# Scrutiny Board (Safer and Stronger Communities)

## **Review of the Phase 2 proposed Dog Control Orders**

# **Comments for inclusion into Executive Board Report**

## Introduction

It was agreed in June 2011 that the Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny Board should play an active part in analysing the proposed options arising from the Phase 2 Dog Control Orders project before approval is sought from the Executive Board in December 2011 to implement further Dog Control Orders. In view of the need to conclude this piece of work by November, it was agreed that this would be considered via working group meetings to which all Board Members would be invited to attend.

An initial working group meeting was held on 18<sup>th</sup> August 2011 to enable Scrutiny Members to gain a better understanding of the aims of the Phase 2 project and who has been targeted as part of the consultation process. A second working group meeting was held on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2011 to consider the initial findings from the Phase 2 consultation process, which concluded on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2011.

During these working group meetings, the following information was circulated by officers within Environment and Neighbourhoods and discussed with Scrutiny Board Members:

- Dog Control Orders Project Timeline for Phase 2
- Copy of the Area Committee Report in March 2011 on the Phase 2 Dog Control Orders;
- Briefing note on the Dog Control Orders dated 9th August 2011;
- Copy of the Public Notice regarding the Dog Control Orders Consultation;
- Statistics of City Wide Dog Activities from April 2010 to March 2011;
- Statistics of City Wide Dog Activity from January 2011 to June 2011.
- A statistical analysis of the responses received from the Phase 2 consultation process.

The following related issues were also raised by Scrutiny Board Members:

- Reporting on dog activity;
- Enforcement of Dog Control Orders;
- Provision of Dog Waste Bins;
- Proposed Enforcement Policy for the Walking of More Than Four Dogs (Dog Specified Maximum Order).

This report presents the agreed view of the Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny Board. The Board has requested that these comments are incorporated into the report to go before Executive Board on the proposed Phase 2 Dog Control Orders.

## **Observations, Conclusions and Recommendations**

## Phase 2 consultation process and response rates

The Scrutiny Board was happy with the Phase 2 consultation proposals and the level of media coverage given to promote the Council's online survey for respondents to the consultation. Prior to the consultation, individual schools were approached on an 'opt-in' basis in terms of their grounds being included as part of the proposed new Exclusion Order. The Scrutiny Board requested that those schools which had not responded prior to the commencement of the consultation be reminded to respond and for Parent Teacher Association (PTA) Chairs to be included in this reminder.

With a total of 386 respondents across the city, with 372 responses received to the consultation questions, the Scrutiny Board notes that this is low in comparison to the Phase 1 response rate. The Scrutiny Board was informed that the Phase 1 consultation had generated some concern initially and therefore many of the respondents were seeking clarification about Dog Control Orders in general. The Board was reassured that this was not a factor during the Phase 2 consultation process as the Council had taken steps to ensure that the lessons learned from the Phase 1 consultation had been adopted for Phase 2. The Scrutiny Board is particularly pleased to note that responses were received across the city and from residents with and without dogs (around 53% were dog owners).

## Responses to the proposed new Dog Control Orders

• Dog Exclusion Orders

The Council proposed that the existing Dog Exclusion Order be amended with an extended list of other land designated for a specific purpose, such as remembrance and wildlife gardens, where a dog may cause damage and disturbance to the area even when under close control. The proposed extended list also included new children's play areas and school grounds where the schools have indicated the wish to have such an Order.

The consultation results show that the majority of respondents are in agreement with Dog Exclusion Orders on the extended list of specified areas. In view of this, the Scrutiny Board recommends that the Executive Board supports the proposal to revoke the existing Dog Control (Exclusion) Order and replaces it with a new Order with the proposed updated schedule of land.

## **Recommendation 1**

## That the Executive Board supports the proposal to revoke the existing Dog Control (Exclusion) Order and replaces it with a new Order with the proposed updated schedule of land.

As part of the Council's approach to review or amend schedules of land associated with Dog Control Orders, the Scrutiny Board recommends that the relevant Ward Members be approached to share their local knowledge of the designated areas to help identify any anomalies prior to finalising the schedule.

## **Recommendation 2**

That as part of the Council's approach to review or amend schedules of land associated with Dog Control Orders, the Scrutiny Board recommends that the relevant Ward Members be approached to share their local knowledge of the designated areas to help identify any anomalies prior to finalising the schedule.

• Dog Control (Dogs on Leads at All Times) Order

The Council proposed to make a new Order stating that on certain specified land, dogs should be on a lead at all times. It is proposed that this Order be applied to all carriageways and adjacent footpaths and grass verges within the Leeds City Council district and is to ensure that any dog is kept under control at all times and does not run unexpectedly into a road causing traffic accidents or injury to the dog itself. It is proposed that this Order also be applied to cemeteries and crematoria.

The Scrutiny Board particularly welcomes this proposal and is pleased to note that the majority of respondents support this proposal too (75% in relation to carriageways and adjacent footpaths and grass verges and 90% in relation to cemeteries and crematoria).

## **Recommendation 3**

That the Executive Board supports the proposal to make a Dog Control (Dogs on Leads at All Times) Order requiring that dogs should be on a lead at all times on the specified land, which is to include all carriageways, adjacent footpaths and grass verges within the Leeds City Council district and in cemeteries and crematoria.

• Dog Control (Dogs on Leads by Direction) Order

The Scrutiny Board also supports the proposal to amend the existing Dogs on Leads by Direction Order to ensure that it applies wherever the new Dogs on Leads at All Times Order does not.

## **Recommendation 4**

That the Executive Board supports the proposal to revoke the existing Dog Control (Dogs on Leads by Direction) Order and make a new Order in the same terms which applies throughout the Leeds district on any land to which the Dog Control (Dogs on Leads at All Times) Order does not apply.

#### Effective enforcement of Dog Control Orders

The Scrutiny Board recognises the need for greater resources to be focused around the enforcement of Dog Control Orders in order for them to be effective. In particular, utilising officers in other service areas to act as professional witnesses to any breaches of the Orders rather than specifically needing to be the enforcers of Fixed Penality Notices (FPN). This potentially could include the role of PCSOs, Parks and Countryside and ALMO staff. The Scrutiny Board also believes that there needs to be a stronger message communicated to the public that these Orders will be rigorously enforced to act as a deterrent.

It is vital that the Council effectively communicates with the public regarding any new Orders, which includes the use of appropriate signage. However, the Board agrees that particular sensitivity would need to be given to areas such as cemeteries and crematoria and also remembrance gardens with regard to signage.

## **Recommendation 5**

# That any new Dog Control Orders are effectively communicated to the public, which includes the use of appropriate signage, and for the Council to reinforce the message that Dog Control Orders will be rigorously enforced.

Whilst acknowledging the level of support for the proposed Dog Control Orders as they stand, the Scrutiny Board recognises that a degree of common sense should be applied to enforcing such Orders, with particular reference to the Dogs on Leads Order. The primary aim of adopting Dog Control Orders is to enable the Council to ensure that dog ownership within the city is conducted responsibly without causing nuisance, distress or health hazards. In doing so, the public interest test should be applied, i.e. where it is not in the public interest to take enforcement action, because the issue is low risk or the resources required are not commensurate with the level of risk presented by the problem, the Council will not pursue offences.

## <u>Proposed Enforcement Policy for the Walking of More Than Four Dogs (Dog</u> <u>Specified Maximum Order</u>)

Whilst the consultation process did not propose changes to the Order that limits the number of dogs that can be walked by an individual to four, the Scrutiny Board learned that the Council received feedback from professional dog walkers about a lack of clarity in relation to this Order and concern that the Order could put legitimate businesses in jeopardy, especially in current times of economic hardship, if enforced to the letter.

In line with the public interest test approach to enforcement, the Scrutiny Board supports the proposal to formalise this into an Enforcement Policy in relation to the Dog Specified Maximum Order. This test should be undertaken on a case by case basis. The understanding is that where the enforcing officer is happy that the person walking the dogs is undertaking it as a professional service and can prove that they were a legitimate and professional dog walker, it would not be deemed in the public interest to pursue action if the person was walking up to the DEFRA recommended maximum of six dogs. If agreed, the original Order would remain in place and enforcement action would still be taken where the public interest test is not met and the Council does not deem the dog-walker to be appropriately qualified to walk more than four dogs or if the dogs breach any of the other existing Orders regardless of the number being walked or the professional status of the dog-walker.

#### **Recommendation 6**

That the Executive Board supports the development of an Enforcement Policy in relation to the Dog Specified Maximum Order.

## Other observations made by the Scrutiny Board

The Scrutiny Board also made the following observations which may be of interest to Executive Board:

The Scrutiny Board considered statistical information on city wide dog activity during the period April 2010 to March 2011. Particular reference was made to the numbers of dogs destroyed during this period and the reasons for this. It was highlighted that the vast majority of stray dogs taken into kennels are either reclaimed or re-homed (95%). Only when a stray dog is not reclaimed or re-homed within a certain period of time is this measure taken. In view of this, future dog activity reports should clearly show the numbers of dogs that have been successfully re-homed.

The Scrutiny Board agreed that greater provision and regular collection of dog waste bins is also needed to support responsible dog ownership, especially in parks and established dog exercise areas of open land.