

PSPO - Other Consultation responses with a position statement from CDC

1	Local visitor or resident	email 20-08-2020
2	Ian Milne, Easebourne Parish Council	email 28-07-2020
3	Louise Collis, Fittleworth Parish Council	email 19-08-2020
4	Councillor Simon Oakley	email 28-06-2020
5	Sam Tate, East Wittering and Bracklesham Parish Council	Telephone conversation 02-09-2020
6	Zoe Neil, Selsey Town Council	Telephone conversation 02-09-2020 Email 17-09-2020
7	The Kennel Club	email 14-08-2020

Detail of Consultation Responses:

1. Local resident or visitor raised the following issues:
 - a) Would like more dog exclusion areas/larger dog exclusion areas.
 - b) Raise concern about dog faeces by the edge of the sea and on walking routes along the coast.
 - c) Raises concern about the number of dogs on the beach.

Chichester District Council's response to the resident/visitor

The dog exclusion zones extant under the current PSPO have proven unenforceable due to access to the zones walking parallel to the shoreline, the inability to provide clear signage at lower parts of the beach and the prevalence of visitors without local knowledge. Larger and more numerous dog exclusion zones would be likely to suffer from similar issues to those described and, in the event that they were better understood by dog walkers using the beach, then they might squeeze dog walking into smaller areas causing higher densities of dogs in other areas. Dog fouling will remain an enforceable issue on the beaches including the privately owned West Wittering Estate and Cakeham Estate beach areas.

2. Easebourne Parish Council raised the following issues:
 - a) Request that Easebourne Park is included in the PSPO as a dogs on leads at all times area.

Chichester District Council's response to Easebourne Parish Council

The Parish has not supplied evidence that would meet the tests for inclusion of the area in the PSPO. Likewise CDC has no records on its database that evidences activities that have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the vicinity that is, or is likely to be persistent or continuing in nature, is or is likely to be, unreasonable and justifies the restrictions imposed. Nevertheless the area is included in the draft PSPO by the provisions for fouling and dogs on lead by direction

which can be the subject of enforcement. A change such as requested would also need to be subject to a consultation exercise at a future date.

3. Fittleworth Parish Council raised the following issues:
- a) Requests that Fittleworth Recreation Ground, School Lane, Fittleworth (FRG) be included in the PSPO as a dog exclusion zone.
 - b) Notes that the FRG is situated directly in front of the Sports & Social Club and used by all age groups to play football and cricket as well as being the location for the children's Playground and Youth Area.
 - c) Notes that the area is sometimes subject to fouling which is not picked up.
 - d) Notes the health dangers associated with dog faecal matter and cites the protection of children's health as the need for the dog exclusion zone.

Chichester District Council's response to Fittleworth Parish Council

The Parish has not supplied evidence that would meet the tests for inclusion of the area in the PSPO. Likewise CDC has no records on its database that evidences activities that have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the vicinity that is, or is likely to be persistent or continuing in nature, is or is likely to be, unreasonable and justifies the restrictions imposed. Excluding dogs would be excessive as dog fouling is already covered by the draft PSPO (and current PSPO).

4. Councillor Simon Oakley raised the following issues:
- a) Requests that CDC includes, at Schedule 1.7 of the Order (Fouling of Land by Dogs), the WSCC owned land at the old Tangmere Airfield.

Chichester District Council's response to Councillor Simon Oakley

Elaine Sanders, WSCC Head of Assets, Asset Management and Estates responded by email to CDC officers (cc Councillor Oakley) (17-07-2020) that WSCC did not propose to request that the old Tangmere Airfield be included in the revised PSPO.

5. East Wittering and Bracklesham Parish Council:
- a) Confirm that the parish council are pragmatic about the challenges of signage and enforcement and accept the changes proposed ie the deletion of the no dog zone at Bracklesham and East Wittering.

Chichester District Council's response to East Wittering and Bracklesham Parish Council

Weighing the parishes pragmatic view with the wider consultation responses, which support the removal of the No Dog Zones, the recommendation to Cabinet will be to adopt the revised PSPO without the two No Dog Zones; one at Bracklesham and the other at East Wittering.

6. Selsey Town Council:
- a) Confirm that Selsey Town Council has not responded to the consultation.

Chichester District Council's response to Selsey Town Council

CDC has indicated to Selsey Town Council that their 17-09-2020 discussion of the consultation draft revised PSPO will be too late to be considered as part of the public consultation response. STC did however confirm on 17-09-2020 that it supports the council's proposal.

7. The Kennel Club raised the following issues:
- a. As a general principle, The Kennel Club highlight the importance for all PSPOs to be necessary and proportionate responses to problems caused by dogs and irresponsible owners. It is also important that authorities balance the interests of dog owners with the interests of other access users.
 - b. The Kennel Club encourage councils to use a wider definition of "assistance dog" to include "a dog trained to assist a person with a disability", rather than "dog trained *by a prescribed charity* to assist a person with a disability" as included in CDC order.

Chichester District Council's response to the Kennel Club

The measures in the CDC proposed order are consistent with the Kennel club's recommendations. On the definition of "assistance dog" this has not proven to be a point of dispute in the enforcement of the existing PSPO and therefore CDC is not proposing to change this. Enforcement Officers are trained to have due regard to disability in their consideration of what may constitute a reasonable excuse for activity that may breach a PSPO, and therefore not constitute an offence.