lead. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 running off lead in appropriate areas. Dog Control Orders should not restrict the ability of dog keepers to comply with the requirements of this Act. 	There are suitable areas where this can be done. The children's play area is not one of these.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Details can be found at the parish office
Authorities should also consider how easy a Dog Control Order would be to enforce, since failure properly to enforce could undermine the effect of an order. This is particularly the case for orders that exclude dogs completely from areas of land. (Defra Guidance on Sections 55 to 67 of the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005)	The standard of evidence just requires a photograph clearly showing the dog walker and dog in the prohibited area – this is much easier than with DFLA
Whilst we believe that the vast majority of dog owners are responsible, Dogs Trust would be happy to talk to the Council about ways we could work together to encourage responsible behaviour amongst the small minority of owners who may cause problems.	Thank you

We work with Councils across the UK in a variety of ways to help them to promote Responsible Dog Ownership. I enclose further information on our Dogs in the Community Campaign. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss this matter.	
We would also be very grateful if you could inform us of the outcome of the consultation process and of subsequent decisions made in relation to the Dog Control Orders.	
9.	
I am writing with regard to the proposal to ban dogs in Old Station play area.	
As a responsible dog owner who keeps his dog under control and always cleans after it, I object to blanket ban on dog walking in this area. There is plenty of space to make this small patch of nature a shared space. The northern part can continue being used as a play area (though, to be honest, I yet to see a child playing there. Unless you consider teenagers drinking beer as legitimate users) and the southern part can be used by dog owners. The southern part is nothing but an overgrown field which is not used by anyone accept them.	(to be discussed)
10.	
<p>On the subject of the DCO here is my input to the consultation document from a person who doesn't own a pet:</p> <p>I frankly believe the original H.net article weakens the argument for the PC's proposal as it seems to suggest that it has been triggered (after 8 years of being available but not implemented) by one unfortunate, tragic and ghastly incident (that a DCO would not have prevented) and not a monitored increase in general concern. Good legislation should not be knee jerk.</p> <p>There will always be a poo problem somewhere in this village, this DCO is localised to specific areas so wont solve the general problem that apparently exists as those irresponsible dog owners will simply go elsewhere to let their dog</p>	As set out above the DCO will be much easier to enforce than existing legislation – all that is required is a photograph

foul. If I thought it would help I would suggest encompassing the whole of the village within the control area. But I don't. I personally don't believe keeping dogs on leads or banning them from areas will help the "poo problem" one iota. If an irresponsible person allows their dog to foul the pavement/play area they will, whether it is on a lead or not. If a dog is free roaming then don't expect it to be aware of the law or read signs.

I think it may help where dogs may be excluded from areas where there are vulnerable people such as children, assuming we can see this danger exists and is getting worse. That being said what about enforcement and signage?

Even if the crime is witnessed there is then the question of how it will be policed and enforced. Unenforced law is weak law. Does the PC have the will, manpower or funds to do this properly and do I as a resident want to fund it?— no point in playing at this – its all or nothing. The PC paper says that it won't cost anything to implement this. I would question this claim as with new laws/bye laws there is always an introduction and ongoing cost even if its financial, volunteer effort, redirected resources or the bad feeling engendered by setting neighbour against neighbour. Simply Google "Cost of implementing Dog Control Order" and you will see that (albeit larger authorities) there is a cost that is attributable.

Personally I would prefer all resources available to be directed at protecting our community from over development which, in my view, is a much greater threat to what Keith correctly describes in his email below below as follows

"When you take a global perspective, most Haddenham residents are very blessed. We live in a safe part of the world and enjoy wonderful freedoms and (comparatively) high standards of living.

I fear that this, arguably, can make us a little complacent." We should not be complacent about the potential uncontrolled growth of the village and we should see this as the primary threat to the community and environment we enjoy today.

I would imagine there are less than a handful of residents who think its OK for their pets to foul public spaces, we have all stepped in poo from a variety of animals in our lifetime and along with the majority I too find it disgusting and lamentable that some pet owners don't make the effort to clean up after their

The Parish Council has been very active over the last 2 years working up a neighbourhood plan to address the threat of development – but relatively few people have supported it – despite its events being well advertised. You can lead a horse to water..but you can't make it drink!

<p>pet, I would point out that there is much more cat poo deposited in my garden than that from a dog and when the horses leave a present in the road it's volume probably accounts for an amount similar to a weeks worth of cat and dog poo put together – and that happens regularly. I have also been bitten and attacked by dogs, cats, horses and therefore I am naturally cautious around all animals as I know that they have a mind of their own and not the mind of their owner. To my mind as a non-dog owner who has safely brought up a child in this village we don't need draconian approaches to solve this problem. We need good education, common sense, social responsibility and a sense of perspective of which there is loads in this village. Let's not make rules that affect all to control the lowest common denominator if we don't have to. That being said if there is an actual increased exposure to dangerous dogs then a DCO may be appropriate as a weapon.</p> <p>From a personal perspective I think the PC should enhance their consultation document by:</p>	<p>The DCOs will support education and encourage personal responsibility.</p>
<p>Publishing the trends of volumes of complaints against dogs and their owners received over the last years, splitting between Fouling and Dangerous (as I believe the implementation needs better justification than hear say – also I would only take into account the dangerous element that would have been avoided if the DCO had been in place).</p>	
<p>Explaining how this new law will be publicised, monitored and enforced.</p>	
<p>Explaining how the areas that are affected will be marked (signed).</p>	
<p>Revisiting the claim that this is a low/no cost implementation and publishing implementation costs and ongoing cost including the cost of enforcement from day 1 and the value of volunteer cost that could have been utilised on higher priority matters.</p>	
<p>This in effect will show the community that the enforcement is necessary due to an increase in dangerous dog complaints and make everyone aware of the cost of the DCO.</p>	
<p>In summary my view is that action should only be considered if it is effective and</p>	

<p>can be delivered and not for any other reason.</p> <p>Whilst I'm on</p> <p>I think that as a group of volunteers the PC generally does an effective job on our behalf but I can't help noticing that the cry of its not within our control does come up from the PC on regular occasions. That doesn't stop the criticism coming their way. I know there is nothing more frustrating than being held responsible for things that you are not accountable for!</p> <p>My suggestion is that the PC helps itself by publishing a list of what they are responsible for and another list of appropriate contact details of the people accountable for those areas that affect Haddenham community but that the PC only has an advisory role or no role at all. Hopefully this will focus criticism, if any, on those areas that the PC can respond to and is accountable for. As the village grows this understanding and clarity through better communication will be vital if the PC members want to retain their sanity. I have suggested this to those PC members I know on previous occasions but have yet to see it published in the Village News.</p>	
11.	
My wife and I support the introduction of a Dog Control Order.	
12.	
<p>I omitted to state in my email below that although I understand why you are considering a DCO, I feel strongly that the idea should be dropped. If indeed the scheme is given the go ahead it will only open the gates for these restrictions to be applied to more areas and all responsible dog owners will feel even more persecuted.</p>	<p>The PC is following the will of the village. Any further restrictions will be subject to consultation.</p>
<p>I am a responsible dog owner who rarely walks my dog in the village but if I do then she is always on a lead and under control. I always pick up any dog poo and dispose of it responsibly. I also abide by any notices that are in situ where I walk my dog such as keeping her on a lead on the permissive pathway (the set aside)</p>	<p>The majority of the restrictions are for locations where there are already no dogs signs – so there should not be a problem</p>

along Station Road - a request ignored by the majority of people exercising dogs there.	
I note that HPC are saying that there are plenty of areas that dogs can be let off the lead to exercise. Just where have you in mind - I think that a list of these areas should be published as I cannot think of many that can walked to from the village.	Footpaths, airfield amenity area, path by the station development, green areas in new developments, village greens, Farrar-Bell field, Snakemoor
I have been told that I should not be exercising my dog anywhere on the airfield as it is private property and that the permissive area is the strip running parallel to the railway. I have not investigated this as it looks very overgrown and I would need reassurance that the area is secure enough to stop dogs getting onto the track. When development takes place on the airfield I would hope that serious consideration is given to the fenced area around the pond being given permissive status for dog walkers. It is ironic that you have funded a dog waste bin there already and that an estate agent for the new houses promotes the airfield as an ideal place to walk dogs!	The amenity area next to the playing field has no restrictions. It is only the actual playing field that is proposed to be restricted
It would not be a good move for all dog walkers to migrate to Snakemoor. I do not let my dog off the lead there and I am angry that it is another area where dog owners do not clear up their mess as I value the facility and all the hard work put in by Robyn Thorogood and his team.	Snakemoor is not a children's play area or a football pitch and so is less of a risk.
I understand why you are considering a Dog Control Order but it is typical that it is only necessary because of a minority of irresponsible dog owners. How will it be policed as I am convinced that these dog owners will carry on regardless - their dogs don't just foul the proposed areas but footpaths and alleys elsewhere in the village. Surely our local police/ PCSOs are too busy to watch these areas. I just wish that all dog owners acted responsibly so that we are not made to feel second class citizens. Dogs mean so much to so many people giving love and companionship and importantly the opportunity to keep owners exercising!	All that is required is a photograph of the offender and dog breaking the law and a prosecution or the threat of one can be applied. The majority of the restrictions are for locations where there are already no dogs signs – so there should not be a problem

In an ideal world there would be a dog park in all communities but that will never happen so we must hope that eventually all dog owners are educated to abide by the rules that you now deem necessary to bring into place.	We believe that there are adequate facilities for dog walking
13.	
I am writing in response to the recent application for a Dog Control Order (DCO) by Haddenham Parish Council.	
The council state they are responding to “regular complaints” about dogs mess in the village, I would like to know the actual number of complaints per annum and in what context. The proposed DCO covers more than dog mess – have there been other dog related complaints, again if so and in what context?	See above from clerk
Although Dogs (Fouling of Land) Act 1996 has been repealed, any orders made under this act are still effective, will continue to be so and can be enforced with fixed penalty notices. Are any of these in place in Haddenham, if not why have the council not acted before as there have been “regular complaints”? If there are any orders in place how many fixed penalty notices have been issued?	There are currently no DCOs in place in Haddenham. The council has decided to consult on implementing them as other measures have failed.
The vote for the implementation of the DCO was five to two, with a council membership of eleven/twelve; this is hardly a clear mandate to proceed on such an emotive issue.	This was a democratic decision
There must be a cost of implementation with signage. The council are also rather vague on the aspect and costs of enforcement. Do they expect the PCSO to get involved, the general public to act or will the councillors be hiding with their binoculars!	The council will start with wood panel signs and printed sheets, paying for signs in due course. Collection of evidence can be done by anyone with a camera (most mobile phones have one now)
Have the council really given due consideration to this application of the DCO. I see no evidence this DCO is a proportionate response to the problems caused by the activities of dogs or their owners, nor is there any evidence that provision has been made for dogs to be allowed to exercise without undue restrictions. Both these considerations are required when making a DCO.	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about. As listed above there are a number of locations where dogs can be walked without going onto football pitches or children’s play areas

Should a DCO be implemented, responsible dog owners will still walk and exercise their dogs; will the council then be looking to implement further orders at will until they have achieved what appears to be their ultimate agenda? Irresponsible owners will ignore any orders so it will achieve very little.	The council will consult the village as it is doing with this restriction.
I would have thought the council has plenty of other issues (e.g. speeding motorists, irresponsible parking or the general unkept appearance of Haddenham) to exercise themselves rather than trying to implement such an ill-conceived idea, which has little chance of making any difference. I would like to see a more harmonious approach starting with the provision of more strategically placed dog waste bins and a more rigorous approach to keeping all bins emptied.	The PC believes this to be good value for money
14.	
I should like to endorse everything Tim Armitt has said with regard to the Dog Control Order.	
15.	
In respect of the councils suggested implementation of a Dog Control Order, I would respectfully suggest that this is a waste of the councils time and money.	
As you state on your own website, the vast majority of the hundreds of dog owners in Haddenham are already responsible and clear up after their dogs. Indeed, the responsible dog owners are not the ones who allow their dogs onto the land you have specified by virtue of the fact that they are areas where children play. But to prohibit dogs completely from some areas is just grossly unfair.	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
For example, a parent may wish to take their children to a play area but the family dog is not allowed to accompany them even when on a lead!	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.

Has anyone told the local wildlife - foxes, badgers, deer and rabbits that they are not allowed to come onto the specified land either in case they mess while there?	Whilst PC members have a variety of skills, interlocation with the animals listed has not been identified as yet.
If you implement this order, the Airfield Playing Area will have to be fenced off to prevent dogs from accidentally crossing from the field next door while running off the lead. Who will be paying for that? It is currently completely open at one end.	The football pitch is sufficiently fenced
Of course, i don't dispute that there are and always have been, irresponsible dog owners who do not clean up after their pets but surely a better approach would be to provide dog waste bins that dispense free of charge bags as they do in other areas. That way, there can be no excuse not to pick up and that even the most reluctant owner can be encouraged to use by way of signs reminding them that there is a £1,000 fine not to do so!	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
The order will be completely pointless unless the parish council intend to actually sue dog owners who fail to comply and in reality, this will be prohibitively expensive and is unlikely to every actually happen!	All that is required is a clear photograph showing the offence – the PC will address each case on its merits.
This order will merely penalise the majority of dog owners who are already responsible.	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
Sledgehammer to crack a nut. ABSOLUTELY!!!	
16.	
My wife and I would wish to express to the Parish Council that we are in total agreement with the proposed Dog Control Orders, as presented for public scrutiny and comment during the last few weeks.	

17.	
I am writing as a resident of the Sheerstock neighbourhood in Haddenham, in response to the public consultation on Dog Control Orders and particularly the proposal to ban dogs in the Old Station area.	Dogs will be permitted in this area on a lead along the path
We have lived in Sheerstock since May 2014 and have a black Labrador retriever. We can be seen walking him at least twice a day around the area, and almost daily we take him to the Old Station ground. This is one of the few grassy areas on this side of town which is a short walk away-- particularly critical for us in the morning before heading off to work. In fact, before deciding to move into the area, we researched nearby green spaces, and the proximity of the Old Station ground was one of the reasons we settled on Sheerstock.	
We take the cleanliness and health of Haddenham's public areas very seriously, and always clean up after our dog. Furthermore, I believe that fellow dog walkers who also use the Old Station are similarly responsible, as we have never encountered a dog waste problem in that area.	
Although there is a single metal slide and two swings in the Old Station area, in over three months of daily visits, <i>we have yet to encounter a single child using the play area.</i> The majority of people we have encountered in fact are fellow dog walkers. It would be a shame to close off the area to dogs, when we've seen no signs of it being used on a regular basis by any other groups in the village. This proposal would negatively impact responsible dog owners in the neighbourhood, without a clear benefit to any other groups. Before going ahead with this proposal, we would strongly encourage members of the Council to spend some time observing the daily use of the Old Station area to understand whether or not this proposal would have the desired impacts.	
If the Council believes there is a demonstrated need to have a dog-free section in the Old Station area, perhaps one compromise could be to divide the area along the treeline in the middle – allowing dogs only in the grassy area to the south of the playground equipment. This would still preserve some offlead space for responsible dog owners to use, but would keep the children's play area free of	

dogs and dog waste.	
We very much appreciate the Council taking time to consult thoroughly on these proposals and please let me know if you have any further questions.	
18.	
I hereby register my objection to the Parish Council (PC) adopting a Dog Control Order (DCO).	
Responsible dog owners clear up after their dogs and these people will feel targeted if this order is adopted. The owners who do not clear up their dog's mess will continue to be antisocial and I doubt whether they will be caught. Also, there is legislation already in place to fine dog owners who do not clear up after their dogs.	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
How will this be policed? There is insufficient community policing in the village already, does the PC expect villagers to act as snoopers. If so, this will cause friction and ill-will in the village and there could easily be repercussions.	A simple photograph of the offender and dog is all that is required for the police to act. Regular offenders are known in the village and will be visited to by the police
Of greater concern to me is that in the future these powers could be abused by the Parish Council.	The PC will take action via the police
After reading the draft minutes of the PC's meeting when the PC voted in favour of adopting a DCO, I am concerned regarding a lack of transparency. Were copies of the complaints circulated to PC members prior to the meeting or were they tabled, evidence of the complaints should be minuted. As Parish Councillors are not elected (for whatever reason) the necessity for who raised this matter at the meeting plus who voted for, against and abstained needs to be clearly noted. I feel the minutes should reflect this for all matters voted on.	
I understand that the cost of implementing the DCO is in the region of £1,000 (as reported by two Parish Councillors) although your web-site clearly states the	?

only costs are the advertising of the the PC's intention to adopt a DCO. If the implementation is costing anywhere near this figure, I think it is totally disgraceful that unelected Parish Councillors are spending this amount of money before seeking villagers' views regarding this matter via the Village Newsletter. This legislation will affect large numbers of responsible dog owners and the PC's rush to implement a DCO is of concern. Also this sum of money could have been better used on amenities which are lacking in the village.	
19.	
I have been astonished at the total waste of time and money that the Parish Council is giving to this matter. Many people in the village are aghast.	
A sledge hammer to crack a nut comes to mind. There is already in place legislation whereby people who do not clear up after their dogs can be fined! However, those people who don't care about this still allow their dogs to foul, and do not get caught, so how will that change with a Dog Control order; who will 'police it' - I would think our constabulary would laugh if called to arrest an offender; they have enough to do keeping us and our homes safe. Who will give the on-the-spot fines?	A simple photograph of the offender and dog is all that is required for the police to act. Regular offenders are known in the village and will be visited to by the police
The other concern I have been told is allowing dogs in areas where there are children. Why not? Most children love animals and are unafraid of dogs. The typical example is Banks Park on the Saturday morning market. There are always parents and children there (quite a few with dogs!) having visited most Saturdays since the market began to my knowledge there has never been a problem. Other examples are the May Day and the summer fete, where there are lots of children and parents with dogs.	Dogs are currently prohibited from banks park The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
Also as a thought the play area between Station Road and Slave Hill; I understand you are not supposed to take dogs there. It's a very large, sad area with very little equipment - a tatty slide and a couple of swings. Very rarely do	

you see children there. Why allocate such a large area, with no facilities to speak of and ban dogs?	
On a plus side I see that there is a play area being erected by the side of the railway by Chilworth Gate, which looks as if it has been thought out with a sensible area allocated, and looks as if it will be fenced off.	
I love living in Haddenham, although now growing far too fast for my liking. It has on the whole a happy, friendly community with neighbours helping neighbours. Please don't make a situation of neighbours spying on each other over where they walk their dogs.	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
You really do have to trust the dog owners; most of them are law abiding and the care of their animals is paramount. We really do not need further legislation than what is already in place.	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
20.	
As one of Haddenham's responsible dog owners, I am quite often dismayed by the few dog owners who do not clear up after their dogs. I was also quite surprised to learn from your consultation paper that some owners blatantly ignore access restrictions.	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
In my view, the Parish Council's proposal is quite reasonable and I was heartened to see that the introduction acknowledges that the majority of dog owners are indeed responsible. However, the difficulty may well be in the enforcement. For example, I understand that leaving dog droppings in public places is an offence but I have yet to hear of anyone who has been fined for this offence. I would be interested therefore to learn of the Parish Council's enforcement proposals and, of course, of any cost implications.	A simple photograph of the offender and dog is all that is required for the police to act. Regular offenders are known in the village and will be visited to by the police

Finally, I wonder if there could be a concession on access to Banks Park by the Scout and Guide Centre for the monthly farmers market, for many people take their dogs on leads to this country-like event.	Dogs on leads will be permitted in Banks park, but not in the children's play area The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
21.	
<u>PROPOSED DOG CONTROL ORDER OBJECTION</u>	
The Parish councils proposal for a Dog Control Order is absurd, having visited the monthly farmers market at Banks Park with three of my dogs on Saturday 2 nd August 2014 I was approached by at least three families asking if their children could stroke my dogs of which I was more than happy to allow, at no point did anyone approach me to say that they felt I should not be there with my dogs.	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
If the council should agree to such an absurd DCO then this happy family enjoyment of allowing their children to meet dogs safely would be removed. I meet many families with children who enjoy the opportunity to allow their children to play happily whilst still excising their dogs there is nothing more children enjoy than running around playing ball with their dog	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
I feel that this DCO is directed at all dog owners not just the irresponsible ones. I am also concerned that if this DCO be approved that further into the future this will be abused and eventually there will be no areas available to exercise your dog.	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
I was also disgusted to hear that this also involves a fee payable of £1000, we have more ongoing safety issue/concerns within the village the on-going parking problem in Sheerstock which is an accident waiting to happen but yet the excuse for the delay in resolving this issue is lack of money.	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
22.	
I thought I would share with you my objection to the proposal for Dog Control Orders. My reasoning is as follows:	

1. Solution in search of a problem. I am very unclear about what is the problem to be addressed by the Dog Control Order. The paper outlines various issues but none of them address the initial question of why 'no dogs' signs were originally placed at Banks Park. I can see no evidence presented here of what that problem was and why it was then deemed that banning all dog owners was seen to be the only solution. What evidence is there that the majority of Haddenham people support this proposal as the paper implies? What is the actual problem to be addressed and why is this the only/best solution- I would like to know the answer to these simple questions.	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
2. Increase anti-social behaviour. The paper suggests that the DCO will stop anti social behaviour. On the contrary, I would suggest that the effect of creating 'no go' areas for dog owners is to make 'anti social' behaviour which before the DCO was acceptable. The over whelming majority of these members of our community - the people we are seeking to control- are normal law abiding considerate dog owners. Why do we as the Parish Council want to make them 'anti-social'?	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
3. The logic for the DCO is flawed. The paper itself says a) there are problems with any enforcement activity, b) the awareness raising motivates people to behave differently, c) it only applies to persistent offenders, all of which strongly suggest other solutions would be more effective. As mentioned, we already have plenty of powers through our PCSO's to deal with people persistently failing to deal with dog fouling (if indeed that is the problem- see 1). On public health argument, dog fouling is extremely unpleasant and toxocariasis very nasty (dangerous to pregnant women as well as small children), although the main source of infection is from cat faeces, particularly litter trays kept in houses. The idea that stopping dog walkers use our local facilities will prevent possible infection in children is quite frankly both preposterous and highly emotive.	Existing legislation does not control offenders – partly as the standard of proof is too high, with a DCO all that is required is a photo of the offender where they shouldn't be.
Lastly, I see this proposal as potentially very divisive, splitting different parts of	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which

our community when we should be striving to bring people together in a spirit of tolerance.	were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
My vote would be against.	
23.	
My concerns for dog walking in Haddenham are that it is difficult to find areas that are securely fenced, so many places are unsafe to let a dog of the lead.	
As a dog walker for the past 30 yrs, I too are fed up of irresponsible dog owners, but the majority do pick up their dogs poo, but don't punish us all. I and many others walk regularly on the airfield dog walking area and it can be a very social experience too. A little chat(especially for the elderly), is a very positive experience too, very much a part of village life. I, myself have made many friends along the way! If the parish councillors take away all the dog walking areas where will we go?	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
As far as the football field in the airfield area is concerned, I'm very unsure as to where dogs are not allowed, except for not in the football field itself, and why isn't it gated? I understand and agree that dogs should not be allowed there or anywhere where children play, but please leave us to walk our dogs in peace!	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
I also understand all this nonsense over dog walking is costing the tax payer a small fortune, could this not be spent on something more important!	
24.	
I am writing to express my support for the Parish Council's decision to apply for a Dog Control Order.	
My main concern is the possible danger posed by uncontrolled dogs to other pets and children. As you know, we witnessed a very nasty incident in which a neighbour's cat was killed by a group of dogs, off the leash, in our front garden. The dogs had run very rapidly, out of control, from the footpath from Kingsey, into Flint Street. The footpath is narrow and has a sharp bend in it; children, or	

indeed adults, are faced with large dogs out of sight and control of their owners. It is no comfort to be told that "they wouldn't hurt anyone" or "they've never done that before." Dog owners should take responsibility for their pets and keep them on the leash on narrow footpaths. Dogs should be on the leash along the footpath to Kingsey as far as the railway bridge.	
"Mr Dog Owner" argues against the imposition of controls that will possibly affect "well behaved" as well as "badly behaved" dog owners. All of us accept restrictions on our individual liberty for the general good - think of speed limits, gun controls or the requirement to send our children to school - and that is a necessity if we are to live together in society. Dog control orders may not always be easy to enforce, but they signal the weight of public disapproval of irresponsible behaviour and, over time, the behaviour changes - witness the use of seat belts.	
25.	
I write to record my opposition to the proposed Dog Control Order and would be grateful if you would pass this to the Council.	
1. I think it is not required in this village. Legislation is already in place to control to the few dog owners in Haddenham and their dogs that do not conform to normal behavior by dogs.	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
2. It is an unwarranted expense and most difficult to monitor without further costs.	
3. It is a further step to urbanisation of this pleasant village.	
Thank you for placing this opinion before the council	
26.	

I voted against the adoption of this additional layer of legislation in the village relating to Dog control for the following reasons:	
Well behaved dog owners are not the problem, but they will be the ones who feel targeted.	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
Badly behaved dog owners will carry on regardless and are very unlikely to get caught.	
Levels of evidence are reduced which allows members of the public to spy upon one another.	Responsible dog walkers will have nothing to worry about
27.	
We would like to voice our opposition to the adoption of a Dog Control Order in Haddenham.	
Responsible dog owners are not the problem but we are the ones that will be targeted.	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
Irresponsible dog owners will continue not to clean up after their pets and are unlikely to be caught.	A photo is all that is required
The whole idea of a Dog Control Order smacks of a BIG BROTHER state and just another attempt by officialdom to exercise control!	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
28.	
PROPOSED DOG CONTROL ORDER – CONSULTATION	
Saturday market at Banks Park stalls offering local produce to villagers. An idyllic village scene, including 20 or 30 dogs during the morning, all on leads greeting	Dogs are currently forbidden from banks park

each other, other dog owners, children and their parents around the children's slide. An idyllic scene the Parish Council is seeking to prevent.	
Can the PC show that a DCO is a necessary and proportionate response to problems caused by the activities of dogs and those in charge of them, as required in the DEFRA guidelines? Manifestly not, given the negligible number of recorded complaints received.	yes
It is the many law-abiding and responsible dog owners who will feel needlessly targeted and stigmatised by the proposed order, while the few anti-social badly behaved owners will carry on regardless and probably not be caught. Furthermore, the order could not be economically enforced without depending on reduced levels of evidence from members of the public; a snoopers and vigilantes charter which would cause needless friction between villagers.	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
The PC has been less than frank in their notice of a consultation period, having debated and resolved to make this application in ignorance of the £1000 fee payable, they have yet to inform the village of this and other costs involved, such as signage and enforcement, so that council tax payers can assess the potential value for money.	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
DEFRA also requires the authority to balance the interests of those in charge of dogs against the interests of those affected by the activities of dogs. Such balance is not apparent in the deliberations of the PC, indeed the fear is of a DCO being extended once granted and further restricting access to dogs with their owners.	The DCOs in the main support existing restrictions which were introduced some years ago and there have not been any complaints. Responsible dog walkers comply with those restrictions and have nothing to worry about.
I urge that this petty and malevolent proposal be scrapped before it causes conflict between villagers and disrepute for the PC, which has more important things to deal with, including their contribution to the Haddenham Neighbourhood Plan.	

29.	
I am writing to add my voice to those who oppose the introduction of dog control orders on the basis of:	
Cost	
Time	
Effort	
Lack of documented need	
Loss of community spirit	
Dubious efficacy	
Unintended consequences	
30.	
In reply to the Parish Council request for input regarding the proposed Dog Control Order for Haddenham village, please find my comments and Objections below;	
<p>1. As you state in your own Question & Answer sheet, you are using a sledge hammer to crack a nut. I have walked my dog in some of these areas and I can honestly say that with regards the Old Station Play Area there are no 'No Dog' signs visible! So may I suggest that before you use the sledgehammer that you visit the 'No Dog' areas and ensure that these signs are clearly visible in all of these areas. You mention that these signs were put up years ago. I for one am relatively new to the village so if the signs have become over grown or are no longer there then how am I or other new dog owners to know that some areas are 'out of bounds' to dogs. With the amount of building having taken place in the last few years I would imagine that I am not the only new comer that does not know where these signs used to be. I consider myself a responsible dog owner, even picking up dog mess that other not so responsible owners have left but I feel that I and the other responsible dog owners are being victimised for the few irresponsible owners.</p>	

<p>2. How do you intend to 'police' these orders? The Parish Council say that these orders are costing nothing to implement but how is this possible when it comes to 'policing' them or are you hoping that non dog owners will report dog owners and thus causing a rift in an otherwise friendly village. How are these Dog Control Orders going to stop irresponsible dog owners from failing to pick up their dogs mess etc? If a person is irresponsible in this manner now a Dog Control Order is not going to make any difference to them.</p>	<p>A simple photograph of the offender and dog is all that is required for the police to act. Regular offenders are known in the village and will be visited to by the police</p>
<p>3. You say there are many areas that dog owners can let their dog of their leads but yet I can find no where, where these areas are listed which is not helpful and suggesting that there is soon to be a link walked way is being very presumptuous as the planning for this has yet to be granted, so this is hardly an argument for Dog Control Orders. There are very few areas within the village where one can legally let one's dog off the lead that I have found.</p>	
<p>4. With regards the football pitches alongside Pegasus Way, whereas I totally support the pitches themselves being 'No Dog' zones during the football season I see no reason why during out of season these could not be utilised by dog walkers. There is also an access path to the airfield that runs at the bottom of these football pitches so for dog walkers to use the airfield (obviously when there is no flying) dogs would need access to this area on or off leads. Or is the airfield to become yet another 'No Dog' zone.</p>	<p>The pitches are used all year round. The access path does not exclude dogs, only the pitches.</p>
<p>In short, I am against Dog Control Orders In Haddenham. There are better steps that can be taken. Firstly ensure that all 'No Dog' signs are clearly visible. Publish a list of Dog Friendly areas ...this could easily be put on the Haddenham.Net site and in the parish magazine, so would not cost any money to produce. I am concerned that the Parish Council is being heavy handed without achieving the desired outcome that we would all want i.e all dog owners being responsible in controlling their dogs in all public areas.</p>	

31.	
I have been made aware of the proposals from the recent Parish Council meeting regarding Dog Control Orders in the village and wish to <u>register my opposition</u>.	
<p>Whilst I sympathise with the sentiments that have triggered this consultation process, I must object on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This will be nigh impossible to enforce as offences will have to be witnessed and corroborated before a case can be successfully prosecuted - Those irresponsible dog owners will be unlikely to change their behaviour - You will be introducing rules which will therefore only penalise responsible dog owners - Anti-social legislation already exists which can always be cited in the rare event of someone being caught red-handed <p>In brief, these proposals represent a small but insidious erosion of civil liberties in Haddenham and should be resisted.</p>	
32.	
Further to the Parish Council request for input regarding the proposed Dog Control Order for Haddenham village, please find my OBJECTION below.	
My concerns are several:	
1) The Council appears to be using the proverbial mallet to crack a walnut. As a responsible dog owner I acknowledge there is a minority that do not, and appear to have no intention to ever, pick up the mess made by their dogs. That said, since they do nothing now, unless there is a direct action resulting from their continuing poor behaviour this will not change as a result of the order.	
2) The areas impacted make no allowance for how people currently move through the village. As a resident of Thame you may not be aware but the	The DCO had been proposed by Haddenham Parish Council, all members are residents and are familiar with the walking

children's Playing Field, as well as the Airfield are heavily used areas as they enable loop walks to be undertaken (especially the airfield: with no allowance for dogs to move through that space on a lead, there will be significant disruption to local, responsible, residents. There is also no acknowledgment that this area in particular is not used for the majority of the year. At a minimum I would expect the Order to be amended to reflect lead walking and a time span boundaries e.g. not applicable between October and March).	routes around the village. Dogs will be excluded from the Airfield playing field, not the site.
3) The Council has chosen to heavily legislate an outcome rather than deal with the cause - perhaps there is a need to look at prevention of the issue at source (given the Council already acknowledges this issue is from a small number of irresponsible residents)?	
In summary, my concern is that the council is legislating in a very heavy handed manner without ensuring there is the required outcome that EVERYONE would want - i.e. dog owners responsibly managing their dogs in all public areas. And without active monitoring there is little that can be done to ensure adherence to the control order - which itself would resolve the issue of the very few that are causing the problem in the first place.	A simple photograph of the offender and dog is all that is required for the police to act. Regular offenders are known in the village and will be visited to by the police
Please note I am AGAINST the proposed Dog Control Order.	
33.	
It seems to me that trying to implement this order will be very difficult. Irresponsible dog owners will continue to be so and it's on the paths and pavements where it has a real effect and that will not be covered. I would not vote for this order.	
34.	
Gets my vote & let me know if I can be of any help.	
35.	

<p>You may be aware that we run Junior Summer Camps on the tennis courts during the summer holidays for youngsters from 4 years to 12-13ish.</p> <p>These are well attended and during the breaks the youngsters have their snack lunches near the patio area beside the tennis courts.</p> <p>I would like to bring to your attention that there was a lot of dog poo by the floodlight stanchion by the gate and the immediate area which makes it impossible to let the children be in this area without the chance of them getting fouled by dog mess.</p> <p>This is an intolerable situation, as dogs obviously use this area regularly and whats worse, it is right by the sign saying NO DOGS.</p> <p>I am reporting to the Parish Council, but it does seem that dog owners completely ignore this sign, as I have counted numerous dogs - with owners on the playing fields in the past.</p> <p>I think it is time to name & shame here, as there is also a children's play area on the Playing Fields and the consequences of infection and disease to children from dog mess is a serious matter, particularly in this warm weather.</p> <p>I would appreciate any comments or feedback on this matter and how we can take some action here.</p>	
36.	
<p>I have lived in Haddenham for 50 years and grew up with dogs in the family home. I own two dogs and also walk a neighbour's dog for them. I always carry poo bags with me and dispose of the waste in the bins provided for this purpose. People moving to this village must find Haddenham very intolerant towards our four legged friends. Part of the joy of dog ownership is being able to walk with your dog off it's lead so that it can run, retrieve a ball and interact with other canines it meets. Fortunately Tom Bucknell from Manor Farm is very kind and generous and has created permissive paths on some of his land. If it wasn't for him we would have nowhere to exercise our dogs in a large, open area.</p> <p>Please can you explain why other villages and towns, i.e Long Crendon, Dinton, Thame and Aylesbury allow dogs to be walked in their playing fields? I have</p>	

walked in several parks in these locations and have never noticed a problem with dog poo. Do you honestly think that introducing dog control orders will reduce the amount of dog poo? Surely your efforts would be better concentrated in enforcing the £1,000 fine which I doubt anyone has ever been made to pay.	
Walking the footpaths of Glebe land is very enjoyable with the Chilterns in the distance and the sound of birdsong. This will no longer be the case if the site is developed, and although the footpath will remain, there will be no pleasure in walking through the middle of a housing estate. I disagree with the report on the Haddenham.net website which claims there are plenty of other areas in the village where dogs can be let off the lead. I am fortunate in that I work part-time and am able to load the dogs in my car and drive out of the village in order to be able to enjoy a long, lead free walk.	
And lastly, who is going to enforce these orders? What will happen if people are caught walking their dog off its lead?	A simple photograph of the offender and dog is all that is required for the police to act. Regular offenders are known in the village and will be visited to by the police
I look forward to the day when my family and I move to a village which is welcoming to dog owners and is not disappearing under a swathe of ugly, town houses.	
37.	
I am in full support of the proposed Dog Control order in Haddenham.	
I run the Under 6 football team in the village and last season had two 'altercations' with dog owners who let their dogs off the lead in the playing field and scared the life out of the boys. I also have to check the field for Dogs Mess as part of my safety checks - it really shouldn't be necessary	

Dear Sirs

In connection with your proposed dog walking bans, I would just like to say families with dogs have always been in Haddenham, surely this is a village life, The only way I can see if dogs are on leads it is the owners that are at fault, so why should all good owners be restricted, How stupid that £1,000+ has to be spent on something so trivial.

I do not own a dog but I do like to see people with families enjoying playing & exercising instead of children staying in with television & computers, surely walking a dog is more healthy for young & old alike.

P.T.O

lots of older people only have dogs
for company, please keep this in
mind.

Dog Control Order

I write to express my concern at the adoption by the Council of the above Order.

I agree that there are areas where dogs should be on leash and areas where they should not be at all (eg. Football fields and Children's Playgrounds). As a responsible dog owner I meticulously observe the existing notices for these areas and I pick up my dog's droppings. I believe that the majority of dog owners do likewise. Where they do not, I believe that existing legislation is adequate to deal with the matter. My objection to the Control Order is that it opens the door to unlimited restriction on the movement of dogs. Whilst I am sure that the existing Council would not impose unreasonable restrictions, there is no guarantee that a future Council would not. In which event great inconvenience could be caused to the majority of responsible dog owners, particularly the elderly who often rely on dog walking as their principal recreation and exercise.

May I, therefore, urge the Council to deal with problems caused by irresponsible dog owners by enforcing existing legislation rather than by introducing yet more new legislation which I consider would be difficult to police and enforce and would not, in any case, do anything more towards solving the problem.

Dear Sirs

We wish to comment on the proposed Dog Control Order.

We are of the opinion that this would not help in the matter of owners clearing up after their dogs. It is true that responsible dog owners do this as a matter of routine and good public *behaviour*.

It is the irresponsible owners that are the problem and we feel that if these people display bad public behaviour in this respect they are not the sort who would take any notice of any Control Order, although we can think of no other solution other than expensive CCTV cameras dotted round the Village which is too horrible a thought to contemplate!

Another effect will be that people who now shop at the Vale Harvest on Banks Park with their dogs will not do so, neither, as we saw today, will children get great pleasure fussing the dogs that are there with their Owners, who incidentally find it a great opportunity for some social chatter

But if this Order is put into place, who is going to police the offenders?

I am, as many of you know a long standing resident of Haddenham. Our family has always kept dogs and at present I have two jack russells. I totally agree about dog mess in the village. But not the way the parish council are going about trying to solve the problem. Firstly, Dog walkers out of every sport or club in the village I.E. CYCLING, CRICKET, TENNIS, FOOTBALL ECT ECT. Dog walkers by far outnumber all these. Yet There are facilities for all these recreational areas except dog walking. Now as someone stated there are footpaths around the village, I agree. But, most of these footpaths are walking dogs only on leads. I don't know how many of the parish council are dog walkers. But if you ask Mr Moore he will tell to exercise a dog correctly and give it the exercise it needs, they must be off lead. There are at present a couple of dog walking areas off lead. But we are going to lose these because of Housing. At Present there is the field, which I would think every dog owner in the village uses, owned by another long term resident Mr. Tom Bucknall. If it wasn't for Mr Bucknalls kind heart and understanding, we would be looking at a situation, off twice the amount of dogs being walked around the village. I fear for the future, If anything was to happen to MR. Bucknall. WHAT THEN, Concerning the dogs which are walked in the village. DOG BINS. there is only one dog bin from Church-end to the post office. On sheerstock which is THE largest estate (At present) in the village there are NONE.

(2)

one, opposite the rising-Sun PUB. Church-end, None
Willis Road - ROBERTS ROAD - The old council estate - THREE.

I hope that there isn't a bit of snobbery going on here.

You can have the bins on your estate - But not ours.

If you provide bins then people are more likely to
pick-up. I have seen people pick up dog waste, look
around, have nowhere to put it and just chuck the bag down.
Plastic takes 1,000 yrs to degrade - dogs mess 6 months. —
Provide bins. Recently, I spoke to Lindsey Poole, dog
walking was part of our discussion. With all the new houses
that are being built, when most people come to the country-
side the first thing most people want is a dog.

Haddenham has a chance to solve the problem Now, and
designate a proper dog exercising area solely for
dog walkers, where others won't complain about mess.

For now and future owners. Haddenham will never not
have dog mess. There are owners who shouldn't have dogs.
But don't go with the trend of blaming everyone that
has a dog, for what a few do.

This parish Council is the most invisible council
there has been in Haddenham. We read the names but
don't know the faces. It's all very well being a parish
councillor and going to all the meetings. But get out,
and around the village be recognized, to talk to people.
Perhaps, You should, when you do manage to get out,
wear Name badges stating - "I AM A PARISH Councillor".

Perhaps then there might be a connection between
people, ideas, and what needs to be done.

I fully understand my letter will be Read
and filed (Purvis) All 9 are also in the

42	
I am writing to express my disagreement with the Parish Council proposals for Dog Control Orders. There are a number of different reasons for this.	
Firstly, I am concerned about the fairness of the consultation process which has been undertaken, as the views of dog owners do not appear to have been widely sought. For a consultation to be fair and fully democratic, I would have thought that notices explaining the proposals and seeking views would have been placed in prominent places where dog walkers are known to pass through. I stumbled across an article on Haddenham.net by chance and have not seen any other notices displayed around the village.	Public notices have been published in the Bucks Herald and Thame Gazette which are delivered to every household. Also on the parish council website.
Secondly, I find it hard to reconcile the response of the Parish Council to a complaint made by one resident as it seems disproportionate and illogical (based on what has been reported in the press). I agree completely that the incident described was horrific and awful but it does appear to have been an isolated one (unless there is other evidence I am unaware of) and I remain unconvinced that DCOs would prevent a similar occurrence. As a dog (and cat) owner I walk my dogs daily using different routes and rarely see any dogs not on leads around the village. Furthermore, I would expect the police, not the Parish Council, to take the lead in similar incidents, taking into account the seriousness, the context, the owner's response and weighing up the likelihood of further offences. As there is already provision in criminal law for these events, it is difficult to see how DCOs could be more preventative.	There have been regular complaints about irresponsible dog owners over the years, this is not in response to a single incident. DCOs are easier to enforce than existing legislation
It would also be helpful to know how the Parish Council propose to fund and manage the system of "catching" offenders and proving their behaviour is "persistent". If residents feel strongly about these issues, it can only lead to frustration and dissatisfaction with the Parish Council if new rules are not fully implemented. As an alternative, has	

consideration been given to taking a collaborative approach with the PCSOs to address any concerns residents have about specific dog ownership issues?	
<p>For the purposes of community harmony as well as democracy , the way consultation and decision making takes place is absolutely crucial and I have been disappointed with how this process appears to have taken place, particularly as the Daily Telegraph recently published a poll placing Haddenham as 9th friendliest place to live in Britain. It was interesting to note that Keswick, which came 1st was noted to be particularly welcoming to dog owners. Newer residents and new dog owners often comment on the friendliness of the dog owning community here and how this helps them settle in and feel welcomed. All groups in society need to be equally represented by elected bodies and the value and human benefits which come from dog ownership, especially for more isolated people, should not be underestimated. Unfortunately this proposed measure does not ring true with the spirit of an inclusive and welcoming Haddenham. Any community friction as a result of these measures being imposed may well inhibit this further and I would hope that the dog owner mentioned in the letter of complaint was offered some compassion and support when it was clear how distressed she was by her dogs' behaviour.</p>	<p>It is the irresponsible dog owners who cause the friction and this order aims to give the parish council the power to deal with these people which will lead to a happier community.</p>
<p>I would support any measures to enforce penalties on dog owners who do not clear up dog mess from paths; the current warnings displayed are only partially effective so more of the same is unlikely to provoke a change. However many years ago, when the Midsomer Murders production team complained about the amount of dog mess in lanes, additional bins were provided and the problem drastically reduced. Practical measures such as those often are the most effective in the real world and responsible dog owners would be happy to advise the Parish Council on where additional bins would be best placed.</p>	<p>The provision and emptying of dog waste bins is a very expensive service which the parish council has to consider carefully before extending the existing numbers. There is always the option of taking the dog waste home and disposing of it with the household waste.</p>
<p>The imposition of DCOs will not make any difference to the majority of other responsible dog owners who already clear up after their dogs</p>	

and keep them on a lead in public places.	
43	
I am very pleased that you have taken such firm action in respect of the dog issues in the village. As a mum to 2 small children I am very much in favour of ensuring that the play areas are safer and cleaner. Only last week my 2 year old was playing in Banks Park and was a centimetre away from stepping in another dog mess.	
As is mentioned in the proposal, responsible dog owners take their dogs on proper walks and don't just let them hang around the play areas, so this shouldn't be a concern to the vast majority of owners in the village.	
I would just like to check how the orders will be publicised and enforced, to ensure that people adhere to them?	
Many thanks for listening to my concerns and taking action.	
44	
I'm a responsible dog owner who cleans up after my dog and wouldn't dream of taking him into playing field for exercise. Those who are not so responsible will not be deterred by the implementation of the above order. Neither will I be spying on and reporting offenders, what a dreadful position to ask us to be in. The parish council's time and money would be better used to protest against the development in the village. If us dog walkers loose the glebe and airfield as exercise areas where else can we go? With dog ownership at 25 per cent of the population, 1000 more houses will bring 250 extra dogs and their poo into the village.	