PSPO - Other Consultation responses with a position statement from CDC

1	National Farmers Union, James Osman, NFU County Adviser, East Sussex, West Sussex & The Isle of Wight	14 Mar 2017
2	Cakeham Manor Estate.	10 Mar 2017
3	Lynchmere Parish Council	14 Mar 2017
4	Stephen Johnson, Maybush Copse Friends	7 Mar 2017
5	Chichester Harbour Conservancy, Judith Meagher	8 Mar 2017
6.	Dogs Trust	22 Feb 2017

Detail of Consultation Responses

1. NFU

The NFU raised the following issues;

- a) dog attacks on livestock
- b) Abortion or defective calves in cattle affected with parasites from dog faeces

The NFU request the Council be more proactive in helping to deal with these issues by using local powers to make up for the 'grey' areas in the legislation.

Chichester District Council's response to the NFU

a) Worrying of Livestock

As NFU have identified there is legislation in place to deal with worrying of livestock. However, there is a misunderstanding among dog owners about their responsibilities around livestock, for example, worrying livestock does not mean the dog is chasing the livestock. Just having a dog, not at heel, could constitute worrying. The Council will include livestock issues in future education and responsible dog ownership initiatives.

The Council recognises the legal position is that dogs must be under control rather than on a lead. There is no definition of what "under control is" and unfortunately, many dog owners like to believe they have their dog under control. However it is very difficult to train a dog to ignore the natural instinct to chase a running animal.

Enforcement action for worrying livestock is often after harm has occurred, and then when it has been possible to gather the evidence.

Rather than include a dogs on lead order, the Council is proposing to extend the dogs on leads by direction across the whole District. In addition, worrying of livestock will be included in any responsible dog ownership initiatives and PR.

b) Dog Fouling

The PSPO applies to all footpaths in Chichester District but exempts land used for agriculture or for woodlands. The Council is proposing to remove the land exemptions. The Council believe the PSPO would help act as a deterrent and could be included in education and responsible dog ownership initiatives. Farmers could also put up signs around sensitive land to explain the order.

2. Cakeham Manor Estate

It was brought to our attention that the map was incorrect.

A corrected map has been agreed with Cakeham Manor Estate and is attached to the PSPO.

3. Lynchmere Parish Council

Request from Lynchmere Parish Council to include Copse Road Recreation Ground and Heathcote Gardens in point 7 in the schedule for the dog fouling order and to notify us that the map for Camelsdale Recreation Ground was wrong.

These areas are all parish owned and therefore are already covered by the order, Schedule 1 – Fouling of Land by Dogs, point 5. Camelsdale Recreation Ground has been removed from point 7 as it is covered by point 5.

4. Maybush Copse Friends

Request from Maybush Copse Friends to include Maybush Copse in point 7 in the schedule for the dog fouling order.

Maybush Copse has been included in the PSPO for dog fouling.

5. Chichester Harbour Conservancy

Request that, like Fishbourne, the harbour at Nutbourne be an area where dogs must be kept on a lead from October to the end of March (ie through the bird season).

The order at Fishbourne Channel is not dogs on lead but dogs on lead by direction of an authorised officer of the Council. It is proposed that this order is extended across the whole of the district and therefore will include the harbour at Nutbourne.

6. Dogs Trust

Fouling - Council should rigorously enforce this element, ensure adequate bins are provided, consider providing free disposal bags, ensure there is sufficient signage.

Dogs on Lead by Direction – This element is key and could result in all other controls being dropped, other than fouling and particularly where they are not effectively enforced.

Exclusion – support exclusion from children play areas, keep other exclusion areas to a minimum and possibly restrict them to enclosed areas. Where exclusion areas are in place, sign them well and provide alternative dog exercising areas.

The PSPO is enforced by the Dog Wardens and Foreshores Officers, we also undertake a lot of responsible dog ownership initiatives and PR where the public are encouraged to provide evidence to enable targeted enforcement, the bin provision is covered in Appendix 3 – response to fouling queiries, give out bags during patrols, signage is in place and we will be reviewing for the new PSPO.

Dogs on lead by direction is a valuable element and could result in removal of other controls, however, there is local support for the exclusion order to remain for the identified areas.

Exclusion – the city parks are enclosed and well signed. The beach exclusion areas are identified by signage and the groynes demark them. There is an issue where people are walking along the shoreline as it is not possible to put signage on the shoreline. In this situation, they would be asked to move to an area of beach where dogs are not excluded. There are alternative areas in the near vicinity where dogs are allowed.